

Responses to Consultation

Binswood Avenue:

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 | <p>You invite comments, support or objections so here are two.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Binswood Avenue is regularly used to provide FREE parking for people working in Leamington Town Centre or just visiting to shop or avail themselves of the excellent restaurants and cafes in town. In the four years that we have lived here, this street has become increasingly popular to the extent that visitors to the properties along this street often struggle to find parking slots. At school pick-up time, we sometimes have problems accessing our private road which runs alongside and is part of Binswood Avenue. Your proposed changes do nothing to address the increased pressure on this street.• You give no explanation for the proposed extended bays. So, why are these necessary? Are they to provide parking for coaches or for the numerous school busses used by The Kingsley school. And if that is the case, what safety measures will be introduced for the many children using these busses? In addition, extended bays would narrow the street and it is used for two-way traffic wishing to access the Kenilworth Road which would make it more dangerous for daily school use. I would appreciate an explanation for these extended bays please. <p>As relative newcomers to Leamington, we have observed increased traffic in the town yet at the same time, a reduction in the number of parking places for families and individuals wishing to enjoy all that Leamington has to offer. This is the BIG problem that you need to address. Finally, I sincerely hope that you do indeed take notice of our comments because my experience has led me to think that this is merely a formality.</p> |
| 2 | <p>We live at XX Newbold Court and will obviously be affected by these changes and look forward to your confirmation that we will be issued with a residents parking permit</p> |
| 3 | <p>No problem with additional parking bays being marked on the north side of Binswood Avenue. It will probably help avoid confusion which would-be parkers suffer from at the moment as the parking regulations are different on each side of the road.</p> <p>In conjunction with other neighbours we feel that it would be better to leave the yellow lines at the end of the cul de sac so that people who have driven to the end of the road,</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>expecting a way through, are able to turn round safely and easily. There is already very little space for them to do so.</p> |
| 4 | <p>The purpose of this email is to object to the implementation of Warwick District CPE Variation 6 (Binswood Avenue) which is procedurally flawed</p> <p>When we purchased our property in 1999 there were no parking restrictions. Over time, more people parked during the day whilst at work in town. Restrictions were then applied to the South side which have been sufficient to allow residents the amenity to park outside their homes. The only time that an issue arises is at Christmas with shoppers which should be considered as an exception. As such this measure is not proportionate and the proposals should not go ahead.</p> <p>No objective evidence has been provided to justify why the proposed changes are required. As such there would be sufficient grounds for a Judicial Review based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • procedural unfairness • the process leading up to a decision was improper • the decision maker who is supposed to be impartial is biased <p>The Council must provide objective evidence that all local designated car parks are full to capacity at the times when parking is deemed to be an issue on Binswood Avenue. If this is not the case, the cost of parking in designated car parks should be lowered such that the existing provision is utilised more effectively rather than displacing vehicles into adjacent street parking facilities which should be for residents.</p> <p>A study should be commissioned over a suitable period of time, lowering the cost of parking until car parks are full to capacity at peak times. A survey should then be commissioned to understand whether there is in fact an issue with parking provision on Binswood Avenue. Until such study is carried out the proposal remains a hypothesis which has been untested and is therefore biased.</p> <p>Given that when we purchased our property we enjoyed unrestricted parking, it would be logical to claim that this amenity should be protected and residents issued free parking permits which would be funded by their already high Council Tax.</p> |
| 5 | <p>I object to the implementation of Warwick District CPE Variation 6 (Binswood Avenue) as no evidence has been provided to support it.</p> <p>We moved into X Binswood Avenue in 2001 and have always been able to park outside our home with ease, other than the festive holidays. The current measures were unnecessary and made no additional improvement, as such it is inappropriate to extend them.</p> <p>The occasional parking congestion we suffer is caused by unfairly high charges in the designated car parks, evident from the fact they function below capacity.</p> <p>The proposal may have been valid if the council had gathered and provided the evidence to support it. That said, in its absence, should the proposal be approved, it is my intention to challenge it in court.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 6 | <p>This correspondence is to formally object to the implementation of the above.</p> <p>I have looked through all the benchmarking and other reports and there is nothing in there that justifies the proposed levels of change.</p> <p>If you compare the costs this would result in the costs to the households with 3 cars being the 11th most expense of the 13 areas benchmarked.</p> <p>In the current environment and together with the likely economic distress that will continue post COVID-19 then it is much more likely the younger children of age to drive will also remain in the family home longer thus pushing more people into the 3 car category.</p> <p>Also the impact of COVID-19 is also likely to drive people away from public transport - both through the implications of social distancing which will drive bus and train capacity down to less than 20% plus the concern of people to be safer. This impact is already being seen in China. Thus use of vehicle's and requirement to park them is likely to increase at a time when residents will be more economically challenged.</p> <p>If you also benchmark the council tax charges for the same 13 areas - Warwickshire is already at the top (most expensive) of those comparator areas.</p> <p>In addition i have not seen evidence that all local car parks are at full capacity at the time its deemed an issue on Binswood Avenue.</p> <p>So in summary this should be rejected.</p> <p>If the grounds for proposing these changes is parking fees are too low then this analysis must also factor in the other funding streams the councils get so must include council tax charges etc - if you factor these in then charges are already highest of the areas benchmarked.</p> |
| 7 | <p>We would like to officially submit our objection to the implementation of Warwick District CPE Variation 6 (Binswood Avenue) on the grounds that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proper procedures have not been followed. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full reviews and reports have not been carried out regarding: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.1 The assessment of whether the car parks are at capacity. If not, what impact would reducing car park charges make. 1.1.2 We have not had the opportunity to have our questions answered due to the lockdown as no one at the council has been available. We need to understand the implications of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.2.1 Dispensation and Suspension Charges – will this significantly increase costs of building works and repairs needed due to additional and excessive parking costs for contractors? |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>1.1.2.2 The suggested possibility of the introduction of Business Permits. Would this potentially exacerbate the parking problem by issuing permits to businesses that previously were not entitled to them? Thus, residents paying more and the parking problem could be worse.</p> <p>1.1.2.3 Are all roads in the area having the same charges? There appear to be similar roads that are not on the list.</p> <p>2. The charges for Visitors parking are exorbitant and will restrict family staying with residents</p> <p>2.1 Our family come to stay with us from long distances, often between 2 to 3 weeks. This would mean that potentially we could use nearly half of our permits in one visit.</p> <p>We hope you will reconsider your proposals.</p> |
| 8 | <p>Clearly there is a conflict between residents and members of the public, when it comes to parking within urban areas, this is only exacerbated when local councils introduce car parking charges in town centres and urban areas with the intention of raising additional revenue to supplement their annual income. Clearly there are other problems caused by this, such as the impact on the UK's High Streets and the retailers where their customers are being charged for parking, whilst the customers of out of town retailers are offered free parking.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the problem must vary between residential areas where the size and nature of the residential properties directly impacts on the demand for parking, for example in streets with a high density of small terraced housing to allow up to 3 cars per house would seem excessive and only lead to more car parking problems, whilst large Victorian and Regency terraced and semi-detached properties such as the houses in Binswood Avenue, could be used as large family homes where more than 3 cars per house wouldn't be enough. This also causes anomalies where two identical properties could be offered a different number of car permits, if one is a family home it would only be allowed 3 whilst the other with 3 flats would be allow 9 permits.</p> <p>It seems that the approach being taken by WCC is too simplistic and fails to ascertain the facts and only seems to be a means of recovering the cost of £80 per permit, which I must question as this seems excessive and without a full break down on how this figure is arrived at, it is difficult to separate the costs directly related to the implementation of the parking permit scheme as opposed to the other statutory obligations of WCC as the highway authority. From my own experience of running a carpark the penalty charges more than cover the cost of running the enforcement so it can't surely cost £80 to issue a permit and have that information entered into a data base? Furthermore, as this problem is a direct result of the district councils introducing parking charges and restrictions on the public roads in town centres in order to raise revenue, surely the district councils should be required to make a contribution towards these costs as it benefits financially from these new restrictions ?</p> <p>I would have thought that WCC should have first established the demand for residents' car parking permits for the various Zones and areas and then once it has this information</p> |

it can then work with the district councils to produce a detailed proposal for the individual areas which allocates the correct number of spaces per property, whilst producing a detailed cost of how much this will cost, taking into account the fact that the problem has been created by the district council introducing their car parking charges. I would surmise there would be only a very few areas in our towns that would require parking permits if the current charges and restrictions in town centres were removed. Clearly in normal circumstances Warwick and Stratford town centres may be on par with Oxford due to their added tourist attraction so it could be argued that they require the highest level of parking protection, however why should residents in areas less affected be asked to pay the same costs ?

In respect to the two options I would suggest option 2 as it's the cheapest, however I am strongly against the abolishment of the visitors permit as our household has more than one classic car, all of which are usually parked off street, however when in use they will be parked outside the property which means the visitors permit is very useful. Unless of course the new permits allow any car registered to the permit holders address to be listed on the permits. Then a resident visitors permit should still be available but at the cost of one of the other permits ie 3 permits or 2 permits and 1 visitors per household.

There is a degree of nonsense in the Benchmarking Report in particular in the 3.1.2 "This could encourage the use of few vehicles by residents which in turn could reduce congestion and promote a cleaner environment" it might come as a surprise that it doesn't matter how many cars one individual owns as he can only ever drive one at a time so there is no difference from a resident with only one car. Car owners already pay a very high level of direct and indirect tax for owning their vehicles and without good alternative public transport they shouldn't be used by central or local governments as cash cows.

In 3.3 Dispensations and Suspensions, why should households be charged for having work carried out on their properties this is incongruous and is contrary to all of the efforts being made by government and Local authorities to deduce the effect of greenhouse gases etc surely owners of properties in these town centres will be living in housing that is old and in urgent need of improvement and repair so surely every effort should be made to encourage this and not penalised by introducing a further cost/tax on carrying out work on their properties? Where is the joined up government? Further evidence to suggest these changes are driven by revenue demands and not based on environmental and housing improvement needs.

In conclusion:

- there needs to be a more flexible approach to the implementation of any new car parking restrictions on households to reflect the individual needs of the residential areas and not as proposed a blanket approach which is entirely driven by the local authorities wish to increase their revenue. So; no to tiered system and no to the new visitor parking.
- There should be flexibility so that each parking permit can have more than one registration number registered to it, giving households flexibility to park one car on the street at any one time whilst allowing them to change which car they park on a daily basis, to suit their needs and travel commitments.

| | |
|--|---|
| | Finally with the impact of the coronavirus which will devastate our High Streets it must be time for local authorities across the UK to finally abolish all car parking charges both on and off street. |
|--|---|

Castle Close:

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 | <p>I have received a letter CPE Variation 6 with regard to parking in Castle Close and the proposal to introduce double yellow lines to one side of the road. I am very much in favour of this proposal as the current status is both inconvenient and down right dangerous to residents. Currently 2 cars parking opposite restrict access up or down the road. It would be impossible for an emergency vehicle to access when this occurs. We have on numerous occasions had to call police officers out as a result and occasionally vehicles have been removed . The current state of affairs is not acceptable and must be changed before a serious incident occurs.</p> |
| 2 | <p>I just wish to state that <u>I fully support these proposals</u> and hope they can be implemented and enforced as soon as possible, which will go a long way to solving the problems being experienced by residents.</p> <p>Clearly you are aware of the need for such restrictions in this road so there is no need for me to repeat them other than to state that the problem in this narrow road has become worse in recent months. There are mix of elderly and young people in this road and the double parking and /or parking on the pavement by inconsiderate motorists has caused much danger, inconvenience and nuisance to residents. (There is at least one person in the road registered blind to whom such obstructions cause considerable danger and inconvenience)</p> <p>Several times over the last 18 months police have had to attend to remove vehicles blocking access, delivery drivers has been unable to gain access, refuse vehicles have been unable make collections and the width of the road has been so constricted that emergency vehicles would have been unable to gain access. (given the age and health issues of some residents it is not unusual for ambulances to have to attend incidents in the road)</p> <p>Whilst the double yellow lines are on the opposite side of the road to my home I would still support the implementation of these regulations should they have been outside my house.</p> <p>I hope this is helpful for your consultation process.</p> |
| 3 | <p>I would confirm that I am in favour of your suggested proposal for the following reasons;</p> <p>As you are no doubt aware the problem in this narrow road has become worse in recent months with inconsiderate motorists causing danger, inconvenience and nuisance to residents.</p> <p>Several times over the last 18 months police have had to attend to remove vehicles blocking access, delivery drivers have been unable to gain access, refuse vehicles have been unable to make collections and the width of the road has been so constricted that emergency vehicles would have been unable to gain access. The latter is very important given the age and health issues of some residents it is not unusual for ambulances to have to attend incidents in the road.</p> <p>That said there is a mix of different age groups amongst the residents from young children to those who are elderly, some with disabilities. There is at least one person</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>in the road who is registered blind to whom obstructions such as vehicles parking on the footway cause considerable danger and inconvenience.</p> <p>I would however wish to suggest an addition to your proposals for double yellow lines on the West side of the road in that you consider placing a single yellow line for limited waiting (for example 2 hours with no return in 4) through the working day (e.g. 8-0am – 6-0pm) on the east Side of the road.</p> <p>Being a public road, motorists who comply with traffic regulations, are entitled to park. However, most of those who park during the day do so for many hours, sometimes for days. This means that the available free parking for visitors to the town using local shops and amenities for short periods are prevented from parking. This leads to a very inefficient use of the parking space. My suggestion would mean that more people could park during the day. Similar restrictions are already in place in many nearby roads in the town, for example Cock Sparrow Street, which is comparable to Castle Close in that all residents have drives at their homes.</p> <p>I hope this is helpful for your consultation process.</p> |
| 4 | <p>Dear Ben -Thank you for keeping us informed and I have now navigated my way through all the paperwork and would support the double yellow lines as way forward. Whilst it will help prevent double parking, chicane driving, benefit the siting nurses and service vehicles it will not prevent parking all day, overnight and for up to three weeks. As a member at Castle Hill Baptist Church not keen on the trees and the absence of a facility for disabled visitors.</p> <p>Thanks again XXXXXXXX</p> <p>Alan Skillicorn</p> <p>From: Civil Enforcement Sent: 12 February 2020 10:29 To:XXXXXXXXX Subject: Re: Parking Castle Close Warwick</p> <p>Dear XXXXXXXXXX</p> <p>I don't know who would have removed the cones from the road. Police may have if they received reports, or a contractor working in the local area if they thought that they were theirs.</p> <p>I can confirm that the necessary documents have been sent off to our legal services department and they have begun the process of organising the advert in the local paper. We will be writing to all the residents in Castle Close when the consultation has begun.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>Ben Davenport Parking Management Traffic and Road Safety Group</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Communities Warwickshire County Council Telephone: 01926 410410 Email: civilenforcement@warwickshire.gov.uk Web: www.warwickshire.gov.uk Like us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/WarwickshireCountyCouncil Follow us on Twitter: twitter.com/warwickshire_cc</p> <hr/> <p>From: XXXXXXXXXX Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2020 10:15 AM To: Civil Enforcement <civilenforcement@warwickshire.gov.uk> Subject: Parking Castle Close Warwick</p> <p>For the attention of Ben Davenport</p> <p>To respect the information given last year that there would be an opportunity for the residents to be consulted we have held off writing about the continuing inconsiderate all day and occasionally many days and nights parking by non residents to allow a breathing space for this consultation. However to help a new resident move in over the past two days we have been using cones to ask for no parking whilst the vans arrive/depart and return to move household goods in. Fantastic neighbourly care. Not so for someone, cones were removed. No knock on the door no warning it was an offence, no indication there was a complaint they were just removed. Any ideas who might have authorised? Look forward to your update on the consultation.</p> |
| 5 | <p>We wish to express our support for your proposal to install double yellow lines in Castle Close. This will eliminate the nuisance and risk to access caused by vehicles parking opposite each other in this narrow road.</p> <p>Castle Close is also used extensively for all-day parking by people working in Warwick town centre or visiting Warwick Castle, although plentiful off-road parking is available for these motorists. This causes great inconvenience to legitimate short-term visitors, parcel deliveries etc.</p> <p>We therefore urge the County Council also to impose a parking limit (we suggest 2 hours) on those parts of Castle Close not marked with double yellow lines.</p> |
| 6 | <p>Re your letter referencing the above, you have suggested double yellow lines to the west side of Castle Close. I have no objection and would support this</p> |

7

Dear Sir,

Parking Restrictions, Castle Close

Thank you for your letter dated 28th. February, 2020.

We have examined the proposal for Castle Close and wish to record our wholehearted support for the scheme.

This will have the following benefits:

Provide easier and safer passage for us, our neighbours and visitors to access our home.

Reduce the dangerous obstruction of the footpaths by cars parked thereon.

Enable delivery vehicles, refuse collections and tradespeople to gain access which currently is not always possible due to obstruction.

Ensure access for carers and emergency vehicles at all times.

We look forward to early implementation of the scheme.

proposed changes. Over the last 30 years we have had an opportunity to observe the traffic parking and are able to take a view. There are very few occasions where I have been unable to drive in and out of Castle Close. Drivers in general do not park in the turning area, common sense prevailing

General Observation.

The carriageway width is restricted to such an extent it cannot accommodate direct double parking. A number of properties have dropped the kerb to give access for more than one vehicle and appears to have some effect in deterring parking. Properties have driveways that are not long enough to fully accommodate a vehicle.

Problems generally arise during the working weekday when vehicles park for most of the day. Larger vehicles have a problem gaining access. Refuse and Green Bin collection is scheduled for Fridays. Other deliveries can be scheduled to arrive at the start of the working day and avoid disruption.

Vehicles also park on the footway obstructing movement for the partially sighted, hard of hearing persons and pram users, causing them to walk on the carriageway: safety aspect.

I carried out a brief survey and noted 9 vehicles parked on the east and 3 on the west side (Fri. 6 Mar). They remained there for the most of the working day. Driving along Castle Close requires moving around parked vehicles, which is frustrating, but can be negotiated.

A view also prevails that the highway is there for residents and their visitors only. I can recall some placing their own vehicles onto the carriageway or traffic cones to deter or reserve a parking space. I do have to remind residents that Castle Close is a public highway and not a private road. The introduction of parking restrictions on one side only could present challenges for the residents.

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>Parking Scheme Amendments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Parking restrictions introduced to cover some part of the working day preferably for a short period of no more than four hours. Schemes have been successfully used in other areas. It should cover both sides of the carriageway and be for weekdays only. There should be no parking on the footway. b) Residents parking scheme permit be made available to exempt residents and visitors. c) Provision should be made in the Order for carers, attending to older people, who arrive in cars along with meals on wheels. They need time to carry out their duties without risking a parking ticket. d) Road signs should clearly indicate restrictions. e) Deliveries and other vehicles required with good reason to stand and wait should be allowed to do so. <p>I would be most grateful if you would reconsider your proposal and take into account the points I have raised. I have been positive in my feedback in setting out the background and offering a solution, rather than giving an off the cuff submission. Should you wish to discuss any particular points then do not hesitate to contact me.</p> |
| 9 | <p>Double yellow lines on right hand side sent down.</p> <p>Excellent idea. It will stop visitors to the Castle thinking Castle Close is free parking & creating a lot of trouble for locals.</p> |
| 10 | <p>With regard to parking in Castle Close, there is no doubt some action is required. When Warwick workers/visitors/local residents/dental patients park on both sides of the road, emergency and service vehicles can't drive down the Close. This could be a major problem if there was a fire or serious accident in the Close.</p> <p>We support the plan for the double yellow lines down the even side of the Close around the end of the Cul-de-Sac and in front of our property.</p> |
| 11 | <p>I have just received a letter regarding proposals for a variation in parking rules for Castle Close and I have concerns about the impact that the plan will have, so I have to offer my formal objection to the proposal that has been offered.</p> <p>My mother has visiting carers 4 times a day from 8am until 8pm and they travel to our home in 2 cars, I do have a drive to offer parking to one of those carers but the other car won't be</p> |

| | |
|--------|--|
| | <p>able to park behind the first car at the mouth of our drive as double yellows are proposed to be in place along our side of the road, although the other side of the road will have no parking restrictions for most of its length I can assure you those spaces will be used for the whole day from early in the morning by people that work for local businesses trying to escape having to pay for parking in metred streets or avoiding those that require permits, for instance a pub In Warwick often has several cars parking all day on this road, with the location of Castle Close being so close to the town centre and also its proximity to the Castle that charge for parking it is the go to place for parking, there will never be an available spot for a visiting carer or relative or even a tradesman</p> <p>The carers have an important job working under pressures of time and have to arrive together it would be completely impractical for one of those cars to have to spend each visit trying to find a parking spot in Warwick and possibly having to walk for 20 minutes to get to our home, and they may not even find a space.</p> <p>I feel that the council should be doing all that they can to help carers in their important role in society and help reduce stress, making visits easier and make appointment times easier to keep. I have read that some councils have provided an exemption for carers to park on double yellows and hope this could be arranged, as the residents parking permits that they already have won't be any use, as I said the parking on the other side of the road will be filled from early in the morning.</p> <p>I look forward to your thoughts on this matter and hope that we can come to a workable outcome that will make us feel secure as life is difficult enough without the worry of a care package being put in jeopardy</p> |
| 1 2 | <p>I would like to confirm my support for these proposals as per the notice and drawing ref: TR\11124-05</p> <p>As a resident of Castle Close, I have experienced many problems due to inconsiderate parking. As the road is not wide enough for double parking I would not expect an overall reduction in availability of <u>safe</u> car parking spaces on the road.</p> <p>The current experience of double parking in the road is that it causes traffic obstructions and hazards. Additionally, as the road is a cul-de-sac, just one obstruction at top of road can impact a significant number of residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventing resident access to their homes (3 different example pics attached, number 1,2,3) • Preventing care workers and nurses accessing patients in the road or progressing to their next patient appointment (e.g. police attended incident on 5th Dec 2019 and nurse carers waiting over 2 hours, missing their next appointments – see pic 4 attached) • Preventing emergency vehicles accessing properties and residents (highlighted in media by many emergency services as a problem) and the consequent Health and Safety risks faced by residents • Preventing refuse collectors collecting rubbish and recycled materials (e.g. missed collection 14th February 2020 – see pics 5&6 attached) • Preventing Road sweeper and drains/gulley clearance (see pic 7). |

| | |
|--------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preventing delivery drivers accessing residents properties, causing missed deliveries. <p>An additional issue is parked vehicles, completely blocking pavements in effort to double park (see example pic 8), causing hazards and danger to pedestrians, by forcing them to step into the road or just an obstruction hazard, most notably to a blind resident of Castle Close.</p> <p>As the purpose of these restrictions is to avoid danger to persons or traffic, the implementation of this proposal will achieve that aim, in reducing the issue and hazards outlined.</p> <p>The primary intent must be to prevent double parking on road as the road is not wide enough, however I believe the majority of residents would also welcome the addition of a residents parking scheme with 2 hour limit on the non-restricted part of the road. As this is the closest road to the town centre and Warwick Castle without any parking restrictions, many people arrive early in the morning (from 7am on weekdays) and park all day. At weekends these are then replaced by castle visitors who park all day. A residents parking scheme with a non-resident waiting time limit (as implemented a few metres further up the adjoining Castle Street) would stop people parking all day and encourage turnover of short term visitors, supporting the local Warwick economy</p> <p>I confirm again my support of the proposals and look forward to their implementation as soon as practically possible</p> |
| 1 3 | <p>On behalf of the Trustees of Castle Hill Baptist Church I am writing to register an objection to part of the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Our objection involves the proposed changes to Eastgate outside the church site on Castle Hill.</p> <p>In our view whilst the widening of the pavement may prove to be more aesthetically acceptable nevertheless the provision of trees does obscure our advertising of community facilities offered. But more importantly appears to prohibit the currently enjoyed parking for the disabled facility. We regularly have up to seven motor cars arriving on a Sunday and indeed some weekday evenings jockeying for about five places on double yellow lines for up to two hours. and the proposals will provide none due to the width of the carriageway. We would appreciate the reconsideration of this proposal shown on the map. By providing designated parking facilities for the disabled.</p> <p>Could you confirm that the carriageway for down Castle Hill is single for vehicular traffic as no direction sign is shown on the published map. In contrast to Northgate Methodist church, Castle Hill Baptist Church has adequate provision for a hearse or wedding car as occasions arise.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> |
| 1 4 | <p>I agree that something needs to be done to improve the parking situation in Castle Close, as it is becoming intolerable. Putting double yellow lines down one side of the road will go some way to helping the situation and stop double parking. But this will not improve the overall parking situation for the residents, and will mean that workers in town will just arrive earlier & earlier in the morning to get a space. We would prefer to have residents permit parking on</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>this road, like ALL the surrounding roads in our area (Castle Lane, Castle Street, Back Lane, West Street, St Lawrence Ave, Crompton Street etc).</p> <p>We are the nearest road to the town centre and castle (with nearly one million visitors a year), with no restricted parking.</p> <p>We regularly get castle visitors being instructed to use our road to park, if their disabled car park is full. It's not fair that our road is being used as an overspill car park for the castle. It's even being advertised on a number of social media sites and internet sites (Trip Advisor, Top Dog Days), as a free parking place for people to use who don't want to pay the £7 parking charge at the castle.</p> <p>We want parking permits, not just double yellow lines!</p> |
| | |

This is in response to the ongoing consultation about conversion of the double yellow lines into additional parking capacity on Chapel Street.

The Warwick County Council (District of Warwick) CPE Variation 6 Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area (Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) Waiting restrictions, On-street Parking Places and Residents' Parking (Consolidation) (Variation No. 6) Order 2020

After a lot of thought and analysis, my wife and I herein formally object to the proposal with supporting rationale below:

1. Aesthetics- The Regent Mews development has exchanged commercial land (AC Lloyd) for residential purposes (Regent Mews). This is an attempt to aesthetically improve Leamington Spa and parking so close to the houses would detract from this theme.

a. I believe it would be beneficial for the area to continue the residential theme with a green verge in front of the houses, with planting, just extending into the road. This would resemble the street further down the road (Russell Terrace) and help improve the area by making it look even more residential, family friendly and in keeping with the Regency theme.

b. When we purchased this property, we recognized and understood the commitment we had to take in keeping with the Regency feel, like having wooden sash windows and doors, even though it required additional cost and maintenance.

c. The Regent Mews houses are family homes and as such are owner occupied all year round. The student accommodation opposite is only occupied partially throughout the year. Therefore, the owner/occupiers of the houses who do pay council tax, will be much more disadvantaged and disturbed by parked cars directly outside their homes.

d. I purchased the house with existing yellow lines out the front, less than 12 months ago. My views would have been different had there been car parking permitted outside the front of properties, which demonstrates a lower appeal and therefore demand. It is unfair to let us know of this now when we have already purchased the house. It should have been conveyed to us when we came for a viewing.

2. Health and Safety

a. Many of the Regent Mews residents have young families and / or young families visiting. As residents (children included) exit their homes, there is currently good visibility for both road users and residents to assess risks. With approved parking outside of the homes, this would be hampered, dramatically increasing the level of risk and potentially resulting in an increased number of road accidents involving pedestrians.

b. We bought this house as we would like to start a family soon but having cars parked in front of our house makes us nervous. We don't want to be paranoid when our child comes back from school. There is no gate/ barrier between our front door and where the cars will be parked.

3. Noise

a. We already experience a considerable amount of activity and noise from a variety of sources - Salvation Army, drug users, drunks and students (not that I would for one moment put them all in one group) - whose behaviour outside our properties is at times deplorable prompting calls to the police (shouting, knocking doors, beeping horns and revving engines). Providing more reason for

comings/goings at night is not something I would like to encourage in what is a family residential development.

b. As noted in 1b above, residents were limited to wooden sash windows as part of the planning conditions. Compared to UPVC lookalikes, the wooden windows noise insulation is very poor. The proposal for additional activity/parking will only compound this discomfort for residents and families, all of which have street facing bedrooms.

c. The plan shown does not reflect the current location of buildings: The new residential houses are much closer to the road than the original commercial building was (as depicted on the plan) and this would contribute to a greater level of noise in the houses and more specifically, bedrooms which are road facing.

4. Parking demand

a. Regent Mews residents do not need additional car parking on the road as we have a car park constructed at the rear of our properties and thus there is no demand for it.

b. There have been no neighbouring developments resulting in additional parking demands.

c. A car park for short period parking exists across the road from the Regent Mews properties and often carries a parking space surplus during the day.

d. The fact that people not using the car park opposite us will leave drink and drug users undisturbed and will only exacerbate this problem

e. If the driver for the parking spaces is demand then evidence should be provided to support there is demand in our area, and is not just a wider Leamington issue.

5. Parking Request by Developers not Residents

a. The residents of the 9 houses at Regent Mews on Chapel Street haven't requested additional parking as we've purchased 2 parking spaces each along with the house. This request was most likely made by the developers (Crucian & Co.) and we vehemently disagree to the need for converting the double yellow lines into additional parking.

I feel quite let down by the council; when I looked at the show home, EhB assured me that the council was putting money into this area to make it more family friendly. Conversely however, it appears now that families are not very welcome as less family friendly measures are being introduced. We bought this home thinking it would be a great place to start a family and are now having second thoughts about this purchase. Please take into account our views and concerns.
Thank you.

This is in response to the ongoing consultation about conversion of the double yellow lines into additional parking capacity on Chapel Street.

The Warwick County Council (District of Warwick) CPE Variation 6 Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area (Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) Waiting restrictions, On-street Parking Places and Residents' Parking (Consolidation) (Variation No. 6) Order 2020

After a lot of thought and analysis, my husband and I herein formally object to the proposal with supporting rationale below:

1. Aesthetics- The Regent Mews development has exchanged commercial land (AC Lloyd) for residential purposes (Regent Mews). This is an attempt to aesthetically improve Leamington Spa and parking so close to the houses would detract from this theme.

a. I believe it would be beneficial for the area to continue the residential theme with a green verge in front of the houses, with planting, just extending into the road. This would resemble the street further down the road (Russell Terrace) and help improve the area by making it look even more residential, family friendly and in keeping with the Regency theme.

b. When we purchased this property, we recognized and understood the commitment we had to take in keeping with the Regency feel, like having wooden sash windows and doors, even though it required additional cost and maintenance.

c. The Regent Mews houses are family homes and as such are owner occupied all year round. The student accommodation opposite is only occupied partially throughout the year. Therefore, the owner/occupiers of the houses who do pay council tax, will be much more disadvantaged and disturbed by parked cars directly outside their homes.

d. I purchased the house with existing yellow lines out the front. My views would have been different had there been car parking permitted outside the front of properties, which demonstrates a lower appeal and therefore demand. It is unfair to let us know of this now when we have already purchased the house. It should have been conveyed to us when we came for a viewing.

2. Health and Safety

a. Many of the Regent Mews residents have young families and / or young families visiting. As residents (children included) exit their homes, there is currently good visibility for both road users and residents to assess risks. With approved parking outside of the homes, this would be hampered, dramatically increasing the level of risk and potentially resulting in an increased number of road accidents involving pedestrians.

b. We bought this house as we would like to start a family soon but having cars parked in front of our house makes us nervous. We don't want to be paranoid when our child comes back from school. There is no gate/ barrier between our front door and where the cars will be parked.

3. Noise

a. We already experience a considerable amount of activity and noise from a variety of sources - Salvation Army, drug users, drunks and students (not that I would for one moment put them all in one group) - whose behaviour outside our properties is at times deplorable prompting calls to the police (shouting, knocking doors, beeping horns and revving engines). Providing more reason for comings/goings at night is not something I would like to encourage in what is a family residential development.

b. As noted in 1b above, residents were limited to wooden sash windows as part of the planning conditions. Compared to UPVC lookalikes, the wooden windows noise insulation is very poor. The proposal for additional activity/parking will only compound this discomfort for residents and families, all of which have street facing bedrooms.

c. The plan shown does not reflect the current location of buildings: The new residential houses are much closer to the road than the original commercial building was (as depicted on the plan) and this would contribute to a greater level of noise in the houses and more specifically, bedrooms which are road facing.

4. Parking demand

- a. Regent Mews residents do not need additional car parking on the road as we have a car park constructed at the rear of our properties and thus there is no demand for it.
- b. There have been no neighbouring developments resulting in additional parking demands.
- c. A car park for short period parking exists across the road from the Regent Mews properties and often carries a parking space surplus during the day.
- d. The fact that people not using the car park opposite us will leave drink and drug users undisturbed and will only exacerbate this problem
- e. If the driver for the parking spaces is in relation to a demand then evidence should be provided to support that there is demand in our area, and is not just a wider Leamington issue.

5. Parking Request by Developers not Residents

- a. The residents of the 9 houses at Regent Mews on Chapel Street haven't requested additional parking as we've purchased 2 parking spaces each along with the house. This request was most likely made by the developers (Crucian & Co.) and we vehemently disagree to the need for converting the double yellow lines into additional parking.

I feel quite let down by the council; when I looked at the show home, EhB assured me that the council was putting money into this area to make it more family friendly. Conversely however, it appears now that families are not very welcome as less family friendly measures are being introduced. We bought this home thinking it would be a great place to start a family and are now having second thoughts about this purchase. Please take into account our views and concerns.
Thank you.

Following the notice letter that we received dated 28th February 2020 we hereby submit our objection to the proposed changes to the parking layout that is currently under consultation for Chapel Street, Leamington Spa.

The Warwick County Council (District of Warwick) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Waiting restrictions, On-street Parking Places and Residents' Parking) (Consolidation) (Variation No 6) Order 2019

Our objections to this proposal and notice are many, which we will detail below.

These changes were also proposed back in the summer of July 2016 but not proceeded with at that time. We do not feel circumstances have changed since then that now justify the proposal being resuggested for implementation, and the majority of the objections raised then remain applicable today.

We fundamentally disagree with the generic reason provided in the "Statement of Reasons" that the proposed changes will "preserve or improve the amenities of the local area through which the road runs" given the reasons we stated in 2016 – and reiterated below.

When the Regent Mews houses were built in 2014 / 2015 there were many objections raised regarding the planning consent of the conversion of the AC Lloyd commercial property and land to residential houses. The main concerns were that it would mean additional cars needing to be parked on the roads around Chapel Street, Church Street and George Street. For this reason, parking was an essential requirement of the development and has been provided.

For clarity;

- Regent Mews residents do not need additional car parking on the road as we have had a car park constructed at the rear of our properties

- There have been no new neighbouring developments resulting in additional parking demands in this area since

- A car park for short period parking exists across the road from the Regent Mews properties and often carries a parking space surplus during the day, and also during the evening and overnight.

In addition, the developer's initial proposal of creating parking spaces in front of the properties was actually rejected by your Conversation Officer as part of the planning process. Instead it was advised that resident's vehicles would need to be located at the back – which, as we have advised earlier in this objection, has been done in a private car park behind our homes. We are not convinced of any grounds why the Conservation Officer would or could now change his/her mind.

The conversation office also mandated that the new properties be built closer to the road than where the AC Lloyd building was located, to improve the Regency feel of the development. This being the case our front elevation doors and windows are now closer to the road than would have been the case. This means that the potential noise generated by the parking and moving of vehicles will be felt more due to the wooden windows and doors (which was another mandate of the conversation office, that subsequently was reversed after construction) than would have been the case had either of the above measures not been mandated.

On buying our home, we recognised the conservation area in which we were purchasing and the commitments this would entail. Given the limitations and expectations of living in a home in a Conservation Area, we would not anticipate the Council creating additional reasons for noise, traffic and visitors immediately at our front doors and windows (when we can often already experience a considerable amount of activity and noise from a variety of sources as you're no doubt aware, including the anti-social issues relating to the usage in and around the Packington Place carpark) when the impact of noise is greater in the type of door and window furniture we have been required to have installed.

We were advised at the point of purchase that the double yellow lines that had been outside AC Lloyd for many years would be retained. Our views on the purchase would have been different had there been car parking permitted outside the front of our homes.

We would also challenge how additional parking outside Regent Mews is in keeping with the Regency feel, especially when the proposed parking places would not be for resident's use? Many residents of traditional streets of regency houses in Leamington Spa have no choice but to park on the street given when their homes were built. We do not suffer from this issue.

The Regent Mews development was marketed as the kickstart to regeneration and aesthetic improvements to this end of Leamington Spa. We were sold our home as an ideal family home, and indeed now have a 2 year old daughter's welfare to think of. There are no gates on the front access of the Regent Mews properties, and whilst current road / traffic visibility is good but this would change overnight if the double yellow lines were to be removed. In conclusion we feel that the Council is again making this more difficult to achieve for genuine professionals looking to build our family home and life in this part of town.

We understand that the consultation period will be ending 1st May 2020 and would appreciate your reply indicating next steps having now received a formal objection.


Charter Approach:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | <p>Since the bollards were installed at Charter Approach the parking has improved at the entrance and as far as the bollards extend. The problem has now been moved further into Charter Approach with cars parking either side of the road just beyond the bollards starting outside of number 4 & 5 Charter Approach. Cars parked either side of the road makes access very difficult for waste collection, emergencies services or for any vehicles of any size needing access into the end of the close.</p> <p>Additional Bollards.</p> <p>In addition to the yellow lines I strongly suggest that additional bollards are installed outside 4 & 5 Charter Approach to prevent cars parking there straddling the pavement and road. This will then help ensure that cars only park on one side of the road at this choke point allowing better access for vehicles that need to reach the end of Charter Approach.</p> <p>This action I suggest would be the least cost/restrictive action to take that would improve the overall parking situation for all concerned</p> |
|---|---|

Cross Road:

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 | <p>In respect of Cross Street/ Oswald Road Junction</p> <p>It is your intention to restrict parking for 8 meters south of the junctions. Currently road markings north of the junction restricts parking for 4 meters which is perfectly adequate and should be mirrored in a southerly direction. Parking can be difficult for residents (I am not suggesting permit parking) so that little bit of extra space is useful as a number of residents have very small cars..</p> <p>I therefore object to the current proposal and request modification.</p> <p>While discussing Oswald Road we still get cars turning from Cross Road and Conway Road up Oswald Road contrary to the one way system because of inadequate signage. There have been a number near accidents involving cars and pedestrians. Further signs are required.</p> |
| 2 | <p>The plans outlined look like the double yellow lines stretch further into the streets (in places) than I would deem necessary and would limit parking spaces that again I wouldn't deem dangerous, looking online as an example at the exit of Cross Road onto Guyscliffe Avenue the yellow lines would stretch to the door of number 9 Cross Road where you would not have any visual benefit turning onto Guyscliffe Avenue and vice versa turning into Cross Road (as you cannot see far enough into the road from that location due to the terraced housing blocking it). However, I can see where the concern lies as some drivers are into the road, or within 2 feet of it.</p> <p>The area suffers with over parking, sometimes I personally have to drive around for 15 minutes before I get a space when returning from work in the evening. This is already unacceptable and especially when arriving back with shopping / luggage / anything heavy to lift or having anything delivered to the property, the plans outlined would only make this worse.</p> <p>The area is only a short walk from town yet has none of the restrictions to parking that you would have 400 metres closer to the town centre. Hence an easy and cheap place to park for work or a social visit into the town..... We also have a local tennis club- without parking and 2 pubs within a minute walk again without parking. Over the last few years applications have been granted for houses to be turned into apartments / flats- without parking.</p> <p>Personally I think if the area was either pay / display or permitted this would solve most of the parking issues and also any road traffic safety concerns. It has been mentioned previously that this would impact on the levels of parking specifically down Cross Road as many of the cars have to park on both sides of the street as the road is narrow, this doesn't seem to be a problem for other councils whereby parking bays are painted onto the pathways, eg Brighton.</p> <p>And with specific regards to traffic safety, I believe the some of the spaces that are currently being parked on are less dangerous than the drivers who drive through the area over the speed limit for a 40mph limit let alone a built up residential area. This to me would be a more pressing issue with a reasonably high volume of pedestrians using the area.</p> <p>In Summary</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>We would support the application <u>on the condition</u> that parking could be guaranteed for the residents of the area and the yellow lines are limited to an area where they would have true benefit to road users.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Further to your recent notification of proposals regarding to the addition of yellow lines in parts of both Gunnery Terrace and Cross Road</p> <p>Whilst we welcome these measures we feel you have missed out the most important part of the "chicane".</p> <p>The corner on the north east side of the junction between Gunnery Terrace and Cross Road to the front of number 13 should have double yellow lines</p> <p>This is where parking causes most problems both to residents and to delivery vehicles (especial the poor refuse collectors)</p> <p>Surely this simple addition of double yellow lines to this corner as part of the scheme will solve these problems for once and all</p> |
| 4 | <p>Thank you for your letter informing of the proposed changes to parking in Guy's Cliffe Road, Cross Street, Rugby Road and other roads intersecting with Guy's Cliffe Road.</p> <p>I support these proposed parking restrictions. They will add considerably to the safety of pedestrians using Guy's Cliffe Road, including the many children who walk from the two schools located on Guy's Cliffe Avenue.</p> <p>They will of course, have a deleterious effect on the parking available to the residents of Guy's Cliffe Road, but I think they are for they greater good! I hope that your discussions will take into account the very heavy parking demands made on Guy's Cliffe and other adjacent roads, by users of the commercial properties on Guy's Cliffe Road.</p> <p>Guy's Cliffe Road is also used as a through-route between Warwick Street, New Warwick Road and Rugby Road. I think there is a case for speed restrictions on Guy's Cliffe Road, again, for pedestrian safety, and would be interested to hear your views on this question.</p> |
| 5 | <p>I have seen the proposal regarding parking and 'Cross Road and surrounding roads' and would like to make a request.</p> <p>I have marked the attached map and drawn a blue line on it. The request is the double yellow line is extended along Cross Road (on the side shown) as cars park next to the entrance between 8 Cross Road and Pyper's Cottage making it very difficult to come out of the entrance to the back of the properties and car parking. The cars park illegally and make it dangerous to exit as visibility and the turning circle is significantly reduced.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Please can you come back to me if this could be possible?</p>  <p>Kind regards,</p> |
| 6 | <p>We all have more pressing things to consider, but I still wanted to write about the proposed changes to parking restrictions at the junctions with Cross Road (Gunnery Terrace, Percy Terrace, Oswald Road).</p> <p>I am writing to ask that the Council try first with single yellow lines for the Percy Terrace/ Cross Road junction.</p> <p>The current situation is dangerous and commuter parking on Cross Road means that often the bin lorries can't get through. However, there is no alternative parking, and I hope that starting with single lines on this particular junction - Percy Terrace is the widest of the roads - will enable us to get used to the restrictions which I agree are necessary, particularly in the working week. Fighting over parking spaces is never good for neighbours.</p> <p>So the main reasons for this request to start with single yellow are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No alternative parking places - Abrupt transition to double yellow at all junctions leading to radical reduction of residents' parking particularly at weekends - Need for transitional period to maintain neighbourly good relations. <p>I do hope you consider this suggestion.</p> |
| 7 | <p>In response to the road traffic regulation act notice on Cross Road, as a local resident I do not have objections. However I would like to raise a concern regarding access from Cross Road into private car parks.</p> <p>Currently myself and other residents already face challenges entering and exiting the property due to the close proximity of parked cars. I am concerned that with restrictions on parking space on the road that this may increase.</p> <p>Please see below images illustrating the current situation. You can see from the tyre marks on the road the path cars sometimes I have to take, extending beyond the white line. When a car is parked up to the white line and with cars also parked on the opposite side of the road it becomes incredibly challenging to manoeuvre.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>I would therefore strongly request that a solution is found to alleviate this, rather than add to the problem, to ensure we have clear access to the drive way e.g the white line is extended further (especially to the left when facing it) or double yellow lines are extended across this entrance way / opposite.</p> |
|--|---|

1.

Hi Rory

Emscote Road – Limited Waiting 2 hours, No return 4 hours, 8am-8pm, W3 Exemption

I'll like to object to this extension of the parking restrictions.

I am in favour of improving the parking on Emscote Road and specifically, the provision of parking restriction with resident's permits. However, the proposed restrictions only apply to the North side of Emscote Road. This will push more parking onto the South side making parking more difficult for residents.

Note also that the published plan TR\11124 – 11 is incorrect, in that it fails to show two bays on the South side of the road, opposite to the bays where the proposed restrictions would apply.

Any new scheme should apply to both sides of the road.

Thank you.

Best regards

XXXXXX

XXXXXXXXXX

XX Emscote Road Warwick CV34 4PP

2.

Thanks. Appreciate the difficulty. Will make a note to check again before deadline. As there doesn't appear to be much info on the web, it's helpful to have some background!

XXXXXXX

On 27 Mar 2020, at 15:50, PMC WCC <pmc@warwickshire.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi XXXXXXXX,

I'll have to check (still getting used to working entirely from home without access to all the files and notes we keep!) but as I recall the intention was for both sides of the road to be eligible for permits, but only one side to have permit bays. The idea is not to remove all parking for non-residents but to provide enough spaces to cope with the limited resident demand during the day, plus the majority of even numbered houses have off-street parking so take-up of permits would be expected to be quite low.

Regards,

PMC

Hello again

I should have asked:

All of 1-17 eligible or odd numbers only?

The bays outside the even numbers don't appear to be included.

Thanks

XXXXXXXXXX

Dear Ms XXXXXX,

Thanks for your e-mail. I can confirm that numbers 1-17 would become eligible to apply for W3 permits if the scheme progresses.

I hope this helps,

Regards,

PMC

Dear Madam/Sir

Thank you for consulting us on these proposals. We note that the consultation period has now been extended.

To help with considering this, please would you advise: as the proposals would make the road outside numbers 1-17 (odd numbers) restricted, apart from W3 permit-holders, is it proposed to extend W3 permit area to include those of us living at these addresses?

I could find no mention of this in the documents, but I may be mistaken.

Please advise

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

XX Emscote Road

3.

XXXXXXXXXXXX
XX Emscote Road, Warwick CV34 4PP
Telephone XXXXXXXXXXXX
e-mail XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Rory O'Connor,
Traffic and Road Safety
PO Box 43 shire Hall
Warwick
CV34 4SX

3 February, 2021

Dear Mr O'Connor

Warwick district CPE Variation 6

We have been notified of this consultation by our neighbours.

We wish to object to the scheme as presented to us.

I was delegated by our local Neighbourhood Watch group to request a residents' parking scheme, writing to you last year, but also in 2016. In my letters I said that as we are the first unrestricted parking on this approach to town we are plagued by people commuting – whether by car in order further to commute by train or to walk to a place of work in Warwick. If someone leaves a space before around 9:30 it is rapidly taken by a car which then does not move until the end of the day. This means that a resident who has to leave before 9 am usually finds it very difficult to return in the course of the day and the chances of a visitor finding a space are remote.

You show only one layby on the south side of the road. There are in fact 3. If occupied by considerate neighbours, these can hold 3, 2 and 2 cars. If occupied by thoughtless or selfish outsiders, these laybys frequently only hold 2, 1 and 1 cars. Leaving these laybys uncontrolled would put them under even more pressure from commuters and therefore the laybys on the north of the road would still be under great competition.

The scheme also does not mention the east side of Ilex Court, which is generally occupied by four cars attached to the south side of Emscote Road. Those spaces need to be part of the scheme in order to maintain anything approaching an equilibrium between supply and demand.

In the advertised paperwork I can find no explanation on how the residents' parking zone would be operated. If you only intend to offer parking passes to the residents on the north side, the situation for us residents on the south side would actually be worse than now, as we would not be able to use a space across the road without having to try and move every 2 hours.

If you do propose offering us parking permits, the scheme would still not provide enough spaces for residents, visitors, park visitors and school parents.

May I also complain that we did not receive a consultation letter from you and would not have known about it were it not for our neighbours across the road. This is particularly ironic given that the initial communications to you were from me. It seems that WCC has adopted the same policy as it did over the Warwick 20mph zone: don't

consult the people who are likely to complain that the scheme is not extensive enough.

Yours sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXXXX

4.

I support the proposed limited waiting on north side of Emscote Road from a point 10 metres west of the junction with Ilex Court for 70 metres westward.

I look forward to the implementation allowing users for the park and leisure centre space to park, rather than the all day parking that often occurs currently.

XXXXXXXXXXXX

XX Emscote Road, CV34 4PP

5.

Dear Rory O' Conner ,

I'm sending this email to you in your capacity as a Traffic & Road Safety Officer with Warwickshire County Council .

I am a resident of Ilex Court (No XX) off Emscote Road . Responding to the letter I received via a vis consultation

period appertaining to changes to parking restriction , westward on the north side . - Starting after 10 metres - immediately from the turn / junction into Ilex Court , for a distance of 70 metres . 2 hrs. parking no return for 4 hrs.

I wish to register a strong objection on the grounds that the proposals will severely exacerbate the problems in

Ilex Court , unless similar proposals are implemented within the actual Court . Its not hard to understand that between the given hours , 8am to 8pm the close proximity of Ilex Court will be used to circumvent the new restrictions . Emscote

Road Guest Houses and residents along with other motorists , identify the convenience . The police have been contacted from time to time during my 30 plus years living in the Court . With the often dangerous problems, emanating from various vehicles parked over ones dropped crossing . I hope it will be recognised that residents of Ilex Court cannot be left out of the consideration . The Emscote Road changes treated in isolation to near neighbours and the impact on them , will not

be conducive to a harmonious , resolved road traffic and parking situation !

Yours Faithfully ,

XXXXXXXXXXXX

&

XXXXXXXXXXXX

6.

Hello,

My name: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Address: XX Ilex court, Warwick, CV344PJ

Regarding the proposal (Emscote Road - " Existing unrestricted parking bays to be restricted to 2 hour limited waiting bays with W3 residents permit exemptions ")

This will highly likely generate an increase of "wild" parking in Ilex court. The people not able to park the full day on the Emscote road will move to the streets nearby..

We are already experiencing bad parking habits in Ilex Court. In addition during school pick up or drop off time we get cars stopped in proximity of our driveways.

Would it be possible to have street marking and something like the current proposal also for Ilex Court please?

Thanks

Regards

XX

7.

Good Afternoon Rory O'Connor

Regarding the restricted parking along the Emscote Road in the waiting bays indicated on your map on the left-hand side of Emscote Road going from Warwick to Leamington Spa is great - but I do not see the 2 smaller parking bays on the other side of the road on your map!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! There is a bay which holds 3 vehicles outside No's 10, 12 Emscote Road and another one holding 1 vehicle outside No 8 Emscote Road - are they also to be included in the restricted 2 hour limit? I feel they all should be included and your map updated.

Yours sincerely

XXXXXXXXXX XX Ilex Court

1.

I fully support DOUBLE YELLOW LINES as planned for Fernhill Drive.

Many thanks

XXXXX XXXXXX.

Number XX.

Sent from my iPad

2.

Although we at no XX would welcome the double lines suggested especially on the blind corners we fear that we will have cars permanently parked outside our house. We would suggest double lines right down the street. Cars are already parked on the pavement blocking transit by pushchairs and mobility scooters forcing them into the road. Residents have ample car parking on their properties. So double lines up both sides of the length of the street shouldn't cause a serious problem. Bring on the lines.

XXXXX & XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX

Sent from my iPad

3.

Firstly, many thanks for the letter received today regarding proposals for changes to parking arrangements, in particular, relating to Fernhill Drive, Leamington, where I reside. I also have comments regarding Newbold Terrace East which is in our vicinity and has an effect on the parking load on Fernhill Drive.

Firstly, regarding Fernhill Drive, we live at number XX, your proposal identifies double yellow lines extending from 21 A, across the Western Power Distribution sub-station frontage and across our driveway ending beyond our driveway dropped crossing. At the moment, we have marked white lines in this area, frequently, we have cars parked outside our property (not on the white lined area) this is virtually all the normal working day, every day, but increasingly at the weekends typically for people using the Newbold Leisure Centre. We normally get the same cars during the week left by people who park their cars there and walk into the town for work. At the moment, whilst this is frustrating for us residents, there is nothing to stop this. The problem arises when we either have to move our vehicles around, have visitors or workmen arriving at our property, at the moment, we can use the white lined area, if you put double yellow lines all the way across our dropped crossing, this will cause problems for us. Please could you consider not putting the double yellow lines over our dropped crossing.

The double yellow lines around the corner at our end of the road are totally supported subject to the caveat in the paragraph above.

Moving up the road, you are proposing double yellow lines on the right hand side only round the bend after No 7, the concern here is no double yellows on the left hand side, has this been considered because all that will happen is that cars will park on the left hand side of an already narrow road.

Noting how the double yellow lines around the school at the junction of Fernhill Drive/Upper Holly Walk are treated with ignorance particularly by parents at school arrival and leaving times, what actual enforcement of these new restrictions will be provided and by whom?

Just a comment on the proposals on Newbold Terrace East, you are proposing double yellow sectors as 'passing places' on the left hand side as you drive up the road, whilst this will help, it doesn't address the serious issue at the curve of the road which is on a slight incline, traffic travels too fast on this section and it would help if the yellow lined area could be extended a further 20 metres in the direction of the Leisure Centre and joined up with the other 'passing place' travelling towards the town. Also, has there been any consideration of a lowering of the speed limit on Newbold Terrace East..

I trust you will find my comments and observations useful and would welcome further discussion.

Many Thanks

XXXXX XXXXXXXX

XXXXX XXXXX

XX Fernhill Drive

Leamington

CV32 4JX

4.

Ref; Warwick District CPE Variation 6

As residents of Fernhill Drive, We are pleased to see the proposals to restrict parking, on the sharp corners at both ends of the street. Parking on the street has increased significantly over the last few years, as has through traffic, particularly since the re-opening of the now very popular leisure centre. Parking on the sharp corners is now common and there have been many 'near misses' resulting from

the poor visibility caused by these parked cars. This is particularly concerning because Fernhill Drive is commonly used by children on their way to and from St Paul's School.

We support the proposals to introduce double yellow lines on the sharp corners and suggest that, to further improve safety:

- At the north end, the restrictions should be on both sides of the sharp bend.
- At the south end, the restrictions should be continuous on both sides of the road from the junction with Newbold Terrace East until after the bend.

XXXXX XXXXXX and XXXXXXX XXXXXX

5.



Dear Sirs,

I live at number X Fernhill Drive. My main interest is in the proposed changes to yellow lines at the north end of the road.

Both ends of the road are made hazardous by vehicles cutting the corners -at the north end from vehicles turning right from Upper Holly Walk and at the south end from vehicles leaving Newbold Comyn Park and turning right into Fernhill Drive. The current double yellow lines at the north end of Fernhill Drive are in my view too short and are roughly one car lengths. With cars parking in daytime on the East side of the road my normal process when trying to turn right into Fernhill Drive from Upper Holly walk is to pause at the junction to check for northbound traffic on Fernhill Drive. With the bend you can still get caught out and you still have the option if you have started to turn and a northbound vehicle appears around the north bend in Fernhill Drive to pause on the double yellow lines. If partway down that north end and a vehicle appears around the bend in most cases the white lined areas at the drive entrances give an option to duck in to allow the northbound car to pass. Due to the congestion at the Upper Holly Walk/Fernhill Drive junction, reversing is usually a very dangerous option for the southbound driver. I have at one stage decided to drive into a neighbours drive at No 2 when inconsiderate parkers have parked over the white driveway areas (ruling out that option) and the oncoming driver is not prepared to reverse.

Most of the parking issues in Fernhill Drive are in my view due to parents and school staff parking. Most regular daytime parkers park on the East side of Fernhill Drive. Sometimes the parking situation is exacerbated when someone parks on the West side. I attach a photo of a recent attempt of a TNT lorry being unable to weave between parked cars. He hooted his horn until one moved. Sometimes it is not the driver of the car who has parked on the west side of the road who is at fault having parked first, but inconsiderate parking of the driver who arrives later and parks on the east side and not allowing enough space for larger vehicles to zigzag between them.

In my view extensive use of double yellow lines in Fernhill Drive without time restrictions is unduly harsh on residents where most of the issue is caused by the school. Could they be limited to say 8-6 for stretches that are beyond the minimum from the junction?

Secondly I view the use of double yellow lines as proposed on the East side of the north end of Fernhill Drive would move parking to the West side on that stretch. This resolves my current issue of turning right into Fernhill Drive from Upper Holly Walk and gives me priority travelling south but moves the problem to when I want to travel north up Fernhill drive with a view to turning left into Upper Holly Walk. In fact it makes it harder as the only driveway space to duck into is outside no 2 and that may, under the proposals be squeezed by parking either side of that driveway Should consideration be given to yellow lines being put on the west side of Fernhill Drive to the North of the drive at no 2 to ensure that north bound traffic can see southbound traffic before deciding to overtake cars parked on the west side? I attach a photo showing the driveway white line outside No 2 looking up towards the junction with Upper Holly Walk. Some parking restriction in my view is needed between that driveway and the school sign to ensure that there is enough space for northbound cars to have a clear view of the junction without the view being obscured by parked cars.

There may of course be increased aggravation over drivers who sweep right from Upper Holly Walk into Fernhill Drive without first checking to see if there is a northbound car as there will be no space

to pass, thus forcing one car to reverse whilst currently we have a driveway or 2 to duck into. Maybe a warning sign is needed on the corner.

One last point I have is that although most cars at present park on the East side of the road, I do have issues at present when vehicles park outside my property (even if parked partially on the pavement) close to my driveway entrance particularly because cars are frequently parked outside no 7 as turning right into my garage becomes an issue. So if generally the changes move parkers to the west side I will be in trouble! The cars parked outside no 7 already make it a tight squeeze to reverse out of my drive when I want to go south down Fernhill Drive.

XXXXXX XXXXXXXXX

6.

Dear Rory

Thank you for your letter regarding the New Yellow lines to be placed at Fearnhill Drive . Please find attached a PDF. I have marked black lines where I feel the parking should be .As at the moment the parking that's available in front of number 60 blocks off our drive a means we regularly have to do a 3 point turn or more to enter and exit the drive . Which has left us at risk when cars are coming round the corner from Newbold Terrace East at speed . I feel it would be safer to move the proposed parking to just past number 61 on the right as this would not impede any one and would move the parked cars further away from the junction. Thank you for your time please feel free to call me if you feel there is anything that is un clear.

Regards

XXXXXXXX XXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX

XX Newbold Terrace East

Tel XXXXX XXX XXX

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

XX XXXXXXXX

XX Newbold Terrace East

Leamington

8.



Dear Sir/Madam,

I live at XX Fernhill Hill Drive and would like to make the following comments.

I support the proposed double yellow lines from the junction of Newbold Terrace East round the corner of Fernhill Drive. Parking around this corner on high traffic parking demand days has been very dangerous for a while.

I support the proposed double yellow lines for passing bays on Newbold Terrace East.

I object to there being no proposed double yellow lines to protect the dropped kerb crossing points at the junction of Newbold Terrace East and Fernhill Drive. These are regularly blocked by inconsiderate parking and this makes it dangerous for families and children to cross the road. This route and crossing is used twice a week by children at St Paul's C of E School to walk to and from swimming. We also have neighbours with mobility issues who frequently can not use the crossing point. The attached photo was taken yesterday morning. It is also very difficult to see traffic coming when crossing the road due to the proximity of the nearest parked car or van. This will only get worse as parking is restricted further.

I object to the proposed double yellow line round the corner at the top of Fernhill drive at the end which joins Upper Holly Walk. At school pick up and drop off times it is very difficult to drive round this corner as the available parking is full and you cant see round the corner. At the moment the parking happens on the other side of the road and passing gaps are provided by the driveways. But the proposal will force parking to the other side with no passing opportunities, unless you go up onto the pavement or reverse at times when there are lots of children about. I feel this will be very dangerous and lead to grid lock, as at these times traffic volume is high in both directions and there will be no passing opportunity for about 50m. I think you need to take the double yellow lines round the corner on the other side of the road at least.

Thank you for considering my comments.

XXXXXX XXXX

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy smartphone.

9.

I notice that you are advertising new restrictions along a section of Newbold Terrace East to facilitate passing places.

Please could you also consider the following:

There are two dropped kerbs on Newbold Terrace East opposite the junction with Fernhill Drive. They are often blocked by parked cars, making the dropped kerbs inaccessible. This makes the crossing points dangerous at best, as pedestrians are forced to cross between the parked cars, and impossible for anyone using a wheelchair or with a pushchair.

Both the crossings are well used by local children and anyone visiting the leisure centre or the other facilities of Newbold Comyn.

Double yellow lines across the two dropped kerbs would act as a further visual reminder to drivers not to park there.

Many thanks,

XXXXXX XXXXXXXX

10.

This email is from 11 residents of 6 properties in Newbold Terrace East, some of whom may also be responding separately. It has been copied to their email addresses above-

XXXXX and XXXXX XXXXX no.XX

XXXXX and XXXX XXXXXX no.XX

XXXXX XXXX and XXXX XXXXXXXX no.XX

XXXXX and XXXXX XXXX no.XX

XXXXX and XXXXXX XXXXXXXXX no.XX

XXX XXXXXX no.XX

With regard to the proposals for 2 passing places on Newbold Terrace East, we submit the following comments with the objective of improving safety:-

1. Newbold Terrace East is now a very busy street, with a significant increase in vehicles of all sorts, cyclists and pedestrians since the Leisure Centre was extended, its facilities more widely promoted, and more activity is taking place on the Comyn. This has increased the safety risks for all users of the street. We have witnessed on several occasions, large vehicles coming in opposite directions blocking the street for many minutes, sometimes for over half an hour, which could jeopardise lives if emergency vehicles cannot get through.

2. Many vehicles do not slow down when other vehicles are approaching them from the opposite direction. And some vehicles exceed 30 mph particularly in the evenings. A speed restriction of 20 mph should be imposed on the whole street to reinforce the message that the street is narrow and dangerous particularly where cars are parked on both sides and where the street bends.

3. The two new passing places proposed for vehicles might improve safety, but the gap between them of 100m is too long to avoid vehicles moving in the opposite direction entering the areas where vehicles are parked on both sides. Reducing the gaps between the passing places would improve safety. This could be achieved by extending the double yellow lines on the south side of the street from the traffic lights by a further 20m, and putting in a third passing place so that gaps between them are about 60m. The extension of the double yellow lines on the south side of the street from the traffic lights is desirable anyway as this is the narrowest part of the street and would improve safety.

4. During the day, vehicles are frequently parked across the pedestrian crossing points from the pathway in the green area opposite Fernhill Drive. These two crossing points should be protected by double yellow lines to avoid pedestrians having to cross the street between closely parked vehicles.

There should be a similar additional protected crossing point further up the street opposite the cul de sac as this is where residents and other pedestrians frequently cross to enter or leave the safer pathway in the green area.

11.

To: Rory O'Connor

From: XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX

X, Fernhill Drive

Dear Rory,

Thank you for your letter on changes to parking restrictions in Fernhill Drive. I have looked at these but cannot see them on the website at the time of typing this email.

Thank you also for your interest in Fernhill Drive - parking and road safety certainly needs attention. However, I do not support the proposed double yellow lines at either end of Fernhill Drive because they will push the parking problem further into Fernhill Drive and result in:

- more difficulties driving up/down the Drive
- more parking outside houses in the Drive which will bring more access problems for house owners
- more parking on the pavement
- increased risk of an accident

My recommended options for dealing with the parking problem in Fernhill Drive are:

Option 1

A key problem for Fernhill Drive is all day parking by workers whom I assume are walking to offices and shops in town. As a result, residents can often find it difficult to move their cars on/off their own drives. In addition, because of the congestion, people park on the pavement making walking along the pavement difficult. This is a particular problem for people with pushchairs etc and disabilities.

A good way forward would be to introduce a restricted parking scheme for Fernhill Drive to stop all day parking, for example, prohibit parking between 2 and 3pm. This would leave more space for residents to access their drives and school pick-ups. Residents could purchase passes to park during the restricted times if they wished.

Option 2

Restrict parking on Fernhill Drive to Residents Only.

I look forward to hearing from you with new proposals,

Best regards,

XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX

12.

Good Afternoon

Please forward this e-mail to:

Rory O'Connor - Traffic and Road Safety

With reference to the above consultation on parking restrictions at Fernhill Drive, please will you confirm that the consultation period has been extended to Friday 1st May?

I had telephoned to confirm this and due to the Coronavirus note that your answer phone message states that your offices are closed and staff are working from home.

Until I checked on the web site, I had intended to ask for an extension to the consultation period, due to the measures put in place by the Government to deal with the virus (one of the reasons we have been unable to meet up and discuss these proposals with our neighbours).

Thank you

XXXXX XXXXX

X Fernhill Drive

Sent from my iPhone

Dear Ms XXXXX,

I can confirm that the consultation period has been extended to May 1st. Due to the extremely short-notice preparations which had to be made in order to shift to a remote working model, a number of notices were late being put up on street (and they now seem a bit redundant, given how few people can or should be out to see them!) hence we have pushed back the deadline for objections.

We're still picking up the various comments and objections coming in - I appreciate that things are difficult at the moment with co-ordinating a response amongst neighbours and other interested parties, so we'll keep your correspondence on file as a "full response pending".

Regards,

Phil

Thank you very much for your prompt response.

You are quite correct. Our road has not been this quiet, with no issues with parking and inappropriate traffic using our (residential) road for a very, very long time!

Thanks again

Best Regards

XXXXX XXXXX

Sent from my iPhone

1.

Good evening,

I am writing to state my full support for the proposed parking restrictions in Gas Street.

Between the pavement parking and fly tipping it is difficult to walk down the street at the best of times. People have become very selfish in their parking, as a pedestrian, often I can barely squeeze through as cars are monopolising the pavement, you would not fit a push chair or wheel chair and certainly not a mobility scooter through these gaps 99% of days.

Thank you for taking this action,

XXXXX XXXXXX

XX Gas Street

2.



I fully support Option 4 for Gas Street / Priory Street.

As a long term resident of Priory Street I have suffered the commuter parking chaos and disturbance for far too long. The Proposed Waiting Restrictions should solve many problems.

Access for emergency vehicles will be quicker once the often ridiculous parking in Gas Street is prevented.

Access for service vehicles will be safer and easier.

Exceptionally stupid parking in Priory Street will be prevented by double yellow lines (see attached image for an example, yes, both vehicles are parked, neither on double yellow lines) Disturbance prior to 06:00 will be hugely reduced by commuter vehicles having nowhere to park.

Residents will be able to park near their homes.

Delivery and contractor vehicles will be able to park.

The grass margin in Gas Street will not act as a rubbish magnet after being churned up by parking.

The footways will be usable by pedestrians who regularly have to walk in the carriageway because of bad parking.

There will be no further occurrences of 'parking rage' between residents and commuters.

I also note that there is no possibility of unintended consequences in respect of health and safety because the proposed waiting restrictions effectively achieve by restriction the exact same parking that existed historically, prior to commuter parking.

Finally I must thank the planning department for persevering in finding an optimal solution. Option 4 really was far better than the 3 options we previously commented on.

Kind Regards,

XXXXX XXXXXX

X Priory Street

XXXXXX XXXXXX,
XXX Greville Road,
Warwick
CV34 5PL
26th March 2020

Dear Sir,

With regard to the proposals of changes to parking restrictions on Greville Road, I will be pleased to see the Disabled parking bay taken away, it has been redundant for years; in fact I reported the fact a few years ago.

In regard to the Yellow lines, I would personally like to see them extended on the East side of Greville Road, (the even house number side) , down to the bottom of the road.

I would also like to see the existing yellow lines removed outside nos. 92,94,96 and 98, as although residents can park at the rear, they have to carry shopping etc all the way up their long gardens, and up steps to their houses. Visitors to these houses are forced to find parking in nearby side streets, sometimes hundreds of yards away. For over 50 years, parking was permitted there, and there was never any issue of accidents or disabled people not being able to get past.

I have written to your department before regarding this, (as have my neighbours), I was told there are safety issues because of visibility being obstructed, but do not believe this to be true.

Yours Sincerely,

XXX XXXXXX

1.

Dear Rory O'Connor,

Many thanks for your letter regarding proposed parking restrictions that will involve the road outside our front door at X Avon Road in Whitnash. We received your letter dated 28/2/20 today. We have looked at the proposed plans and reasoning behind it.

We absolutely understand the concern for road safety regarding keeping the end of the road towards the junction clear. Safety is always a number one priority. We have noticed over the past few months the builders that are working on a property on Heathcote road keep parking right on the junction to Heathcote Road. We have asked them to move on several occasions regarding these concerns as you cannot see clearly to get out of the street. We always try to park as near to our gate as possible and never obstruct the junction.

Parking on Avon Road is very difficult at the best of times. You will see from your records that we discussed with the planning office last month about getting a dropped kerb to put a drive on our property to ease this problem. As the road is class D we do not require planning permission but we are in the process of applying to the council for consent as we were advised. We are getting quotes for a drive but we fear it may not be possible because of the water drain access on our land, where we would endeavour to place the drive.

People from Heathcote road always park in our street, making it a challenge to park in the street, let alone outside our property. If there is an event at the social club, our street becomes impossible to park in also. At the moment many of the Avon Road residents are elderly and do not own a car. We think in the future more and more car owners will live in the street and thus this will compound the current problem.

Of course we would prefer not to have the double yellow lines because we feel this will contribute to a worse overall parking situation in the street and people ultimately parking in more hazardous places. May I add that our main access to our property is from the gate directly leading onto Avon Road and people often block our entrance, which has made it very difficult when needing to get in and out the door.

We definitely would support parking permits for the residents of Avon Road only to park on Avon Road and not Heathcote road. We are seriously worried people will block our property access if you do go ahead with this without permits. We do think there would need to be a solution for the residents of Heathcote road though. We will do our best to get a drive onto our property but should this not be possible because of the water hole we would suggest the council try and move it so we can put a drive in or contribute towards the cost of putting a drive in, to enable better parking in the

street. If you do agree to go ahead with the double yellow lines, please could this be put into place after our drive has been completed.

We would love not to have two cars and rely on public transport more but unfortunately given the nature of our jobs, this is not possible.

We hope this makes sense in explaining that we do not believe just adding double yellow lines will solve this already difficult problem. Clearly we also appreciate your concerns and agree the parking situation needs to improve. We can understand it may seem like a quick solution for you but we feel it is certainly not a sustainable option for the future. We look forward to hearing back from you.

Yours faithfully,

Dr XXXXXX XXXX and Dr XXXXXX XXXXXXXX (Owners of X Avon Road)

2.

Dear Rory O'Connor

I have received a letter from yourself entitled Warwick District CPE Variation 6 which refers to 'parking restrictions which will affect your street'. However, when I visit the WCC webpage (www.warwickshire.gov.uk/trafficschemes), my street (Acre Close) is not listed on the webpage. Please could you therefore clarify which street you are referring to?

Thank you

XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXX

Dear XXXXXXXX XXXXXX,

Thank you for your email, we are proposing restrictions for Heathcote Road, and due to your proximity to the proposed restrictions you have been included in the consultation process. Additionally we have extended the consultation process from the 1st of May

Kind Regards,


Rory O'Connor

3.

Dear Sir

I wish to object the proposed scheme to add double yellow lines along the section of Heathcote Road from the present line upto and around the corner in to Avon Road.

As shown below.



It is not the concept of the yellow line to which I object it is the consequences of the yellow lines.

On any give day there will only be one or two cars parked in this area, normally the disabled person at 9 and their health worker and sometimes number 25 will park on the Road.

So the normal value of the scheme is limited and the people effected are already at a disadvantage.

The reason for my objection is the impact the scheme will have in Avon Road. We already have enough cars in Avon Road and do not need any more No.11 already park in Avon Road all the time and other visitors to Heathcote Road have been seen parking in Avon Road. On a good day we have 15 car park on our street but I have counted 35 on a bad day. We have some residents with four

cars in a single house with no off road parking and other housings with child between 16 and 19 who will shortly start driving.

You cannot implement this planned scheme without ,

1 - Arrangement for those in Heathcote Road without off road parking to park.

2 – A solution to the Avon Road parking which does not add a financial cost to the households of Avon Road. (We do not want to pay for parking permits to park for our own street).

I would also question what safety issues have been identified to justify scheme.

Your sincerely

XXXXXX XXXXXX

XX Avon Road

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

4.

Dear Rory,

Having received your letter dated 28th Feb, 2020 regarding the introduction of parking restrictions in our vicinity, I am writing to add my support at least in part to the proposed introduction of yellow lines. As a resident of Avon Road, parking is at a premium as things stand (and yes, we knew this when we moved in 20 years ago but it's become a lot worse since then) and it is not helped by residents from Heathcote Road parking on Avon Road, in particular right at the bottom of the road on the corner so that it becomes extremely difficult to see when trying to pull out onto Heathcote Road and narrows the entrance so that only one vehicle can turn in or out. Indeed on one occasion whilst trying to pull out of Avon Road another resident was turning in simultaneously and as we squeezed by one another I clipped the 'illegally' parked car which was slightly jutting out on to Heathcote Road (belonging to a non-resident) and ended up having to pay for damages. I appreciate it's difficult for those on Heathcote Road without a driveway to park (again, they knew this when they decided to move there) which is why I'd like to see yellow lines at the very bottom of Avon Road and running round onto Heathcote Road at least for a few metres but perhaps not all the way up to the shops as the map appears to suggest, they need to be able to park somewhere and the last thing we need is to have them trying to park in and further up Avon Road in an attempt to be nearer their houses, that would be chaos. In fact I would go a stage further and suggest Avon Road should

allow parking for 'residents only' and their visiting friends and family, perhaps using a permit scheme. That said it should be incumbent upon all those with driveways on both Avon Road and Heathcote Road, to not park on the road and make sure their visitors follow suit in my humble opinion.

Yours sincerely,

XXXXX XXXXXX (resident at XX Avon Road)

5.

From: XXXX XXXXX, XX Avon Road, Whitnash, Leamington Spa, CV31 2NJ.

XXXXX XXXXXX

Dear Mr O'Connor

I am writing to object to the proposal to introduce double yellow lines at the stretch of Heathcote Road in Whitnash, Leamington Spa, near to Glebe Court, and also into the entrance of Avon Road.

There are severe parking problems already in Avon Road which is a cul-de-sac with very limited on-street parking for the many terraced properties there that don't have off-road parking.

The situation has been successfully self-policed and managed for decades by the residents, who ensure everyone can park and that access is always clear and safe for emergency and council vehicles and deliveries.

However, the loss of even a couple of available on street parking spaces at the entrance to the cul-de-sac will have a significant impact on people's ability to park and there are absolutely no alternatives anywhere else in the local area. Additionally, the people in the cul-de-sac are all aging as well as people rarely move from the road and are not able to walk miles with shopping.

There are several houses on Heathcote Road at that junction with Avon Road that also do not have any available off-road parking alternative, so yellow lines there would force them into the only possible place - round the corner into Avon Road, causing a two-fold problem for which there is no viable or reasonable solution.

Please consider creating residents parking spaces bays on Healthcote Road for the residents on Healthcote Road - both sides of the opening to Avon Road - for all the several properties that desperately need them.

Additionally please do not put yellow lines anywhere on Avon Road at all further reducing parking in an area where there is literally nowhere else for local homeowners to park.


Many thanks for your time and trouble.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any further assistance.

Kind regards

XXXX

6.



● Heathcote road
Whitmarsh
Leamington spa
Cv31 2ng

RE; CPE variation 6

20/03/2020

Dear sir

I am writing to you as I wish to object to your plans to put yellow lines outside my house, I have not got a driveway. I am disabled and can only walk short distance I also have carers to wash and dress me 7 days a week they say if they cannot park outside I will lose their services I need to park near my house due to my disability my family would not be able to park or medical personal I would become housebound some cars speed down the road if lines are put along the road I feel it would be used as a race track

Yours faithfully

[Redacted signature]

MR [Redacted name]

1.

Dear Sirs

I wish to support and object to the plan for double yellow lines in Kingsway and Monarch Gardens.

This is long overdue so I fully support this plan, however, I strongly recommend the lines go all along Kingsway up to the junction with Queensway.

The proposal as it stands does not wholly alleviate the problem and emergency vehicles would still not be able to access Monarch Gardens when traffic is queueing at the junction as they cannot pass the parked vans.

Kingsway is now used as a cut through from Tachbrook Drive to Queensway and queuing traffic has become a big problem as large vans are parked and the traffic queue includes HGV vehicles from Travis Perkins and surrounding units.

I hope you will take my concerns and comments seriously and extend the yellow lines.

Kind Regards

XXXXXX XXXXX

XX Monarch Gardens

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy S8 - powered by Three

1.

Hello Rory

Just to keep you in the loop with Montgomery Road/Tachbrook Road, as you are aware, the straight stretch of road approaching the junction is an ideal place for people to park. However local people in Montgomery Road have been targeting these normally 5/6 cars and vandalising by scratching & damaging wing mirrors. I have contacted the Police several times and PC Sample has been out to the road of concern and i have shown him where people are parking and the damage the locals have caused. PC Sample said the car's are all legal and are parked here legally. However if car's were to park over the blocked paved area then he said he would be able to prosecute. Only the postman mid morning crosses this crossing. I have included many photographs of the regular vehicles that park there, the second photo with the dark blue car, the lady owner of this car has been harassed by some of the locals, had her car scratched & wing mirror damaged. She is parked legally every time. One of the cars is my own, please zoom in and note the scratches along every panel. PC Sample has posted warning letters to the locals along that road basically highlighting the vandalism and those caught will be prosecuted. I am in favour of these cars being parked here, they cause NO obstruction or danger. As you can see in one of the photo's even the Police park there. The locals who have complained to you are just too lazy to negotiate normal driving conditions. Please do not apply these lines to this road as there is a shortage for our family's.

Many thanks

XXXXXX

XXX Tachbrook Road


Whitnash

CV31 3DE

XXXXXXXXXXXX











2.

Antony Gardner Crescent
Whitnash
Leamington Spa
CV31 2TQ

Mr Rory O'Connor,
Communities Group,
PO Box 43, Shire Hall,
Warwick
CV34 4SX

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| RECEIVED 19 MAR 2020 | |
| COMMUNITIES GROUP | |
| LEADERSHIP TEAM | |
| GROUP | |

17th March 2020

RE: Parking order (Variation No.6) – Montgomery Road

Dear Mr O'Connor

I write to OBJECT to the notice recently posted regarding new Parking Restrictions on Montgomery Road at its junction with Tachbrook Road.

I object because I believe the proposed 18 metre length of the new restriction is TOO SMALL.

For several years now we have had people parking near this junction and it makes leaving and entering the estate dangerous. I personally have seen 2 occasions where young cyclists have shot across on the cycle/service road and who were seen at the last second because of parked cars. Fortunately, in both cases, I was going slow enough to safely stop without doing them any harm.

Besides cyclists, those that park near the junction make turning in from Tachbrook Road particularly hazardous because once a car leaving the estate has committed to passing the parked cars, they have no place to go if a car suddenly turns in (bearing in mind that Tachbrook Road has traffic that regularly exceeds the 30mph speed limit). I personally have nearly been hit by a car in this way as I came alongside the last parked car in line as a car swung round into Montgomery Road from Tachbrook Road.

I would ask that you reconsider your proposal – perhaps taking into account that the cycle path/service road needs to be protected from having poor visibility of cyclists caused by parked cars.

I would suggest that the length of the restriction should be extended from 18 to perhaps, 40 metres or more to keep this junction clearer and safer than it is at present.

Yours sincerely





(Tel:  email: 

3.

Hello Rory,

I currently park my car on Montgomery Road, and if you put yellow lines there I will have no where to park as I'm unable to park outside of my house. If I have no where to park then I would have to sell my car and then have no way of getting around to help my elderly family members or get to and from work. I have had my car scratched and the wing mirror broken although I park legally not on the path or over the edge.

XXXXX XXXXXXXX

Sent from my iPhone

Parking restriction proposals – TR\11124-18 - Myton Gardens, Warwick

No Waiting Monday – Friday, 9am-5pm

We agree with the proposed no waiting Monday to Friday 9am-5pm parking restriction for Myton Gardens. The grounds for this are stated below. However, I feel there should be some exemption for visiting trade persons whilst working on properties on Myton Gardens. Generally trade persons are able to park on the existing driveways, but this may not always be the case, such as when the driveway is being replaced.

Also, please consider extending the restriction to Saturday and Sunday daytime except for residents and their visitors (provide residents with permit to display on visitor's car when they visit). Weekends are particularly bad when the weather is good or when there are events in town centre or in the park, when families park their cars all day for free.

Myton Gardens is a small narrow cul de sac situated between Warwick School (and now Kings School which recently moved to the Warwick School site) and Myton School. Myton Gardens is also opposite the entrance to St Nicholas Park off Myton Road.

Myton gardens is currently congested during the day with parked cars. Many of these parked cars are from pupils at Warwick School (and Kings School) and Myton School and the cars are left parked all day. The other parked cars are from people using St Nicholas park, including people walking their dogs or using the sports facilities and who are too lazy or too selfish to use the St Nicholas Park or Myton Fields car parks. The cars are parked on both sides of the road creating a chicane which is hard to navigate especially for emergency services and delivery vans and lorries. The cars are also parked opposite people's drives making it difficult (and sometimes impossible) to get on and off the drive during the day time.

I write on behalf of my wife and myself to wholeheartedly support the Parking proposals for Myton Gardens, For some time I have been very concerned about the difficulty larger vehicles have in accessing all properties and the potential inaccessability for emergency vehicles, in particular Fire Engines.

I have also been aware of the difficulties faced by wheel chair and disability scooters when so many have parked on the pavements.

There is a serious parking issue in Myton Gardens and the problem has been exacerbated in the past year as the result of the extensive building programme at Warwick School to accommodate Kings High School leading to a lack of parking spaces at the school.

It is now extremely difficult for the residents to get in or out of the road sue to the parked cars on both sides including bends and the turning circle. Particular problems are experienced by Ambulances, Refuse and Delivery Vehicles. Fortunately there has bee no need for a fire engine since those vehicles would be unable to navigate the chicane bends created by the haphazard parking by Warwick School boys.

For these reasons I fully support your proposal for single yellow lines on both sides the length of the road including the turning circle.

There is a serious parking issue in Myton Gardens and the problem has been exacerbated in the past year as the result of the extensive building programme at Warwick School to accommodate Kings High School leading to a lack of parking spaces at the school.

It is now extremely difficult for the residents to get in or out of the road due to the parked cars on both sides including bends and the turning circle. Particular problems are experienced by Ambulances, Refuse and Delivery Vehicles. Fortunately there has been no need for a fire engine since those vehicles would be unable to navigate the chicane bends created by the haphazard parking by Warwick School boys.

For these reasons I fully support your proposal for single yellow lines on both sides the length of the road including the turning circle.

Thank you for your letter dated 28th February 2020 concerning the above proposal and I fully support the proposal, we suffer from Warwick School Pupils parking all day, Fishermen Parking at Weekends and Families visiting the Park. We look forward to getting our Street back

I refer to the consultation on proposed parking restrictions at Myton Gardens, Warwick as portrayed on plan TR\11124 - 18.

We are residents at Myton Gardens and fully support the proposals.

We agree entirely with the statement of reasons which gives rise to the justification for the parking restrictions.

We look forward to early implementation of the scheme.

I confirm that I support the proposals for parking restrictions to come into force at Myton Gardens Warwick CV34 6BH.

As residents of Myton Gardens, Warwick, CV34 6BH I am writing to confirm WE ARE FULLY IN AGREEMENT with the parking proposals for Myton Gardens, as below:

SINGLE YELLOW LINE RESTRICTION. MON-FRI 9.00AM - 5PM.

Each property in Myton Gardens has plenty of driveway space for possible short-term parking for visiting tradesmen etc.

I wish to express my strong support for these proposals. On many occasions recently I have had difficulty driving down the road because of parked vehicles, most of which have no connection with residents. As a diabetic living at the end of the street, I am concerned that should I need medical assistance and ambulance would find access difficult;; for the same reason I am concerned about the elderly resident (of the street). Parking in the turning area also causes large delivery lorries sometimes to reverse onto lawns in front of houses while attempting to turn in a very restricted space.

I am a resident on Myton gardens living at number 5 and I received your letter regards the proposed parking restrictions.

I am emailing to thank you for looking at this proposal and am emailing in support. Having purchased our house in October last year I have seen the difficulties and dangerous parking first hand.

The issues are:

1. Sixth form students parking their cars all day and possibly local workers

2. Badly parked cars doing this to the point were at times I couldn't get to my own house or down the drive!

Had an emergency larger vehicle wanted to pass this would have been impossible.

3. Myton school parents parking at the entrance to the street on double yellow lines often on the pavement and restricting the footpath and it hard for other drivers to see accurately when turning out.

4. Use of the street for parking by park goers/dog walkers who wish to avoid parking charges both on week days and weekends. This is denying the council of income.

5. Use of the street again at the weekends for users of the Warwick pool next door.

I absolutely agree with the proposal. I am unsure if there is a way of also being applicable at the weekends without restricting visitors to residents.

I have seen signs at the entrance of streets in Warwick that are close to the hospital saying 'no hospital parking here'. I wonder if something similar saying 'no school parking here' would be helpful.

I also wonder if these would go manned? Often I've seen cars parked on the double yellow lines all day!

It's very frustrating having 2 young children trying to walk to places with a constant influx of traffic and pollution down our street.

I am hopeful that the restrictions would be approved. We have met with the head master of Warwick school who is also in full support of parking restrictions being in place.

As a resident of Newbold Terrace East I believe that this scheme will make parking even more difficult for residents on our road.

As it stands there are rarely enough spaces on the road for residents during the day and it can be a struggle when arriving home from work in the evening to find a space near your house too.

There is currently the residents permit zone outside some of the houses, but this is often full as well. I am not advocating extending the permit zone, but I do believe that adding in these double yellow line (no waiting zones) will make parking for residents all the more difficult, so I think the road should stay in its current format without these zones.

The justification for adding these zones is to add somewhere for cars to pass, however as a resident of this road I have never had an issue with passing in the four years I have lived here. Two cars can easily pass each other in the width of the road with parked cars on either side. Lorries and cars already have places they can wait for oncoming traffic to pass before they proceed if they wish to do this. There does not need to be more of these passing points added at the expense of residents losing parking places near their houses.

With regard to the proposals for 2 passing places on Newbold Terrace East, we submit the following comments with the objective of improving safety:-

1. Newbold Terrace East is now a very busy street, with a significant increase in vehicles of all sorts, cyclists and pedestrians since the Leisure Centre was extended, its facilities more widely promoted, and more activity is taking place on the Comyn. This has increased the safety risks for all users of the street. We have witnessed on several occasions, large vehicles coming in opposite directions blocking the street for many minutes, sometimes for over half an hour, which could jeopardise lives if emergency vehicles cannot get through.

2. Many vehicles do not slow down when other vehicles are approaching them from the opposite direction. And some vehicles exceed 30 mph particularly in the evenings. A speed restriction of 20 mph should be imposed on the whole street to reinforce the message that the street is narrow and dangerous particularly where cars are parked on both sides and where the street bends.

3. The two new passing places proposed for vehicles might improve safety, but the gap between them of 100m is too long to avoid vehicles moving in the opposite direction entering the areas where vehicles are parked on both sides. Reducing the gaps between the passing places would improve safety. This could be achieved by extending the double yellow lines on the south side of the street from the traffic lights by a further 20m, and putting in a third passing place so that gaps between them are about 60m. The extension of the double yellow lines on the south side of the street from the traffic lights is desirable anyway as this is the narrowest part of the street and would improve safety.

4. During the day, vehicles are frequently parked across the pedestrian crossing points from the pathway in the green area opposite Fernhill Drive. These two crossing points should be protected by double yellow lines to avoid pedestrians having to cross the street between closely parked vehicles.

There should be a similar additional protected crossing point further up the street opposite the cul de sac as this is where residents and other pedestrians frequently cross to enter or leave the safer pathway in the green area.

Thank you for your letter dated 28 February regarding the above.

I wish to remind you of our previous correspondence on this matter when I first raised my concerns in October 2019. In particular the fact that it had taken me an hour to travel up from the traffic lights to my home. This delay could put lives at risk if emergency vehicles are similarly delayed.

Currently the traffic lights only allow very few cars travelling down NTE to cross over especially if they are trying to turn right, thus causing further traffic jams.

Your proposed "20 metre passing places" will help but the number should be increased to 3 or 4, or extended to 40 metres!

Please would the team consider the extension of resident parking bays between numbers 9-33 and 42a-42. The resident parking situation has progressively worsened as more people seek free parking while working or shopping in town making it difficult for residents to park. The Council has also issued an excessive number of permits on the street relative to the permit bay spaces available, for example number 39 would normally be entitled to 3 permits as a single dwelling but as it is split into 5 apartments the number that can be issued is significantly more than this and in fact greater than the entire provision outside the that and the adjacent properties.

I notice that you are advertising new restrictions along a section of Newbold Terrace East to facilitate passing places.

Please could you also consider the following:

There are two dropped kerbs on Newbold Terrace East opposite the junction with Fernhill Drive. They are often blocked by parked cars, making the dropped kerbs inaccessible. This makes the crossing points dangerous at best, as pedestrians are forced to cross between the parked cars, and impossible for anyone using a wheelchair or with a pushchair.

Both the crossings are well used by local children and anyone visiting the leisure centre or the other facilities of Newbold Comyn.

Double yellow lines across the two dropped kerbs would act as a further visual reminder to drivers not to park there.

I received a letter notifying me about the proposed double yellow lines to create passing places on Newbold Terrace East. I don't think the plans go quite far enough and need further areas of double yellow lines further down the road to allow safer pedestrian crossing.

There are two road crossing places close to the Fernhill Drive junction where the path on the comyn side has a formal crossing area to the other side and these are often completely blocked by parked cars. The crossing places are dangerous as visibility around the cars is poor, forcing you to get well into the road between the parked cars before you can see if the road is clear. The crossings are generally used by children making their way to St Pauls School, or to the sports centre or park, and they are often on bikes. I see so many close shaves here. The parked cars also make it very awkward for people with push chairs etc to cross the road.

I would like to see double yellow lines in front of the pedestrian crossings to prevent cars blocking them thereby creating a safer road crossing.

I support the proposal as it will improve traffic flow.

I would have one request – the permit bays currently on Newbold Terrace East are not sufficient for the residents particularly at the eastern end – in front of 34-41. If you could add extra bays on the same side extending east in front of 42 and west beyond 33 that would be a big improvement.

1 It is disappointing to note that the Council is seeking to amend the legal restrictions because the Vauxhall Garage has not complied with the law....this is completely contrary to public policy. Members of the public are expected to comply with the law as it is – we had yet another traffic warden come up the road a few weeks ago, looking to enforce the parking restrictions against local residents who are unable to park because of the Garage workers taking all of the local spaces. The Warden did not make any exceptions....

2 I have personally telephoned the Council on numerous occasions over the years, to report the fact that the Garage have a transporter unloading, at peak traffic times, in direct contravention of the traffic order in place. No action has ever been taken.

3 Queuing traffic waiting to drive down the road, from the Coventry direction, are likely to block the entrance/exit to Goodfellow street, which, in turn, will cause a back up of traffic leading back to Rugby road – this currently happens – I witness it regularly. This is more likely to happen given the new position the Council is suggesting that the Transporter takes up.

4 There are currently 7 Garage worker cars which park every day, between the end of the yellow line around the mouth of Goodfellow street, and my property.

5 The cars coming from the Coventry direction need space to be able to drive around those 7 parked cars (which arrive by about 7.30 am and just after) and pull in, safely, before the parked up Transporter in its new place.....this is a big leap to make in one movement – the length of several buses I suspect. The traffic approaching from Rugby road end, rarely wants to give way, because, they have 'right of way' as there are no obstructions on their side. The number of 'near misses' and screeching of brakes, blowing of horns, etc, from 8 am onwards, is too much to count. It is a very dangerous spot.

6 There are 3 garages on the opposite side of the road, at the back of the properties in Quarry st. The first one, often has a car parked outside. The second two, with white doors, are rented out and used for storage. There is a clear space in front of them. This gives some room for cars coming from the Rugby road end, to pull over a little.

7 I would suggest that, to make some space for cars to pull around the 7 parked cars, before Goodfellow street, the Council looks to reduce the available on road parking space by extending the yellow lines around the mouth of Goodfellow street, by say, the length of 2 cars, which is directly opposite the white garages. This would have the effect of widening the available width significantly and making it much safer to enable cars to pull around those 7 (or 5) parked cars. Those cars are always there, so this must be taken into account. There is no point in assessing the road without taking into consideration the daily street scene.

8 It would help traffic flow hugely, if the Council were to make use of some lined markings on the road, at the junction with Rugby road, to encourage those cars turning right, to move and wait towards the middle of the road, which is wide enough at the junction to take at least two cars in width, one to turn right and one to turn left, for at least two cars back. The problem is that many drivers selfishly sit in the middle of the road, frustrating those wishing to turn left, preventing good traffic flow. White lines would indicate the need for right hand turners, to wait in the middle, leaving a clear flow to the left. This would all help the flow of traffic in the road at peak times, something which is sorely needed.

9 Please also bear in mind that once the driver from the Coventry direction has managed to pass the 7 parked cars, and pull in safely somewhere without blocking Goodfellow street, that driver then

needs to make another movement, around the parked up transporter and needs good visibility to do so. The Council must keep traffic around the area flowing as well as can be, to ensure that these movements can be made safely. This is the current problem. The less parked cars in the road, the more chance of safe movements.

10 Simple solutions are as follows –

- suggest that the Garage complies with the law and brings the transporter at times which comply with the legal restrictions,
- Suggest that the Garage unload the transporter on their own site.
- Suggest that the Garage workers park either on their site, or, a bit further down the road by the cemetery, away from the busy junction. An increase of yellow lines would achieve this, and would enable a much safer and clearer flow of traffic for all.

Thank you for inviting us to take part in the consultation on changes to parking restrictions in Othello Avenue. As residents of Banquo Approach we are in support of the proposal; however, we are concerned this proposal will not tackle the real issues that users of this road experience on a daily basis.

Our concern is related to the image presented below between north of Banquo Approach and Portia Way. The issues in this area of Othello Avenue are:

1. Lack of visibility for vehicles travelling in both directions due to residential parking and narrow road, as marked with a blue line on the map.
2. Lack of visibility for pedestrians approaching Othello Ave from the West and wishing to cross the road (marked as a yellow dotted line in the enclosed map). Pedestrians have very limited visibility of vehicles traveling SB (green arrow in the map).

The above issues create a lot of tension between drivers, frequent dangerous driving and some drivers encroaching on the pedestrian area to drive along this section of Othello (This behaviour is observed in vehicles driving SB).

We would like you to consider, in light of the above, and given that there is no right solution as there is a very narrow road that carries more traffic than was probably anticipated and bus services, that perhaps better signalisation could be introduced or switch this section of road to a single lane offering prioritisation to SB traffic so that the right of way is clear to all road users with the aim of minimising arguments.

Also, just above the mini roundabout (close to the red arrow) there is a small dip on the road which also makes visibility difficult. Therefore, vehicles need to wait slightly before that dip or at the mini-roundabout to have full visibility of incoming traffic SB.

We trust this information is useful to inform your decision about the changes to parking restrictions in the area.

Do not hesitate to get in touch, should you need clarification about the issues discussed above.

I write with reference to your letter dated Friday 28 February 2020. Our house is number, opposite the Banquo Approach T junction.

Drivers regularly park their vehicles opposite this T junction, often half on and half off the footpath outside our home. Because Othello Avenue is one of the main bus routes through Warwick Gates, vehicles parked there – which has included buses - can cause a significant nuisance, delaying traffic and frustrating other road users, which unfortunately, we have borne the brunt of. They also obstruct the footpath. And because this junction is immediately before/after a mini-roundabout, parked vehicles can cause mayhem.

I welcome the proposals to install the new double yellow lines. However, can I request an extension to the proposed lines to include the area directly opposite this T junction. Unfortunately, the current proposal would just encourage more illegal parking.

I would be grateful if this could be accepted as an amendment to the original project.

In addition, I can only speak for my own household, but we have suffered abuse and threatening language from other drivers attempting to use the road, who assume that the vehicles parked outside are ours. As you imagine, this has caused some very distressful situations for us as a family.

As I have already said above, I fear that the current plans could make this situation worse.

Finally, we have been assured that any responses to this proposal would be treated as confidential and that no named respondents would be published. I trust that this will be the case.

Thank you for reviewing the parking on Othello Avenue, Warwick, CV34 6ED.

I have lived at this address for more than three years. The parking, near misses and incidents of road rage outside our house are at an all time high.

The excessive parking by hospital staff on both Othello Avenue and Portia Way exasperates the problem.

Often vehicles, including both lorries and buses are having to dangerously mount the pavement between the park and the entrance to the shops and doctors surgery at Cressida Close.

There are two bus stops on opposite sides of the road between the entrances to Portia Way and Coriolanus Square. Hospital staff begin parking their cars (mounting the pavement) from the first bus stop to the park. The congestion causes traffic to back up to both Heathcote Lane and past the entrance to Bolingbroke Drive during the rush hour and each time a bus waits at either bus stop.

I would recommend making both Othello Avenue and Portia Way 'No Hospital Parking' similarly to Arundel Close, Pembroke Close and other streets surrounding Warwick Hospital.

I live at Banquo Approach and am concerned about the proposal for double yellow lines on Othello Avenue. There is a significant issue here with the safety of road users and pedestrians with cars regularly parking and blocking access and visibility along the road. However double yellow lines will only move the problem elsewhere as the root cause of the issue is not being addressed.

The local rehab hospital does not have enough parking for its staff, therefore the staff regularly park along Othello Avenue, Portia Way and surrounding roads. The issue has progressed so much that people are now starting to park on Banquo Approach by our house. My concern is that the double yellow lines on Othello will move the cars to our road and other surrounding roads across the estate.

The safety issue along Othello does need to be addressed, as crossing to the park or driving down the road can be quite hazardous. However the full implications across the estate need to be assessed, with options to address the root cause of the issue prioritised. This is also something that we have mentioned to MP Matt Western as something which must be addressed to address safety in Warwick Gates.

I am writing in relation to the current parking consultation on the estate.

Although this has always been a problem, in the last year or so, parking changes at the nearby hospital have made the parking situation on our road significantly worse.

My house faces directly onto the street, and we frequently have cars parked up the kerb, literally a foot from our front door. This happens on a near daily basis.

Although we ourselves have two spaces on our drive, we opt to park one of our cars up the kerb outside our house purely because if we do not do it, we will have an endless parade of people parking there, slamming doors inches from our front door.

Our neighbour also does the same, with the result that parking on our street is dangerous. Pedestrians can not get by, and the road generally looks like a car park.

I have seen the consultation for double yellows on Othello Avenue, but I fear this will just make the situation on Costard Avenue even worse as the parking gets pushed further out.

My suggestion would be for double yellow lines on all those sections of Costard Avenue which are NOT clear parking areas.

At the very least, there needs to be some interaction with the hospital around their parking rules - on Costard Avenue we see a near endless parade of hospital staff parking up kerbs and heading towards work (they're easily identifiable by uniform and lanyards).

I live on Orsino Close within the Warwick Gates area. I have recently had sight of the proposed parking restrictions for the estate and would like to raise my concerns that whilst they are an improvement, this proposal as stands does not address the daily problems which occur on Othello Avenue with cars frequently parking on one side of the road causing obstructions and unnecessary delays and danger to other road users.

I frequently walk this way with my young child in a pushchair and often see dangerous driving on this stretch of road due to aggressive driving and 'stand offs' with cars speeding through or waiting to pass this stretch as a result of congestion/ parked cars. This stretch of road is a main bus route and also in between a children's play area, gp surgery and community centre. The frequent manner of Inconsiderate and aggressive driving poses a serious danger to vulnerable road users including children and the elderly walking and crossing this stretch of road.

I would strongly urge you to amend your proposal to include double yellow lines and speed bumps along the stretch of Othello Avenue to address this matter.

I fail to see how yellow lines around corners of side streets an on island where nobody parks anyway will solve anything.

Problems along Othello Avenue are caused by parked vehicles between the playground and Juliet Drive. Residents in Juliet Drive and roads off are also stuck with parked vehicles from residents of other streets.

Parking permits for residents and restrictions on timings would be far more useful in controlling traffic in the area.

These proposals will solve nothing and are a waste of taxpayers money.

I live at Banquo Approach, and all days I face unsafety traffic situation to go through the Othello Ave close to Play Area in both directions with parked vehicles on West side. Due to parked vehicles and vans in west side, the driver faces a hidden situation that impact in late traffic and non-safety driving, even for children and elderly crossing the road.

As there is plan to review the double Yellow Lines in this area, from my point of view the issue# XVI must be amend from "northwards for 30 metres." to "northwards for 250 metres (at least)." To avoid parked vehicles till next north junction. Same as for issue# XV.

Othello Avenue - No Waiting at Anytime

- i. South side, from its junction with Touchstone Road, eastwards for 9 metres
- ii. South side, from its junction with Touchstone Road, westwards for 46 metres
- iii. North side, from its junction with Banquo Approach, eastwards for 52 metres
- iv. North side, from its junction with Banquo Approach, westwards for 7 metres
- v. South Side, from its junction with Launce Grove, eastwards for 8 metres
- vi. South side, from its junction with Launce Grove, westwards for 6 metres
- vii. West side, from its junction with Dogberry Way, southwards for 10 metres
- viii. West side, from its junction with Dogberry Way, northwards for 10 metres
- ix. West side, from its junction with Bolingbroke Drive, southwards for 11 metres
- x. West side, from its junction with Bolingbroke Drive, northwards for 63 metres
- xi. West side, from its junction with Lady Grey Avenue, northwards for 5 metres
- xii. West side, from its junction with Lady Grey Avenue, southwards for 7 metres
- xiii. East side, from a point 58 metres south of its junction with Banquo Approach, southwards for 47 metres
- xiv. East side, from its junction with Banquo Approach, southwards for 14 metres
- xv. East side, from its junction with Banquo Approach, northwards for 50 metres
- xvi. West side, from a point 48 metres north of its junction with Lady Grey Avenue, northwards for 30 metres
- xvii. East side, from its junction with Juliet Drive, northwards for 9 metres
- xviii. East side, from its junction with Juliet Drive, southwards for 8 metres
- xix. West side, from its junction with Portia Way, northwards for 13 metres
- xx. West side, from its junction with Portia Way, southwards for 13 metres
- xxi. East side, from its junction with Coriolanus Square, southwards for 10 metres

In general a very positive step. I am resident in Coriolanus square, and the north side extension to the double yellow lines is a very good idea. Have witnessed many near misses here, and have had to leave notes on cars that have been badly parked here.

I would note that the northbound run as drawn up Othello is a lottery of an evening. After the traffic calming by the park there is normally an unbroken line of parked cars on the left of the road by early evening. As a driver you are totally unsighted for a long stretch of road here as marked below and this is incredibly unsafe. Drive this daily and see many incidents of cars having to mount the pavement on the right, road rage and gridlock

I am entirely in agreement with your plans for yellow lines.

I have concerns too that local drivers and 'cut through- rat run' drivers seem not to observe the 30 mph limit.

The play ground, which has been much improved in the last twelve months is proving popular.

Could we have a 20 mph in the play ground and adjacent road.

For my part I would like even stronger traffic calming measures, so that the Othello Avenue 'rat run' is no longer viable for drivers that don't live on the estate. The cost of such measures, along with necessary Fire Service, Ambulance and Police would I am sure be prohibitively expensive.

I feel that a 20 mph area around the play ground could make all drivers be more considerate of the future generations. It too could have the effect for a few drivers to abandon the Othello rat run.

Upon reviewing the planned changes to parking restrictions on Othello Avenue I wish to object.

These do not address the main cause of dangerous parking and obstruction to driving.

The key area of concern is on the left hand side just, up from the park. (it is missing from your diagrams but is opposite numbers 56 upwards to Juliet Drive). Due to the line of traffic consistently parked here and the bend in the road, there is a rat run where cars have to proceed with no visibility of oncoming traffic. When I have raised this previously it was suggested to me this was a safety measure as it meant cars had to slow down. Unfortunately, the opposite is true as cars speed up to get through this piece of road as quickly as possible.

I also don't understand the need to put double yellows on the corners of roads. I have never seen anyone parked on any of these corners and it is against the highway code anyway. I live at Othello Avenue and note there are plans to put double yellow lines around the mini roundabout outside our houses, this is also pointless as in all the years I have lived here no-one has ever parked there. I would be interested to know the thought process behind these proposals.

Whilst I support the additions of double yellow lines I am extremely frustrated that the problem seems to have been misunderstood considerably. Parking is generally not so much of a problem around traffic calming roundabouts and at junctions, but is a HUGE problem down Othello Avenue between the park and the shops at the top of the road. It is down the length of Othello Avenue that double yellow lines are required. The proposed new double yellow lines could also possibly compound the current problem, forcing more people to park down the length of the road which creates only one lane that traffic can drive down, visibility problems so that "stand-offs" and road rage incidents occur and also forces pavement mounting by vehicles stuck in an impasse situation, which is a danger to pedestrians. I have lived in my current property for 20 years and this problem is getting worse and worse, I personally take a "long-cut" through the estate at every opportunity, to avoid the road right by my own home. Please don't allow half a job to be done this time, a solution is greatly required.

The letter we have received today is just not good enough. I live on Banquo Approach and after looking at the plans as to where the yellow lines will be painted I am disappointed. The lines do not go anywhere the actual chaos that is caused every morning / afternoon / evening. The yellow lines need to go much further up Othello Avenue - all the way up to the shops. This will stop all the potential accidents and people having to take their vehicle into the pavement in order to get past.

Watching emergency vehicles struggle is something that makes me very sad and the fact the yellow lines are not going to be painted up to where the actual problem is - is just ridiculous

I live on Warwick Gates and use the Othello Avenue road daily. I would like to recommend that the whole of the Othello avenue should have no parking (i.e. double yellow lines) restrictions on it; particularly the stretch leading down to the park from the Co-Op end. This is a very busy road and is now being used by double decker buses too. Since cars are parked on one side of the road, it makes the traffic movement very slow and is also very dangerous with a number of near misses in the area. Thanks.

1.

Dear Rory O'Connor,

Plymouth Place and Farley Street – No Waiting at any Time

It is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the north and south sides of the junction of Plymouth Place and Farley Street. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic, and ensuring free flow of traffic.

Re: Plymouth Place - No Waiting at Anytime

i. North side, from its junction with Farley Street, westwards for 8 metres

ii. South side, from its junction with Farley Street, westwards for 8 metres

We write to object to the above proposal, we believe the objection period now ends on 1st May 2020.

It is clear that there is, or can be, at many times during the year, huge amounts of traffic parking in the area of Plymouth Place and Farley Street, most of which tend to be commercial vehicles using the area as a free-car park, taxis, mini-bus or hire vans or people parking and leaving vehicles for long periods probably using the train to go to Birmingham Airport for a holiday or indeed, parking and walking into town.

Therefore to avoid danger to persons or traffic and ensuring free flow of traffic it would feel including Plymouth Place and Farley Street into a Residents' Parking Zone, to be a sensible way forward rather than paint the area in further ugly double yellow lines?

We had thought some time ago local councilor, Helen Adkins, was going to kindly encourage a consultation paper on this subject, within the area of Plymouth Place and Farley Street?

Perhaps therefore the above proposal could be paused and a consultation re residents' views on extending nearby Residents' Parking Zones to include Plymouth Place and Farley Street, would be wise to take place instead?

Many thanks.

Kind regards,

XXXXXXXXXX (& XXXXXXXXX)

Cc XXXXXXXX, XXXXXXXX

XXX Plymouth Place
Leamington Spa
CV31 1HW

2.

Hi there

I am a resident of Plymouth Place and wish to raise objections about the new parking proposals.

The new approach will not solve the parking issue but instead, make the situation worse by forcing people to park on both sides of the street and make the street too narrow for fire engines and ambulances to drive down.

It will mean that I am not able to park outside my house any longer and will result in cars clogging up other streets including further down Farley street.

The permit parking that was introduced in Russell Terrace a few years ago has meant more and more people parking in Plymouth Place and Farley Street - this new proposal will exacerbate the issue and is not the right solution to the issue.

The fundamental issue is that a number of commercial taxi companies or van hire companies are using Farley street as a parking area rather than renting sufficient commercial spaces.

By introducing the proposed yellow lines all it will do is force residents to park further and further away - as the taxis and van hire companies will still be parking their vehicles before ordinary residents get home from work.

I am literally begging please do not introduce this as I won't be able to park outside my own house.

Regards
XXXXX XXXXXX
XXX Plymouth Place

3.

Dear Mr O'Connor,

I am writing with regards to the notice of intended parking changes at Plymouth Place/Farley Street.

Whilst I consider the idea of preventing parking within the first meters as very good (as driving in and out the street has become difficult on both ends of Plymouth Place due parking on both sides), I object to the plan due to the already strained parking situation in Plymouth Place for the following reasons:

- numerous multiple occupancy house properties appear to have more cars than there used to be - there are newly constructed properties in Plymouth Place which although they have allocated parking may add further cars if used for multiple occupancy -over the last few years Farley street has become a parking area (nights/weekends) for mini busses and taxis which reduces the parking for residents further
- multiple occupancy properties in Radford Road use Plymouth Place and Farley Road as well as commuters for the train station -Residents of Plymouth Place are not able to park in Russell Terrace due to a parking permit zone there

Whilst a 10m parking restriction may not appear much it will definitely add to the existing parking problems.

I think therefore that these changes should only be implemented in conjunction with a parking permit scheme similar to those implemented in other parts of Leamington.

As there are no speed restrictions (e.g speed bumps) in Plymouth Place tighter parking may also be a H&S issue, as it appears that there are cars frequently exceeding the speed limit in a small street where families with young children live.

Kind Regards,
XXXXX XXXXXXXXX

4.

Hi

I have seen the notice about proposed works.

We were told it was going to be Russell Terrace/ Farley Street junction at the sit meeting with count councillors.

This is the junctions where there have been accidents. As people have been parking their Vans . Kids are crossing without knowing what is coming the other way. Accident waiting to happen

Thanks
X X XXXXX
XXXXXXXXXXXX
Sent from my iPhone

5.

To whom it may concern,

I have seen today that a sign has been put up outside my house showing intended work to paint lines showing a no waiting zone on the road. (A photo of the order is attached)

Can someone please send me a plan of what is going to be done and why? Why are the restrictions so long? Why is it only on this end of the road when a fire engine wouldn't be able to get down the west end of Plymouth place due to the parking. As a resident I would rather see a parking permit system on the entire road controlled so that the council ensures there are enough spaces for all cars.

The plan will remove 28 metres of parking which at an average car length of 4.5 metres, will remove 6 parking spaces. On a road that is already congested and that the council has just passed planning on a new 2 bedroom property on this junction which will come with at least two cars for which the council said there are spaces two roads away. Where are these 6 cars now suppose to park?

Best regards,

XXXXX XXXXXX

Email: XXXXXXXXXXXX@hotmail.com
Tel: XXXXXXXXXXXX
Sent from my iPhone

In response to the notices posted in Reeve Drive regarding the proposed yellow lines. Due to Covid 19 and Government guidelines we have been unable to engage on a face to face basis with the neighbours (stakeholders) to fully discuss the implications proposed by the council. As you know all contact has been stopped which has severely limited any attempt to fully gather a consensus of opinion. We did letter drop on the matter and had a response by email from seven households, all against the proposal and none for supporting. It is my intention to have a face to face meeting with the residents upon the lifting of the current restrictions.

My reason for this is because of a statement made by Haresh Kumar of WCC, who is recorded as saying:

"I trust you will understand that the County Council would prefer to be given clear guidance from the residents on what they wish to see, otherwise the decision falls to the Council Officers. Unfortunately in this day and age decisions may be challenged, as it could be construed by some that such a decision was not in line with the residents' requirements"

Statement

The traffic measures in place currently were approved by council at the development stage as calming measures by 1) restricting the width of the road in part to less than that of the road where a parked car would be and 2) a give way. Therefore, traffic can never be free flow because of the physical limitations of the road and so to remove cars would not increase the free flow of traffic and therefore, this would not avoid danger to persons or traffic.

Summary

Currently, the flow of traffic is not comprised by parked cars but by traffic calming measures (a give way). Therefore, this is not an improvement to safety by extending or adding yellow lines.

We request this proposal is withdrawn as there is no safety case and its burdensome to the majority of residents.

I was slightly surprised to read below - without any apparent prior notification to local Councillors - on the lampposts in Reeve Drive about proposed parking restrictions in the road. As I'm sure you're aware, this is a very busy road used by parents of children at St Nicholas School in preference to blocking the even busier and more dangerous Whateley's Drive.

Can you please advise what has caused you to consider introducing these parking restrictions, what consultation you've undertaken and what your plans are to stop parents reverting to using Whateley's Drive?

I wish to object to part of the parking restrictions planned for Reeve Drive, Kenilworth: The extension of the current restriction on the north side of Reeve Drive would reduce the amount of parking available for residents of both Reeve Drive and Whateleys Drive with no benefit in terms of safety or traffic flow.

The proposed restrictions on the south side of Reeve Drive would, however, be beneficial.

I want to register my objections to the expansion of double yellow lines along Rugby Road.

We live at Rugby Road, on the corner of Oswald Road. I firmly believe that removing parked cars at this location will encourage drivers to increase their speed as the road becomes wider. We already have an issue with speeding cars along this road. In the last year there have been two significant traffic accidents involving speeding cars. Both have resulted in significant damage to cars and properties close to our house and one of those in a fatality.

I have two children (8 and 10) and am extremely concerned that cars regularly pass our house at speeds approaching 50mph.

I would request that the council reconsider this proposal and keep the on street parking.

I would like to object to the proposal (Ref: Warwick District CPE Variation 6) for double yellow lines outside no 203 Rugby Road, CV32 6DY.

Nobody has asked me for these double yellow lines. They do not appear to be required. There are already major parking problems for residents in the area and any further loss of on-street parking will just make a bad situation worse. This proposal is likely to push car parking further down the road that will make the exiting and entry to the driveways there more dangerous. In short I fail to see any evidence of the need for these double yellow lines that are likely to make the road more dangerous not safer.

I write in connection with the proposal to extend the double yellow lines along a section of Rugby Road, from the junction with Oswald Road in the Warwick direction.

I object to this proposal; I can see no justification for it, as it would appear to offer no benefits but only disadvantages.

There are no vision problems for cars entering Oswald Road (for some years now a one-way street) from Rugby Road from either direction; there are already double yellow lines on the opposite side of Rugby Road, so the road width is not restricted at this point. As for disadvantages, with the loss of two parking spaces outside numbers 201 and 203, there will be increasing pressure on any other meagre spaces along the road. I live at number, and although I am fortunate to have a driveway, like some of my neighbours, there is already considerable difficulty entering or exiting my property because cars are often squeezed into the small spaces between driveways. Moreover, I suggest that the loss of parking availability will cause considerable inconvenience for the residents at 201 and 203, as they will be unable to load or unload as they can currently and indeed have done for many years.

Please reconsider withdrawing this proposal and use the money saved on other more worthwhile projects, of which there are many.

We would like to express our concern and object to the proposal for double yellow lines outside no 203 Rugby Road, CV32 6DY.

We are best placed to give honest real time information on the situation in our area of this section of Rugby Road in relation to the following Parking / speeding / neighbourhood watch and so on.

We have off road parking at No. Rugby Road as do our neighbours which allows parking for our neighbours on the opposite side of the road which has double yellow lines. However there is still not

enough space and to reduce these spaces further will simply push the parking issue in front of our property at which is already very dangerous to exit and enter if cars are parked on both sides of our entrance.

The proposed plan would remove the right for parking outside no 203 and this in turn would reduce the parking by one or two cars on the rugby road in a situation where we are already very short of parking.

I have received your letter of 28th February regarding the new double yellow lines for Rugby Road; a letter which does not explain the reasons for this remarkable and unthinking change. In objecting I would like to point out that this change will affect me and the houses opposite. I am 84 and have difficulty walking, my immediate neighbours are of a similar age and will also be badly inconvenienced.

I wish to object to the proposed new waiting restrictions in Rugby Road Leamington. I cannot see any danger to persons under the present arrangements and changing them will cause avoidable inconvenience in an area where on road parking is constrained. As far as the free flow of traffic is concerned, this is far more affected by the large vehicles that park on the stretch of road parallel with the shops.

I am writing to object to the proposed changes to parking restrictions on Rugby Road.

I live at Rugby Road with my family. Our household includes five adults with three cars that we use on a daily basis. On the side of the road that we live, very few houses have driveways and therefore our household and our neighbors rely on the street parking that is available opposite.

If the council were to extend the double yellow lines as proposed, this would remove two parking spaces that are utilised daily by the community.

Currently, myself and my neighbors are careful not to obstruct any driveways and to park considerately. If these spaces were removed, we would be forced to try and find parking on Oswald Road, Cross Road and Percy Terrace. These streets are already congested and under pressure from resident parking.

If the plans were to go ahead, you would be removing two parking spaces that are currently safe, unproblematic and cause no obstructions. By removing the available parking that is relied upon, you will be encouraging drivers to park less considerately and potentially, more dangerously.

I cannot see any advantages to extending the double yellow lines; Oswald Road is a one-way street which means that no cars access the Rugby Road from Oswald Road and therefore there is no visibility hazard.

On another note, a more important priority for the Rugby Road is the speeding and dangerous driving that occurs and caused a pedestrian death shortly before Christmas. I would be interested in hearing whether the council has plans to introduce traffic calming measures in the area.

I cannot see the reason to extend the double yellow lines further along than they already are. I, myself live at. The bus stop is directly outside my house, which restricts the number of parking spaces our row of houses has. Bearing in mind there are eight houses in this row, there is space for a maximum of five cars, although due to some people not parking neatly enough its very often only four. Therefore to lose that extra bit of parking outside 203 will make things even more inconvenient

than it already is. I have lived on Rugby Road since 1972 and have never considered those parking places to be of any safety issue, especially after Oswald Road was made on-way.

I am writing to strongly object to the proposal to paint double yellow lines outside 203 Rugby Road, CV32 6DY, and ask you to reconsider the proposals.

There are 16 properties between Acacia Road and Oswald Road/Fairlawn Close junctions on Rugby Road. The net loss of 2 parking spaces out of currently 6 on this stretch of road will exacerbate regular problems already confronting visitors and deliveries to my house Rugby Road CV32 6EH. We have lived here for 25 years and parking continues to get more difficult.

My garage fronts onto Fairlawn Close. Shortage of parking spaces locally often leads to inconsiderate parking affecting my access to this garage.

As the residents of Rugby Road we wish to register our agreement with the proposed parking restrictions.

The attached photo shows the parking on the double yellow lines and below, up to the white line outside of 205 Rugby Road. This type of parking is a regular occurrence.

As you will observe from the photo, parking makes exiting the property onto Rugby Road extremely difficult and the proposed restrictions will be an improvement as long as the other residents observe the restrictions.

Ideally we would like to suggest the double yellow lines be continued to outside no. 205. Because of the signpost, any vehicles parking on the road outside 205 have to park up to the white line and into the road which means we have to drive into the side of oncoming traffic when exiting our property.

I am concerned that one of the properties opposite is operating two businesses from their home, one of which is a taxi company and parks up to 4 vehicles on the road sometimes causing a hazard.

The attached photos are a few that we have taken over a period of time and show how hazardous it makes exiting onto the main road.

I live at Rugby road in Milverton and today have received a letter indicating a traffic scheme proposal. I am writing to object to the traffic scheme on the grounds of it making parking even more of a nightmare than it already is.

Every day there is a different car parked outside my house which makes getting in and out of my driveway difficult. I can only think that extending the double yellow line will make this worse as people will struggle to park. My relatives often have nowhere to park as it is.

With reference to the above proposed waiting restrictions which extend past the front of our house at Southam Road, we would like to object on grounds of safety. In order to exit our drive safely onto the main road we have to reverse in so that we do not have to reverse out. It appears from the plan that we would not be able to wait on the road for a suitable opportunity to reverse in without contravening the waiting restriction. As the road is now very busy due to housing developments along it, we sometimes have to wait a long time for a gap in the traffic to reverse in to the drive.

Although we have always preferred to reverse in the drive for safety reasons, we (and other residents) actually had a letter from the police last year requesting that we do this as there have been incidents along Southam Rd of residents reversing out onto the road which was causing a risk to other road users. This proposal seems to contradict what the police have asked us to do so is rather confusing.

Please can you clarify what the position will be for us if the new waiting restrictions go ahead as we have 4 cars and so do not have the option of turning around in the drive before joining the road.

Spring Pool – Warwick Correspondence

1)

Dear Rory,

We are writing to show our support for the traffic proposal for Spring Pool, Warwick. We contacted the council back in December 2018, after purchasing our house and experiencing endless problems with non-residents parking on the street. Our main concern was that the emergency access point was regularly blocked, risking the safety of NHS staff, patients and spring pool residents.

We welcome the proposals to place restrictions on parking on the street as this will hopefully alleviate some of the issues we face each day. We feel this will be very effective if the measures are actively enforced by a traffic warden on a daily basis. Commuters are regularly becoming more brazen, parking on double yellow lines at the entrance of Spring Pool and blocking private parking bays. This demonstrates that a combined approach of enforcement by a traffic warden with the new road marking & signage will be required. The Management Company who manage Spring Pool are actively trying to stop commuters parking in our private resident bays so the pressure will need to be maintained to ensure all approaches work together.


We have looked at the plans for Spring Pool which on the whole look great. After living here consistently for two years, we wish to make a couple of points that will make the parking proposals even more effective. As you can see from pictures commuters are continually overhanging the T-Junction and blocking the entrance to the bays of the private car park. We are concerned and hope that the two parking spaces proposed to remain on the T-Junction will be very tightly positioned together. This would enable residents and large vehicles such as fire engines to be able to access the houses further down Spring Pool and the emergency access point as intended. We have personally experienced issues when we moved into the house where our delivery van could not navigate the T-Junction due to the way cars were positioned and this has remained a problem with further deliveries.

The second point we would like to make is that cars are parking across the opening of private bays in front of properties 6 - 14 and 47 - 69 (see map). Looking at the proposal, the double yellow lines seem to stop at the opening of the private bays which will encourage people to continue to park like this. Therefore, is it possible to extend the double yellow lines so they are continuous throughout the street to combat this? Obviously, residents will know they will be able to continue to use their private bays beyond the yellow lines.

It has been a long and stressful two years for my partner and I having to deal with these issues. I know that many other residents of Warwick will welcome these changes and an end to this daily stress. We hope that these changes will not only be implemented, but will be properly enforced.







2)

Dear Mr O'Connor

As residents of xxx Spring Pool, we fully support these proposals. At present there are no parking restrictions here with the exception of the double yellow lines at the junction of Spring Pool and Cape Road. The current work from home scenario does not show the usual problems with indiscriminate parking by commuters, including abuse of the double yellow lines at the junction. Apart from making access difficult for commercial vehicles, on occasions we have cars double parked which make it very difficult for ordinary motorists to pass through the space. Sometimes we have vehicles which park partly on the pavement causing problems for mothers and prams.

Thank you

3)

I write to comment on the parking changes proposed for Spring Pool.

I frequently visit a friend who lives in Victoria Street, Warwick. My visits are usually at evenings and weekends. On 95% of my visits there are no car parking spaces available at all in Victoria Street, Albert Street or Cape Road. Therefore the only nearby place to park is in Spring Pool, where there are always spaces available at all times in my experience. I understand a lot of the residents of Victoria Street rely on this parking as they have the same experience as me.

I support the proposal for Spring Pool being included in the W2 Residents Parking Scheme. However the proposals reduce significantly the length of that road to be available for parking, with a large amount of double yellow lines shown on the proposed plan. This could cause friction between residents. Considering traffic speeds are very low in Spring Pool, I suggest that it would be safe to provide more parking bays as I have marked on the attached copy of the proposals plan. Vehicles currently park in these locations and there never seems to be any problems.

I also suggest that as an alternative, residents with a W2 Residents Parking Scheme permit should be allowed to use the County Council car park at the eastern end of Cape Road free of charge or restriction at all times, not just evenings and weekends.

4)

Dear Sir

I'm writing to support the proposed change to introduce parking restrictions on Spring Pool. As a resident the cars parked on the road during working hours obstruct access to the road and at times come close to blocking the road for delivery vehicles and as such present a hazard.

5)

Dear Sir,

As owner of number xxx Spring Pool, Warwick, I would like to support the proposed new parking regulations.

I believe Spring Pool is the only remaining road in the area which at present allows all day parking, and so is used by office workers etc. to leave their cars all day without incurring

parking fees. The road is always jammed solid with cars during the week, use being made of both sides of the road and other inappropriate places, leaving little space for fire engines, ambulances etc. to get through. Equally there is nowhere for visiting health workers, carers, and other essential visitors to park at present. Restricting to 2 hours only would, for the most part, solve these issues.

St Micheal`s Road.Correspondence.Redacted

1)

That's great thank you for letting me know.Mum will be a lot happier now .

2)

Hello

I fully support these proposed extensions noted on drawing TR/11124-32

3)

Thank you for your consultation letter on the changes to parking restrictions on St Michaels Road.

I have the viewed the plan showing the proposed extension to the double yellow lines and can confirm that I fully support this. It resolves the issue of badly parked cars (mainly Warwickshire County Council and NHS workers) partially obstructing my driveway on weekdays. Please be aware that the road will need to be resurfaced before this work can be done.

4)

I am all for the parking restrictions in St Michael's road, although I think more than what you are planning on doing should be done.

I am lucky to have a driveway so do not experience car parking issues. But one of the major reasons why some of us on this side of St Michael's have drives is due to the issues we faced with parking from non residents parking to avoid paying for parking at the hospital, at the local technology park and some even park here and bus it into town.

Some of these selfish drivers do not consider that their parking will cause traffic issues. And they will very often park between the drop curbs between the drives. But these have stakes in to stop cars parking between the drives on the grass verges.

So instead some will then fully park on the road not considering the cars parked opposite who have to park on the grass verge to allow the flow of traffic.

When they do this they cause major traffic issues and as there is the bend in the road, which many cars speed round, it's an accident waiting to happen. I often here cars speeding round that corner coming from the Cape Road end and suddenly having to slow down due to the congestion cars parked on my side of the road have caused.

I totally agree to this restriction.

But I feel more is needed.

Firstly cars drive too fast round that corner so maybe speed bumps for that section to stop the speeding cars. And they really do whizz round very fast. And it becomes dangerous to pull off your own drive and even to pull on. An example was the other day i was coming from the Cape Road end of the road and slowed down to reverse onto my drive. A car came speeding round the corner so fast it had to stop so suddenly its brakes screeched. This was one example. It happens almost everyday and I am very surprised that there hasn't been a crash.

The yellow lines or other restrictions should be extended further down St Michael's and go past St Christopher's Close and maybe round the corner heading towards Saliford Gardens. Many cars will park on the bend or just after the bend and due to cars parking on either side it can be very tricky to get past especially if a big lorry or a bus is also stuck trying to get past.

Another area I think you should look at is the same kind of parking restrictions you have around the hospital. This is because of many visitors to with Warwick Hospital or St Michael's Hospital use my street as a car park. Also your own staff use our street as a free car park and will often block drives, park in stupid ways and take up residential spaces. Most of the issue in St Michael's is caused not by residents but those mentioned above, who use our street as a free car park. They even park in disabled bays. So maybe you should consider a residential parking only scheme. Make it so only residents and their guests can park in St Michael's and no one who isn't a resident can like round the hospital. This will free up the road even more. But for now I am happy for the yellow lines to be put in. But I hope you can get a traffic warden to come down the road on a daily basis because many drivers park on the yellow lines, disabled spaces and over drop pavements regularly and almost daily.

□

Stratford Road.Correspondence.Redacted

1)

I want to raise an objection to the addition of double yellows on Stratford road and surrounding areas.

Reasons: waste of tax payers money.

I'd rather you install a speed camera on Stratford road where I often see people speeding up and down the road, I have two young children and I worry about this constantly.

The places you propose double yellows I've never seen anybody parking there, it won't make any difference to road safety. It's complete waste of money and time. As a tax payer I urge you to consider better use of public funds to properly make our roads safer.

2)

Good afternoon

We live at xxx Stratford Road and whilst we agree with the current proposals we do not feel they go far enough. We would be happier to see double yellow lines on the whole of the Stratford Road (apart from the parking inlet opposite the Kia garage.)

We are concerned that the current proposals will just move the problem further up the Stratford Road. We already have an issue with speeding on this road and do not want an issue with parking.

It will make it increasingly difficult to see when we exit our driveway. When people have parked outside our house in the past they have often overhung our driveway which is even more frustrating.

I hope that our concern will be taken into account.

3)

Sir/Madam

I wholeheartedly agree with the proposed parking restrictions planned for Alders Grove. However the proposal does not go far enough to achieve the desired results.

Alders Grove is one of two feeder roads serving Foxes Way and the rest of our small estate. The feeder roads are narrow in relation to other roads in the area and are difficult to navigate safely to avoid potential vehicle collisions. A number of recent incidents have been narrowly avoided.

Installing double yellow lines on the north side of Alders Grove will not achieve the desired requirements and resolve the current problem. Installing double yellow lines on both the north and south side of Alders Grove would allow the free flow of pedestrians and traffic and avoid an impending serious health and safety issue.

4)

Sir/Madam

We wholeheartedly agree with the proposed parking restrictions planned for Alders Grove. However the proposal does not go far enough to achieve the desired results.

Alders Grove is one of two feeder roads serving Foxes Way and the rest of our small estate. The feeder roads are narrow in relation to other roads in the area and are difficult to navigate safely to avoid potential vehicle collisions. A number of recent incidents have been narrowly avoided.

Additionally due to the traffic using one side of the road, a number of large pot holes appear frequently and although they are filled from time to time, they soon reappear. This is damaging to vehicles and dangerous to bicycles.

Installing double yellow lines on the north side of Alders Grove will not achieve the desired requirements and resolve the current problem. Installing double yellow lines on both the north and south side of Alders Grove would allow the free flow of pedestrians and traffic and avoid an impending serious health and safety issue.

Kind regards,

5)

Although our County Councillors problem, as one of you r district Cllrs I have campaigned for a long time to get double yellows put down there, i doubt if this is the finished article and i think we will end up with double yellows both sides,

Trinity Street. Correspondence, Redacted

1)

Dear Sir/Madam,

I understand there is a plan to increase the double yellow lines on Trinity Street, I am assuming to improve access for the garages opposite.

I do however feel this will have a considerable affect on the availability of parking, for the other Permit Holding residents of Trinity Street, which is already very limited in nature.

I find it difficult to understand how parking on the opposite side of the street severely impacts the accessibility of these garages as this surely would don't normally be the case.

Therefore I would like to register an objection to these proposed changes as it will be detrimental to the other Permit Holding users of parking on this road.

Many thanks,

2)

I am writing to object to the proposals for change of parking in Trinity Street, Leamington Spa. The proposal is to *increase* the no parking on the south side of the street at the western end by extending the yellow lines.

The residents in the western end of Trinity Street need more parking, especially L1 permit parking [the L1 permit scheme has been tremendously successful and we, the residents, are very appreciative of it].

Please note that:

1. Three further houses have been built by the very area that the extra yellow lines will cover.
2. A little further east on Trinity Street at the junction of Trinity Street and Beauchamp Road there is construction of houses of multiple occupancy with many additional bedrooms but not additional parking was included [the residents of Trinity Street and Binswood Avenue objected but it was approved on appeal to London]. If the residents of these properties are granted L1 permits there will be massively more cars and permits issued than spaces available.
3. It is proposed that residents of Binswood Street [numbers 2-62 even numbers] will be eligible for L1 parking permits. They will inevitably park on the limited spaces on Trinity Street near to Binswood Street, and the proposal to reduce the available parking with yellow lines will exacerbate the problem.
4. I recommend that Trinity Street from Binswood Street to Beauchamp Road be all made an L1 parking permit area on both parts of the street.

There is a real risk that the situation area will be like the one that happened in London where Chelsea Kensington Council issued many more parking permits than there were parking spaces available.help.

If there is an issue over road safety for pedestrians and other road users then making Trinity Street one way from Binswood Street to Beauchamp Road would help.

It is not clear from the diagram/proposed plan if the proposed yellow lines will reduce the two L1 parking spaces by the garages just east of 157 Trinity Street. If that happens that will be an additional reduction of parking spaces.

At night and late in the evening the residents are often having to park on yellow lines or in front of garage entrances because there are already too many vehicles of people returning from work compared to the number of spaces available.

Yours sincerely

3)

As the owner of xxx Binswood Avenue I am in full support of the proposed changes to the yellow lines in Trinity Street as shown on drawing number TR/11124-35.

4)

I am full supportive of the proposed changes to the yellow lines in Trinity St as shown on drawing number TR/11124-35.

**Wedgknock Green, Oken Road, Cape Road, Deerpark Drive, Newburgh Crescent.
Correspondence.Redacted**

1)

As a resident of Newburgh Crescent, I am writing with a number of concerns regarding the proposed changes to the parking plans for our road, Wedgknock Green and the surrounding roads.

Although the current situation in Newburgh Crescent with no parking restrictions results in the haphazard parking of cars in the road, I am very concerned that the introduction of the proposed parking restrictions will result in an increase in the speed of cars in our road. The current parking of cars on both sides of the road does have the effect of causing chicanes in the road, which slows the speed of cars. From our upstairs window at the front of the house I have a view of almost the whole of Newburgh Crescent all the way up to Cape Road, and often see cars driving too fast down our relatively narrow residential road. However the parked cars cause the cars to reduce their speed. I therefore feel it will be very important to make sure that traffic calming measures are introduced in Newburgh Crescent, given the number of families in the road, if the proposed parking restrictions are introduced. I would suggest that speed humps across the road would be necessary in the road, however I wouldn't recommend using speed pillows, as personally I don't think have any affect in reducing the speed of vehicles as they can be easily avoided.

I understand that Deerpark Drive will still have parking on one side of the road, so given that Newburgh Crescent is roughly the same width, I would propose that our road has the same, rather than no parking at all. Any parked cars would then cause a reduction in speeding traffic.

Although most people have drives, not everyone does and a lot of houses do have more than one car. We do have a drive that we can just get 2 vehicles on if necessary, so would not need a residents permit to park on Wedgknock Green, but would want to be able to have visitors permits for additional residents. I am not clear how this system would work, but understand that this would be done online, although I do not know how you would know when visitors were going to leave. We used to live in Haringey in North London and had a residents permit system in our road, and each year we were issued with a number of visitor permits you could use for any visitors.

Wedgknock Green is used by quite a large number of NHS staff for parking in the day currently, which must have an impact on residents with no driveway trying to park, although at night time, there is lots of space. I understand there will be around 20 parking bays for residents here, but given the number of residents in the surrounding streets without drives, this does not seem sufficient. I would like this number to be increased, which would have the knock on effect of causing the hospital to make sure that it has sufficient parking for all staff. The current 30 minute waiting areas on Peel Road, are nearly always empty, as 30 minutes is not long enough for anyone to go to the hospital for an appointment, including waiting time.

I also understand that there will still be some residents parking on Cape Road, between Oken Road and Deerpark Drive. As someone who uses this road each morning and evening to drive to work in Coventry, any parked cars here cause a lot of obstruction to the flow of traffic, which includes local buses and lorries. I would like to see this stretch of road to be no waiting/parking at any time. It is particularly difficult to see the traffic coming down Cape

Road when turning out right from Deerpark Drive onto Cape Road to go north, as there are often parked cars on the right which obstruct your view. If parking is going to be allowed on this stretch of Cape Road, it should take this into account and not be close to the Deerpark Drive at all.

I do hope that you will take these concerns into account when finalising your plans for parking restrictions in this area.

2)

I am in support of the proposed parking restrictions for Wedgnock Green,

3)

I am generally in favour of the proposed parking scheme measures. At number xx Newburgh Crescent it's very difficult to get on/off the driveway when there is someone parked opposite.

Might I suggest though, making it single yellows rather than double on our street? With a time limit 1 to 2 hours?

This would make it easier for elderly relatives and friends to drop by and visit, collect and drop off children, grand children. It would prevent people parking all day which is the main problem with provision on our street.

It would give delivery drivers some access to properties.

It would also provide some traffic calming to slow the speed of vehicles as I fear if it's a clear run, for the cars that already speed down the street, the parked cars make it less easy for them to do so. It's surprisingly quite a busy road as people use it as part of a cut through across the town when it's busy. From Coventry Road to Saltisford for instance.

May I also request that resident's permits are free and include visitors passes/permits too.

I hope you'll consider my suggestions and look forward to hearing more about the scheme.

4)

Proposed Waiting Restrictions / Residents' Parking Scheme Wedgnock Green and Surrounding Area, Warwick Warwick CPE Variation 6 TR\11124 - 37

Thank you for your letter outlining the councils plans for parking on Cape Rd and surrounding area.

I have viewed the plan and fully support the proposal with no objections.

The only addition I would like to add is for wooden posts to be placed in the grass verges that run alongside Cape Rd. Continuous parking on these grass verges is a serious hazard, not only damaging the verge, but making reversing off our driveway into a fast flow of traffic dangerous due to the restricted vision.

I have already made a request for the above - PEM reference No. 507439, but as of today received no reply.

5)

Warwick District CPE variation 6 /Deerpark Drive/Wedgnock Green/Cape Road.

With reference to the above scheme and additionally to objections we recently presented please view the two attached Pictures.

The pictures were taken on Monday 23rd March around 10am. I monitored this over the following days and can confirm no additional vehicles were seen parking.

Obviously no issues with parking which is odd considering most residents are home due to the Covid-19 regulations which require people to stay home.

All vehicles in the pictures are those belonging to residents and this is representative of weekend parking.

Therefore it is obvious that residents do not cause this problem yet will be financially penalised and possible inconvenienced.

NHS staff have been blamed for the parking issues but I am confident that the stay at home policy highlights that other workers are the main culprits as NHS heroes are still working!

Solve the problem of inconsiderate workers parking in residential streets.

Do not impose extra burdens on hard working residents.

We look forward to your response to our objections.





6)

As a resident of Deerpark Drive I'm writing to show my overwhelming support in favour of the parking restrictions proposed in and around our street. Driveways are blocked, causing home owners great difficulty in coming and going from their own homes. Footpaths obstructed with no regard for the elderly, disabled or young families. The general increase in footfall in the area causing other forms of anti social behaviour such as littering.

Please let's get this done!

7)

As you can see by the address below we live on Cape Road in the affected areas so I can only really comment on the area around our house.

On a normal work day, most of the cars that park on Cape Road (between Dear Park & Oken Road) and directly outside our house (sometimes blocking the our drive) have Warwickshire County Council Staff Parking Permits displayed in their windscreens. Watching the drivers getting out most have lanyards with WCC ID passes. Simple evidence shows that the majority of the parking problems in the area are caused by the people and their work colleagues that work for the WCC and more than likely the Highways department!

The proposed limited waiting / Permit Parking area along the east side of Cape Road is nearly impossible, only about 3 or 4 of the houses along this stretch of road "do not" have off street parking and dropped kerbs. Parking is very limited already.

Parking is available on the west side, but most park on the very wide pavement to ease the flow of traffic along the road. There is still plenty of room on the pavement for mobility scooters etc to pass when cars are parked. So the idea of double yellows is a good idea as long as you allow permit parking on the pavement as you have done in the surrounding roads.

Parking Permits for our visitors that stop for more than 30 mins, Are they free or do our visitors have to pay to parker there car? None of this is mentioned!

Warwick District Council, in there "Residential Design Guide" May 2018, clearly state that *"Existing front gardens, should be protected from becoming hardstanding for vehicle parking areas"*. The proposal to remove all, or nearly all, of the on street parking goes against the Planning Guidelines and will force property owners to convert their gardens to hard surfaces for parking. This is something I unfortunately will have to look into.

The traffic is worse than ever at the moment due to the over running works on Birmingham Road. So any analysis should be does after these works are complete and the traffic has settled down.

If you would like to discuss any of my comments, please contact me on the number below.

8)

We live at xx Wedgnock Green and we are writing to offer our support and happiness at the proposal for Wedgnock Green and surrounding roads.

As for justification of our support; our house we often get inconsiderate parking, berate drivers and hostilities when a hospital or local worker is requested to move their car. At times we have found difficulty in parking our car in our drive due to this. Twice last year we have not been able to drive out and at least ten times we have seen a car parked outside our house almost all night. I previously mentioned before that this was possibly taking away revenue from the hospital carpark as well as being a nuisance to us.

All in all we are happy for this scheme and would happily provide counter arguments should anyone disagree with this!

9)

I strongly object to the proposal to introduce parking restrictions to Oken Road which will ultimately penalise friends and relatives visiting this street at any time, when the real problem is almost exclusively council employees parking in this area during normal office hours.

The council should grasp the nettle and encourage their staff to find other modes of transport to travel to work.

10)

With regard to the proposed scheme from the "statement-of-reasons.pdf" Warwickshire County Council Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 The Warwickshire County Council (District of Warwick) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Waiting Restrictions, On-Street Parking Places and Residents' Parking) (Consolidation) (Variation No. 6) Order 2020 Wedgnock Green, Oken Road, Cape Road, Deerpark Drive, Newburgh Crescent—No Waiting at any Time. It is proposed to introduce "no waiting" at any time restrictions for the extents of the junction of Wedgnock Green. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic, and ensuring free flow of traffic. Objections: 1. Residents have NOT caused this current issue. Workers leave their vehicles during the day Monday to Friday, leave them in an inconsiderate manner with little regard for road traffic regulations or effects on residents. There is no issue on weekends or school holidays when the majority of residents are home. I have lived here since 1982 and this problem has appeared in the last couple of years. We are in effect being penalized for other persons actions. 2. The proposed plan reduces available parking bays within view of our home address. Our property is severely disadvantaged due our location. Our frontages are barely deep enough to accommodate a vehicle. We currently use pavements and an area around a small green space. The area around green space is NOT shown as parking in the plan and I estimate at least six spaces will disappear near our address. We would have two options. Park in a bay used by a neighbour (on a first come first served basis!) Park further away within the W7 permit zone. We have very good relations with our neighbours and do not wish to upset anyone by parking outside their property. 3. We note that there are limited resident bays proposed around Wedgnock Green. If this area is to become a residents permit area the number of unrestricted bays should be reduced to a minimum, ensuring residents are able to park within a the W7 zone. If there are no available residents or unrestricted bays where would we park? 4. We have concerns over security of ourselves and vehicles. Our Daughter returns home late from work some evenings due to her shift pattern and the street lights go off well before her return. She suffers from severe anxiety attacks and this could exacerbate her condition . Page 1 She is (as we are) very concerned over her personal safety. There have been numerous instances of lone females being followed recently in the area. Is fair to expose her or anyone else to such heightened risks? 5. My partner is self employed and owns a long wheel base van. He currently parks directly opposite our property. The plan shows that this space will be disappearing. Due to the length of the vehicle he will occupy two bays and may cause other residents to complain. Due to the fact that his vehicle has been broken into we now have CCTV covering it whilst parked. If he had to park in another location this security would disappear. Furthermore he removes all valuable tools overnight and loads these in the morning before commencing work. Some of the equipment is large and heavy. Parking within a reasonable distance allows him to continue his business. He would NOT be able to continue in business if he is expected to park away. It would add extra time and stress to his working day. 6. Financial implications We note that there are proposals to increase the price of the permit to £80 pa per vehicle. From the start of this year our costs have increased significantly. Both household and business costs have shown large

increases, whilst our combined incomes have failed to meet the increases. I would in effect work one week of my part time job to cover an £80 permit! Why are we now expected to pay a fee per vehicle with no guarantee of finding a space locally? We write this as the implications around Covid 19 add to the uncertainty for household incomes. Even at this early stage it is highly likely that my partner will be impacted. His self employment status affords him no right to any financial support and the impact on my work security is not clear.

7. The statement of reasons sets out : “avoiding danger to persons or traffic, and ensuring free flow of traffic” We do not believe that introducing “no waiting” at any time and permit parking will achieve this outcome. We feel that many of the people leaving vehicles immediately in the vicinity of our house work for the council and NHS. Due to lack of provision or planning with regard to workers arriving by car both the council and NHS have caused this problem. The solution lies in providing provisions for workers arriving by car or ensuring workers adopt alternative modes of transport ensuring cars are not left in residential streets during working hours. The roads surrounding our area were never intended to cope with the levels of vehicles when the estate was conceived 100 years ago. Traffic Chaos in the Warwick area often results in queues on Cape Road and surrounding roads as traffic volume increase. Parked vehicles on Cape Road from the junction of Oken Road to Deerpark Drive often cause hindrance to traffic flows. Your plan does nothing to avoid this aspect and will fail to “ensure free flowing Traffic”. We object to the plan in the current form as we do not think your objectives will be met. At the same time certain residents will be impacted disproportionately in a negative way. We believe the cause of the problem should be addressed. We also think it would be constructive to explore the possibilities of a one way system and 20 MPH zone in the area of Deerpark Drive, Newburgh Crescent, Wedgnock Green.

11)

I am concerned about road safety on Newburgh Crescent if these plans go ahead. Already to many drivers go to fast on this narrow road .if parking is restricted it will lead to more even more speeding and danger to residents . Road bumps will be needed to reduce this situation or the plans need to be reconsidered .Further residents having to pay £25 for a parking badge is unfair as they are parking where they live and this has always been free .it discriminates against those residents who cannot afford to have a car port .

Please let me know how the issues I have raised are to be addressed.

12)

I am a resident in Deerpark drive I fully support the restrictions as I am getting fed up with people parking outside my house in such a way that pedestrians sometimes having to go in the road to get back on the path many of them with young children,we have alot of drivers pass down this road who think it's ok to use it as a race track and that is dangerous for the people who have to walk on the road because of the cars that dont park close to the kirb then I see people looking towards my house shaking there heads thinking it's someone at my house,I am not the only one that feels this way,and also when people pull up to park sometimes I have to say to them can u park properly please or say would you kindly find somewhere else to park as I'm having work done hear the odd few are ok but most of them get aggressive towards me and insult me,please please do something about the parking in

the area it cannot go on like this so many residents have had enough but are too afraid to say so. thank you

13)

I am a resident of Newburgh Crescent and fully support the proposals suggested. I have a young child and am about to give birth to my second. I will be a stay at home mum for a while. We also have a dog. It is getting increasingly awkward and dangerous going out for a walk with both the pushchair and dog as I'm constantly having to walk in the road due to inconsiderate parking taking up most of the pavement. These plans would eradicate this issue. It is also very difficult if I have any visitors during the day as there is nowhere for them to park. The green at the top of our road is pretty much full by almost 7/7.30am during the week. My husband walks our dog around this time and says that people are parking up so early and leaving their engines running for lengths of time just to secure a parking space. This is obviously not great for the environment either. I've lived on the Crescent for nearly 12 years now and have definitely noticed the situation getting worse and worse.

I just hope there is enough support to allow the plans to go ahead.

14)

I am writing to you to give my support for the proposed parking changes for Wedgenock Green and the surrounding roads

Being a resident of Deerpark Drive with no driveway, I have found that parking near my property is often hard due to non-residents vehicles often being parked on the pavement outside my property. This has caused quite a bit of inconvenience, especially as myself and my partner have recently moved in and are often having to carry heavy/large items to and from the property

Despite this support, I implore the council to work with the hospitals and other local business to ensure adequate transport and parking provisions are made to alleviate the problem parking and to ensure that the problem is solved rather than moved

Many thanks for your work serving our community,

15)

Further to the letter dated 28 February 2020 and a request for support or objections to the proposed scheme, please see pictures below taken outside and opposite our house (37 Newburgh Crescent) last week and previous. These images are not extraordinary for weekday parking in the road by non-residents (hospital and council workers), even though they are ridiculous from an access / egress perspective not only for residents but for pedestrians and emergency vehicles. People are having to walk in the road as pavements are blocked, including those with pushchairs or mobility aids. My husband has a visual impairment and frequently has to walk in the road due to the poor parking. This is also hazardous as despite the parking situation, there are many drivers who think that our road is a race track - despite it being narrow and cars parked everywhere.

There is frequently trouble backing off the drive and having to go backwards and forwards as someone's parked right behind our car on the road. We have also had people drive on and off our drive to turn around as they can't be bothered to drive round the block. Is this not trespassing?

We have taken numerous photos and have been in correspondence with John Holland, our local PCSO Peter Groom and to others at the council over the years as this has got worse over recent times. When I first moved in, there was nothing like the poor parking there is now.....

We have been lobbying to get the parking situation resolved for several years now and are pleased it is finally being taken notice of. Therefore please consider this e mail of whole hearted support for the scheme - and not before time!











16)

I received your letter dated 28 February Re: Warwick District CPE Variation 6.

I wish to register an objection to the apparent Proposed Limited Waiting zone on the Wedgenock Green traffic scheme outside number xx Deerpark Drive as this would be straight across my driveway restricting access to the road.

I can only think this is a mistake.

<https://wccroadsafetyengineering.files.wordpress.com/2020/03/wedgenock-green-warwick.pdf>

Can you acknowledge this objection and assure me it is being reviewed please?

17)

To whom it may concern,

We are fully in support of the parking proposals. Measures such as those proposed are long overdue.

18)

I am resident at xx Newburgh Crescent, and I would like to object to the proposal on safety grounds.

Currently, unrestricted parking means cars can be parked on the road / pavements effectively narrowing the road. This has the effect of slowing down those muppets who wish to drive fast on this road (over 30mph) meaning children and other pedestrians / road users are at less risk from collision. As per its name, Newburgh Crescent is a curved road, meaning that speeding cars are hard to see until it's too late. Even driving on / off the hardstanding is sometime tricky when encountering some idiot racing down the empty road.

19)

Hello, further to the letter outlining the consultation on parking restrictions effecting Newburgh Crescent Warwick.

We would like to express our support for parking restrictions on Newburgh Crescent and the surrounding streets.

Firstly I could not locate the proposals and plans on the website mentioned in the letter, not sure if you could check out if they have been uploaded yet?

We have lived here for 19 years and for the following reasons we support the plans:-

Newburgh Crescent is very narrow road and people who work at the hospital and in the town use our road and the surrounding streets to park for long periods of time, often very badly.

On occasions we struggle to drive out of our estate for badly parked cars. We once witnessed an ambulance who could not get through - what hope would a fire engine have?

People have no thought for the residents - we once had someone visiting the hospital park over our drive blocking our cars in and her reason for this action "parking round here is a nightmare "!!

We have three young children who we have to get to school on time and because of inconsiderate people, with often bad attitudes (if challenged) we find driving from my home very stressful . Accidents with parked cars or cars coming out of junctions with poor visibility is just waiting to happen.

We would welcome the restrictions which we feel would benefit our physically being able to drive our young family safely from our home on a daily basis and also our mental health in doing so.

We very much hope that the restrictions come into place.

20)


I hereby agree to the proposals for Deerpark Drive Warwick

21)

Good morning.

I have just received a letter regarding parking restrictions on millers road Warwick.. having look on the website millers road is not listed. Can you please express the proposed plans to my parking? If I'm receiving a letter 1 day before the objection period ends then I would like to receive information regarding this.

Parking is extremely tight already in this area and with hospital workers parking we struggle to park outside our own house. If the council are willing to pay for kerb removal then I will be ok with it. Having 2 small children I request that I'm able to park outside my own hose.



Rory O'Connor
Traffic & Road Safety
PO Box 43 Shire Hall
Warwick CV34 4SX

16 March 2020

Dear Mr O'Connor

Re: Changes to parking restrictions in Wedgnoek Green, Newburgh Crescent and nearby streets

Thank you for drawing our attention to the consultation on Warwick District CPE Variation 6. I agree that the parking arrangements in these streets need to be improved, for the benefit of the community, and I appreciate the work done so far. However, there are aspects of the proposed scheme that I am very concerned about and wish to challenge.

In brief, these are the modifications that I would like to see made, to resolve problems with the scheme as described:

1. A total of **40** parking bays on Wedgnoek Green to be allocated for "30 minute wait & permit holders". This would leave in excess of 20 unrestricted parking bays.
2. Permit holder parking on **one side** of Newburgh Crescent, exactly as already established in Peel Road, which has the same width of carriageway.
3. Traffic calming measures in Newburgh Crescent, to mitigate the risk to pedestrians from the increased speed of traffic in this road.

Rationale

I understand that the drivers for this scheme are as follows:

- Workers from local organisations (NHS, WCC, factories) park all day in some areas, making it hard for residents and their visitors to find spaces.
- Parking on pavements causes obstruction for pedestrians, making it less safe, especially for older people and those with disabilities.
- Inconsiderate parking *on both sides* of the roads sometimes causes obstruction for large vehicles, including emergency vehicles.

Introducing parking restrictions in Wedgnoek Green alone will simply *move* the problem of workers' parking, exacerbating the problems in Newburgh Crescent and Deerpark Drive. However, a solution to these problems needs to find a balance between the needs of pedestrians and those of residents who own cars. The proposals as they stand do not achieve the right balance, in my view. The main issues arise from the "No Waiting" restriction for both sides of Newburgh Crescent and Wedgnoek Green.

- **Inadequate parking capacity:** In Newburgh Crescent and Wedgnock Green there are about 24 houses that do not at present have a driveway. A number of other houses have space for one car, but actually use **two** or more cars (not an unreasonable position for families with two or more working adults, given poor public transport links). But in the proposed scheme, only about 20 spaces (parking bays) have been allocated for residents' parking for these two roads together. Some 46 spaces on Wedgnock Green remain available for all-day workers' parking.
 - It appears that there is a significant shortfall for residents' cars, and that no accommodation has been made for their families, friends, tradespeople and other visitors.
 - Some pavement parking for residents has been allowed in Deerpark Drive, where the walkway is wider. But this is not enough to cater for any overflow from the other streets.
- **Distance:** I understand that it is considered reasonable for residents and their family and friends to walk from the Wedgnock Green parking bays (even if any are available) to the far end of Newburgh Crescent. This is not the case, especially for those drivers and their passengers who may be older or have a disability or have infants and young children. The exemption for loading and unloading does not resolve this, and a more accessible solution is needed.
- **Excess speed:** Even now, drivers use Newburgh Crescent as a "rat run" between Millers Road and Cape Road. Some of these cars are driven at dangerously high speed, and the only thing that impedes this excessive speed is the congested parking. If the parking is improved, then there will be a need for traffic calming measures, to protect the very pedestrians and residents whose needs are being addressed by the proposed changes, including young children.

Proposed modifications

In view of these shortcomings, I would like to make three suggestions :

1. A total of 40 spaces on Wedgnock Green to be allocated for permit holders. This would leave in excess of 20 unrestricted parking bays. This seems a more appropriate balance, being $\frac{2}{3}$ for residents and visitors, and $\frac{1}{3}$ for other users.
2. Permit holder parking on one side of Newburgh Crescent
 - a. Although the carriageway and pavement here are narrow, they are no different from those in Peel Road, which already has this arrangement.
 - b. I suggest that half-on-pavement parking would be a good compromise here, given that pavement parking (for permit holders) is deemed acceptable in Deerpark Drive.
 - c. This arrangement will ensure that one pavement will always be unencumbered, providing safety for vulnerable pedestrians.
 - d. Not only would this option provide some accessible parking for those without driveways, or with more than one car, it would also enable residents to have services (plumber, decorator, etc) to their homes when needed.

3. Traffic calming measures in Newburgh Crescent, to reduce danger from speeding drivers. I am conscious that such measures will incur a cost, but the risk to pedestrians and residents is too great to disregard. If one-side parking is agreed (see above), this might be enough to discourage poor driving behaviour, or at least to ensure it doesn't become worse than at present.

Looking at your website, I see that a previous consultation took place in February 2019, and that you intended "writing to residents" about this. I have to tell you that we received nothing from you last year, and therefore did not have the opportunity to respond. The last time we had chance to give our views was several years ago. If we had been included in the (informal) consultation in 2019, we would have given the above feedback at that stage.

I am conscious that some of the modifications I have suggested require further detailed discussion. I have tried to limit this response to the main points, but I will be pleased to discuss the issue with you. My email address and telephone number are given above.

Finally, may I wish you and your colleagues well as you try to keep healthy and adjust to the unimagined difficulties we all now face.


Kind regards

A blacked-out rectangular area, likely redacting a signature or name.A blacked-out rectangular area, likely redacting contact information such as an email address or phone number.

[REDACTED]

19th March 2020

Rory O'Connor
Traffic and Road Safety
PO Box 43 Shire Hall
Warwick
CV34 4SX



Dear Sir,

RE: Warwick District CPE Variation 6

With regard to the proposed scheme from the "statement-of-reasons.pdf"

Warwickshire County Council Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 The Warwickshire County Council (District of Warwick) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Waiting Restrictions, On-Street Parking Places and Residents' Parking) (Consolidation) (Variation No. 6) Order 2020 Wedgnoek Green, Oken Road, Cape Road, Deepark Drive, Newburgh Crescent - No Waiting at any Time. It is proposed to introduce "no waiting" at any time restrictions for the extents of the junction of Wedgnoek Green. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic, and ensuring free flow of traffic.

Objections:

1. Residents have NOT caused this current issue.

Workers leave their vehicles during the day Monday to Friday, leave them in an inconsiderate manner with little regard for road traffic regulations or effects on residents. There is no issue on weekends or school holidays when the majority of residents are home. I have lived here since 1982 and this problem has appeared in the last couple of years.

We are in effect being penalized for other persons actions.

2. The proposed plan reduces available parking bays within view of our home address. Our property is severely disadvantaged due our location. Our frontages are barely deep enough to accommodate a vehicle. We currently use pavements and an area around a small green space. The area around green space is NOT shown as parking in the plan and I estimate at least six spaces will disappear near our address.

We would have two options. Park in a bay used by a neighbour (on a first come first served basis!) Park further away within the W7 permit zone. We have very good relations with our neighbours and do not wish to upset anyone by parking outside their property.

3. We note that there are limited resident bays proposed around Wedgnoek Green. If this area is to become a residents permit area the number of unrestricted bays should be reduced to a minimum, ensuring residents are able to park within a the W7 zone. If there are no available residents or unrestricted bays where would we park?

4. We have concerns over security of ourselves and vehicles. Our Daughter returns home late from work some evenings due to her shift pattern and the street lights go off well before her return. She suffers from severe anxiety attacks and this could exacerbate her condition .

She is (as we are) very concerned over her personal safety. There have been numerous instances of lone females being followed recently in the area. Is fair to expose her or anyone else to such heightened risks?

5. My partner is self employed and owns a long wheel base van. He currently parks directly opposite our property. The plan shows that this space will be disappearing. Due to the length of the vehicle he will occupy two bays and may cause other residents to complain. Due to the fact that his vehicle has been broken into we now have CCTV covering it whilst parked. If he had to park in another location this security would disappear. Furthermore he removes all valuable tools overnight and loads these in the morning before commencing work. Some of the equipment is large and heavy. Parking within a reasonable distance allows him to continue his business. He would NOT be able to continue in business if he is expected to park away. It would add extra time and stress to his working day.

6. Financial implications

We note that there are proposals to increase the price of the permit to £80 pa per vehicle. From the start of this year our costs have increased significantly. Both household and business costs have shown large increases, whilst our combined incomes have failed to meet the increases. I would in effect work one week of my part time job to cover an £80 permit! Why are we now expected to pay a fee per vehicle with no guarantee of finding a space locally?

We write this as the implications around Covid 19 add to the uncertainty for household incomes. Even at this early stage it is highly likely that my partner will be impacted. His self employment status affords him no right to any financial support and the impact on my work security is not clear.

7. The statement of reasons sets out :

"avoiding danger to persons or traffic, and ensuring free flow of traffic"

We do not believe that introducing "no waiting" at any time and permit parking will achieve this outcome. We feel that many of the people leaving vehicles immediately in the vicinity of our house work for the council and NHS. Due to lack of provision or planning with regard to workers arriving by car both the council and NHS have caused this problem. The solution lies in providing provisions for workers arriving by car or ensuring workers adopt alternative modes of transport ensuring cars are not left in residential streets during working hours.

The roads surrounding our area were never intended to cope with the levels of vehicles when the estate was conceived 100 years ago. Traffic Chaos in the Warwick area often results in queues on Cape Road and surrounding roads as traffic volume increase. Parked vehicles on Cape Road from the junction of Oken Road to Deerpark Drive often cause hindrance to traffic flows. Your plan does nothing to avoid this aspect and will fail to "ensure free flowing Traffic".

We object to the plan in the current form as we do not think your objectives will be met. At the same time certain residents will be impacted disproportionately in a negative way. We believe the cause of the problem should be addressed. We also think it would be constructive to explore the possibilities of a one way system and 20 MPH zone in the area of Deerpark Drive, Newburgh Crescent, Wedgnock Green.

Yours faithfully.

The signature and address are redacted with black ink. The signature appears to be a single line, and the address consists of two lines of text.

Warwick District ~~_____~~
CPE Variation 6 Warwick ~~_____~~

5. 3. 20

Dear Sirs

I would like to register my full support for the proposed parking scheme for Wedgnock Green and surrounding areas.

It was so nice to meet you both in person, and thank you for your time. Hopefully, between us we will put an end to this horrendous situation of wilfully hoisted parking.
Thank you both.

Yours Faithfully,
~~_____~~

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| RECEIVED 18 MAR 2020 | |
| COMMUNITIES GROUP | |
| LEADERSHIP TEAM | |
| GROUP | |

Rory O'Connor
Traffic and Road Safety
PO Box 43 Shire Hall
Warwick
CV34 4SX

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Re: Warwick District CPE Variation 6

Dear Mr O'Connor

In response to your unsigned letter this is my third time writing on this subject, I have never had a reply yet. Why ask for replies to your letters if you won't respond to them

I am live in carer for my 90yr old disabled mother.

My car is her only transport, kept on road by her attendance allowance
Her last remaining pleasure to go a ride in the car around the local lanes

It takes her 8-10 minutes and considerable effort to get to the car if it is parked as close as possible, outside the house on this side of the road which is less than 50yds, and a further 2 minutes with the door wide open to get in with my assistance. If it is further away she can't get to it making her a prisoner in her own home

She has Heart failure, breathing difficulty, chronic arthritis, crumbling spine and skin cancer, requiring bi-weekly visits of district nurses (where will they park?) along with other problems which come with being 90 years old which result in her only being able to walk very short distances using 2 walking sticks with frequent rests to recover her breath, all a matter of medical record

As she is a Blue Badge holder we applied for disabled parking bay but we were refused on the grounds the road is too narrow

We looked into having a dropped kerb which costs a minimum of £1000. As she only gets her pension and attendance allowance and I only get carers allowance not even our joint income affords this

Your plan to put double yellow lines down both sides of Newburgh Crescent takes away a disabled person's only transport and her only pleasure, making her life worse than it already is. I believe this is victimisation of a disabled person. Surely disabled tenants have rights.

I want to know what you are going to do to avoid this reprehensible action

Looking forward to your immediate reply

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Telephone: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

WARWICK

[REDACTED]

13th March 2020

Rory O'Connor.
Traffic and Road Safety,
Warwickshire County Council,
P.O. Box 43,
Shire Hall,
WARWICK

| | |
|-------------------|-------------|
| RECEIVED | 16 MAR 2020 |
| COMMUNITIES GROUP | |

Dear Mr. O'Connor

RE:- PARKING RESTRICTIONS - CAPE ROAD WARWICK

Thank you for your letter dated 28th February. Having viewed the proposals at Shire Hall last Friday we write to offer our support. We understand that any consequent pavement parking on the west side of Cape Road will become unlawful by virtue of the proposed new parking regulations.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Wharf Street.Corespondence.Redacted

1)

With reference to the proposal above and specifically with regard to parking restrictions in Wharf st. I would like to say thank you for this long overdue proposal. I live at xx wharf st and have been plagued by inconsiderate drivers parking outside the house and half way across my drive. I have had one accident coming off my driver due to not having any visibility to oncoming traffic due to vehicles blocking any view and other road users speeding and not being able to see me.

I also have a drop kerb that only covers half the drive and drivers constantly park up to the edge of the drop kerb restricting my access. As an example if I'm approaching wharf st from under the railway bridge and a car is parked up-to the drop kerb I have no option but to reverse onto the drive. This is ok during quiet times but in rush hour on a number of occasion i have nearly been hit from behind by speeding drivers.

I wholeheartedly support this initiative which will reduce traffic, poor parking reduce risk of accidents and improve traffic flow in what is a residential street and would be grateful if the yellow lines can be painted up-to the drop kerb at number xx wharf st.

Thanks for making my day today with the letter through our door.

2)

Whilst the councils proposals to paint double yellow line in Wharf Street as per the plans outlined is an excellent idea my concern it that it will only move the parking problem further up the road.

I live at number xx and there is often cars parked on both sides of the road sometimes blocking the disabled dropped curb and on occasions parked in such a way that it makes it difficult for lorries and buses to get through. I personally would like the scheme extended so the double lines run the complete length of the street adjacent to Campriano Drive.

Regards

3)

I'm writing to express my support for the proposed parking restrictions to be implemented on Wharf Street in Warwick. I live in at xx Wharf Street and the double yellow line will ensure that access to my driveway is not impeded by other vehicles.

In addition, I believe that the proposed changes will greatly improve the overall access along the street and prevent past incidents where vehicles have had difficulty passing due to parked vehicles. This has previously been a particular problem when events have taken place at St Nicholas Park.

4)

My name is xxxxxxxxxxxx, I live in xx Wharf Street, Warwick. Yesterday, I received by post a letter from the Council about consultation for parking restrictions.

As requested in the letter, below my suggestions.

I agree there is need to put some restrictions in order to ensure free flow of traffic. However, I personally find too drastic the proposal of "no waiting at any time" in Wharf Street. I

personally think that a restriction "No Waiting Monday – Saturday 8am-6pm" would be more appropriate. This because the problems of too many cars parked in the street are mainly in the day time (several people park there and then go to take the train). In the evenings the road is much more empty. Only few spaces are occupied by people that live in the area, which is good to me.

5)

We have received your communication with regards the changes to parking restrictions which will affect the street we live on, Wharf Street.

Having looked at the proposed parking plans online, I see that you are to implement double yellow lines from the Railway end of Wharf Street up to the turning onto Cliffe Way.

I have to say that as much as I welcome the proposals, at this time I will have to raise an **objection** as all the double yellow lines will do is move the parking problem further down Wharf Street.

Every morning you can see cars going up and down Wharf Street looking for a space where they can park their car for the day, usually at the residents of Wharf Street expense. All of these cars tend to be for people working at the Fiat garage, people not wanting to pay for parking at Warwick Station and most commonly Warwick Hospital Staff where they park on Wharf Street, Cliffe Way, Nelson Lane and any other road they can find.

Along wharf street we are currently experiencing more and more cars starting to park on the far side of the road if there are no spaces available which is creating problems in that sometimes residents are unable to reverse out of their own driveways as the cars are effectively blocking them in.

One option would be to extend your proposals for double yellow lines to include the whole of the far side of the road on Wharf Street (hence preventing a car slalom course when cars are parked on both sides) and maybe introduce parking permits for the street.

Another issue on Wharf Street is many houses have white T-lines that cover the dropped curb aspect of the street, yet we still have cars on a daily basis who park right across the T-lines. Maybe you could provide the residents with a communal clamp so we can point out the issue to them, obviously we wouldn't charge them to remove the clamp but it will teach them a valuable lesson!

Wharf Street does feel like a forgotten street in the council's plans. It was not that long ago when the road was to be re-tarmac'd... but shortly before it was due to happen it was cancelled because apparently Wharf Street is made of the wrong tarmac!!

On Nelson Lane there is currently space where companies want to build houses but the plans are always refused on traffic grounds. Why don't you open up this space and convert it to a temporary car park while the council find alternative solutions.

Like I say, if you were to put double yellow lines the whole length of the far side of Wharf Street then you might get a lot more support but at the present time, until you come up with a solution that will not just simply push all the parking problems further up the street then we would **object** to the proposal.

6)

Existing parking issues

Parking along Wharf Street (top and bottom of) & Cliffe Way is already an issue due to:

- Visitors to Warwick hospital (when parking down Nelson Lane is busy)
- Visitors to Evolation Yoga (no parking for customers)
- Employees of Warwickshire Napton House (housing for adults with learning disabilities)
- Employees of the Fiat garage
- Employees of Coten End School
- Employees of the Storage companies by the bridge and employees of John Barber leaving personal vehicles as they pick up their work vans
- People using the train that can't park on Broad Street due to the permit system in place

Current Impact

- Cars already park on the side of the road opposite residents essentially creating a chicane at times and causing residents issues accessing and exiting driveways

Risks

- To Pedestrians; school children and homeowners
- Speeding - Wharf Street is already seen as a "short cut" rather than Emscote Road, with motorists clearly exceeding the 30mph speed limit
- This is a popular road for schoolchildren going to Coten End – it's already dangerous given the current parking situation, plus volume and speed of traffic

Proposed works

Q) Can you confirm what the objectives of the proposed plans are?

Q) What problem is it trying to solve?

Q) Do you have an impact assessment on proposed plans you can share?

Impact on proposed works

- This will only exacerbate existing issues - pushing the problem further up Wharf Street

Possible solutions for consideration

- Parking permits for Wharf Street residents
- Double yellow lines on the side of the road opposite properties

- Pressure businesses to provide ample parking for their own employees and customers

Key issue

- Given Wharf Street and Cliffe Way's proximity to schools; hospitals and businesses there isn't enough space to accommodate parking demand – the question is how we manage this safely now and in the future for both pedestrians and motorists – as such the plans need reviewing.

7)

I live at xxWharf street and would like to submit comments about the proposed changes to parking on Wharf Street.

Although the proposed changes will address the issue of parking around the junction of Wharf St and Cliffe way and under the railway bridge, it seems likely that the cars that park there regularly will find alternative parking close by.

My concern is that people will start to park on Wharf street opposite the houses that run from the junction of Cliffe way and Nelson lane. This has already started to happen albeit infrequently, but the proposed changes are almost guaranteed to ensure that this becomes daily common practice for people looking to park their cars.

My objection to this is twofold, people parking opposite the houses would make accessing and leaving the driveways somewhere between impossible and extremely difficult, depending on where the cars are parked. Cars parked on both sides of the road also makes navigating traffic approaching from the opposite direction difficult, on occasion dangerous. The volume of traffic on Wharf street during the week is significant.

My request or suggestion is that the proposed double yellow lines be extended all the way along Wharf street, on the opposite side from the houses that run between the junction of Cliffe Way and Nelson lane. If this cannot be done then I object to the proposed changes on the grounds that the change is likely to have material and negative consequence on the people who live on Wharf street.

8)

Thank you for sending us the letter ref changes to parking . My partner xxxx has submitted his thoughts , I wanted to add a couple of additional comments please .

I have started to work at home in the last year or so now , I have noticed a vast amount of changes to the traffic on Wharf street . The parking is becoming intense and becoming a aggressive road as they speed down the road very fast I'm talking 40 mph plus . Cars are beeping at each other and exchanging hand gestures and bad language . Sometimes they miss our parked cars by mm . I have enclosed some of the parking photos from junctions and parked cars on the other side of the street .

In addition I watch the recycling lorry struggle on Fridays when cars are parked on the other side of the road as very little room to pass , this also continues with new cars being delivered to the Fiat garage which travel on a large lorry . Additional large lorries come down this road also to deliver supplies to Storage unit next to the bridge . Tree surgeons , builders etc .I feel that we are always on the tail end of issues , it's like a no Mans road . I would like to think that residents can park their own cars near their homes especially after recent break ins we suffered , 11 in total . I would like to think possible residents parking permits and double

yellow lines on the other side of our homes on Wharf street .

I was trying to gain access to our drive this week , it took 14 point turn as the access was blocked by parked cars . Would really value your help for us to be looked after , especially after the new apartments that are being built on Wharf street which have no parking as part of the sale and excessive cars from hospital staff , yoga centre etc













10)

In response to your letter dated 28 Feb, I'd like to formally object to the proposed parking restrictions on Wharf Street.

There are a number of reasons for this that include:

- The proposal is not solving the problem, you are just moving it further down the street
- No impact assessment has been shared or objective for the proposed proposal
- The road is used as a cut through and cars just speed down it - what is being done to prevent this?
- What other options were considered and why were they not put forward in the proposal

As I say the proposed restrictions do not seem to be solving the problem and as a resident of Wharf Street I am deeply concerned about this proposal.

11)

As a resident of Wharf Street, I am writing to stress my concerns over the proposed parking restrictions. Whilst I agree there is an issue by the fiat garage and under the bridge, and double yellow lines will resolve this, it will only serve to push the parking problems further along to the residential end of the street, where parking is already at a premium. The majority of the homes have turned their gardens into off street parking and paid to have the

kerbs dropped. With cars already parking where they can by undropped kerbs it makes reversing off our drives quite difficult at the best of times. I foresee without double yellow lines on the opposite side of the road, all the current cars that park at the far end by the garage will park opposite the housing thus making it impossible to get on or off our own drives.

When the housing was built and a path put on that side of the road, I believe parking bays and yellow lines were requested, but declined as the street would not be monitored by a traffic warden. Therefore would it be more prudent to give the residents parking permits for street parking as required, but that would still need reinforcing by a patrol.

Yours sincerely

11)

Your ref - Wharf Street - No Waiting at Anytime i. West side, from its junction with Cliffe Way, northwards for 18 metres

ii. West side, from its junction with Cliffe Way, northwards for 20 metres

iii. West side, from a point 32 metres south of its junction with Highlands Close, southwards for 37 metres

iv. East side, from a point 150 metres north of its junction with Broad Street, northwards for 77 metres

These geographical descriptions appear nonsense,

Item i and ii have restrictions that would be in the same place.

Am I right in thinking that this should say ' At the junction of Wharf St & Cliffe Way the parking restriction will extend westwards up Cliffe way on either side of the road'

Item iii – Wharf Street has no junction with Highlands Close at all.

So there cannot be a restriction ' south of Wharf Street junction with Highlands Close'

It concerns me that these descriptions are so inaccurate and this is the only link I could find – why couldn't you send a link to a map?

As a result I feel misled.

In addition I have a number of points to raise –

a)Yes for years there has been and is dangerous parking at the junction of Wharf Street and Cliffe Way - parking is on the verge in Cliffe way.

b)Increasing parking on the east side of Wharf Street is making it dangerous for cars to reverse out from drives on the front of their properties. And residents are being verbally abused.

c)The elbow bend in Wharf Street north east of nelsons lane and the parking bays outside the Wharf buildings on the east side of Wharf Street make that bend very dangerous.

d) We have a residential home and a block of specially adapted flats for the disabled in Wharf Street, therefore we have a higher number than average of disabled residents. We have a number of dropped crossings for this reason but people regularly park on them and there is no enforcement.

e) 15 years ago I fought for 3 years to have safe pavement put on the east side of Wharf Street, at that time the architect and myself specifically requested that double yellow lines be put in on the east side, of Wharf Street opposite residents' houses. We were told that there was no point as no traffic wardens policed the road.

Unless the council can guarantee that the 'no waiting restrictions' will be enforced, there is no point in putting them in.

f) When the new Residential Unit was built next to Gray's garage – (who have car transporter deliveries) I pointed out that parking by 24 hour shift staff at the home would cause a problem.

In addition parking outside Gray's Garage makes entry and exit onto their premises really dangerous.

g) Massive parking issues have been caused by totally inadequate parking provision in the housing estate around Campriano Drive; and now more parking problems are about to be caused by the Wharf buildings in Wharf Street which are currently being turned into flats and have no parking.

These problems can be laid directly at the door of poor planning decisions.

I reiterate unless you are going to enforce restrictions with regular traffic warden patrols there is no point

h) In addition I would like to know if you do put in parking restrictions, will residents need to have permits for parking outside their own properties, require visitors permits, and what will they cost?

I am objecting to the proposal. -

Unless double yellow lines are put along the entire length of the east side of Wharf Street ie opposite all the residential houses from the junction of Wharf Street and Cliffe Way to Nelson Lane -

all that the current plan will do is displace the parking **to** the residential part of Wharf Street, this will cause more traffic flow issues, endanger pedestrians, and cause more problems for access on and off to driveways.

This proposal is ill thought through, you need to consult residents about double yellow lines opposite the houses, and make sure the restriction will be enforced by wardens.

12)

I would like to protest the proposed double yellow lines along Cliffe Way and partial areas of Wharf Street.

The fact is a lot of the parking down by the bridge, and further along the street is from people working down the street. Fiat garage. Storage solutions. The school. People parking and then going to the station. All putting double yellows down there and Cliffe Way will do is push it up our street. Moving the problem. Not solving it. We already have an issue with people

starting to park at the bottom of the Nelson Lane junction for people going to the hospital. This will only make this worse. Causing problems entering and exiting our drives.

Solution could be employers providing better parking for employees. Parking permits and double yellow lines but to be discussed on the opposite side of wharf street to the original houses.

13)

I'm not sure if you'll be picking these emails up currently, but we would like to object to the proposed double yellow lines on Wharf Street please. We live in the property xxxxxxxx railway bridge. Cars often travel quite fast down Wharf Street, but do have to slow where cars are parked and it is often necessary for cars to pause and give way. We were concerned that without the parked cars, cars would continue to travel at speed and not need to slow down, increasing risk to pedestrians and our young family. Interestingly this strangest of weeks there are only a handful of parked cars here, and cars are travelling too quickly, which seems to have tested the hypothesis.

A second, but less important concern, would be that our visitors (including elderly parents) would be unlikely to find parking outside our house (because other cars would likely be occupying the few available spaces).

We would be grateful if you would consider our objection.

14)

I live at xx Wharf Street. Cars currently park on my side of the street outside my property which is fine. However if anyone also then parks on the opposite side of the street it makes it difficult to access my property safely with my car on to the drive.

It seems a good idea to have double yellow lines under the bridge and at the corners of Wharf Street and Cliffe Way, but this will encourage parking at the Nelson Lane end, and as there are no restrictions people will park on both sides of the street.

If the proposed restrictions go ahead, there should also be restricted parking all along the street opposite the houses to enable safe access to properties.

Kind regards

William Street.Corespondence.Redacted

1)

Thank you for you coming back to me so quickly, I appreciate it.

Just so I'm clear the proposal is to increase the L4 residents parking to include William Street? Can I also just check that (as your plan indicates) that would include a (one?) bay on the William Street (EAST) where there used to be a loading bay but currently there are double yellow lines?

Is there any consideration to making Wood Street (North of William Street) and on the West side also part of the scheme?

2)


I received a letter to my home address (xx Wood Street) to inform me of the consultation into parking restrictions.

I believe related to William Street (as Wood street does not appear in the list)

With regard to the proposals for William Street I am in favour of the residents scheme being extended as there is currently insufficient provision for the localised area and where there is potential capacity, close by, it is actually a different zone (Zone 0) so is no use to the residents of Zone 4.

Previous contact with your department has requested that the remaining section of Wood Street, currently not included in the resident parking zone, should also have residents parking status and it seems such a shame this is not being applied at the same time. Marked on the attached map in RED (with current allocated areas marked in GREEN) [at the North end, on the West side of Wood Street.]

I would request if this is a possible extension it could be considered at this time?



The growing number of property developments of single dwellings / business premises changing to multiple number residential properties, within a very small area, has/will had a detrimental effect on availability. Even with the, limited, parking provision within these developments there is always further demand than is provided.

However the increased capacity, especially where the proposed increase in parking charges being forced onto residents would at least be partially mitigated by the increased potential to be able to park in the area we are paying for, would be a positive step and I'm sure will be welcomed by all residents in the vicinity.

Again, I would request the Wood Street proposal be considered in this stage as it would likely become unviable for any action to be taken for some time in the future.

3)

I am writing to you to communicate my support for the proposed introduction of parking restrictions on William Street, Leamington Spa.

I am a William Street resident and currently pay for an L4 Residents' Parking Permit and a Visitors' Permit, and I often find it difficult to park near to my home. The situation has been gradually getting worse over the last few months and I wrote to the council about it a few months ago, so I am pleased to see action being taken.

4)

As a resident of William Street, Leamington Spa, I write in strong support of the proposals notified within the consultation document for this area. At present, William Street is a magnet for commuters (Monday to Friday) and shoppers (especially weekends). Commuters want to park all day, free. Shoppers want to linger in the town centre for long periods. All week, there has been a demand for places late into the night from those using town centre pubs and restaurants.

The consequence is that it is impossible to park near the house on any day, when arriving home before at least until 6 p.m.. and that is not a certainty. Although we have now been allowed residents' parking permits in zone L4, our street is not (yet) in that zone. This just displaces the problem as residents in streets already within L4 need parking places too. Often William Street is an 'overflow' parking area for neighbours in adjacent streets.

At present, we have the following problems, in addition to the above:

1. commuters arrive earlier and earlier to secure a space, if available.
2. they frequently sit in their cars, engine running, passing the time until their work place opens. This is bad for the environment, and for us, when near our open windows.
3. cars circulate the area, looking for a place to become available, and competing for one when it does.
4. 'parking rage' - hussling us (and sometimes verbally abusing us) to move more quickly when we are spotted leaving our house and getting into a car.

In summary, the proposed scheme is to be warmly welcomed for reasons of amenity (as specified in the WCC document), practicality and environmental improvement.

(It might be noted that a petition signed by many neighbours was submitted to WCC some time ago, calling for the inclusion of William Street in L4. I believe one of our neighbours will be forwarding a copy within their response to the consultation.)

5)

Reference to the consultation to permit William Street to L4 permit. I would like to add my support to the proposal from myself and my husband who live on xx William Street, and have done for 5 years. In addition please find attached the petition signed by residents of William Street, Wood Street and Rosefield Street, which was conducted in March 2018. All residents were in support of permitting William street due to the increased issues we face regarding a lack of parking. We received both the support of our local Lib Dem councillor and our MP (labour), in attempts to get these changes implemented. We are pleased that you are now considering this.

William Street - Petition for...

William street is currently used as a free car park for many workers in leamington. It is unfair to both those that have to pay to park locally as well as the residents such as ourselves who can no longer park on the street. We have also encountered abuse and violent behaviour from those that do use the road as it is getting harder and harder to park. It is also used by parking attendants working for the council, who no longer wear their uniform when collecting their cars. We hope that you consider the wishes of residents who have to deal with this 7 days a week, pay council tax and already pay for permits to park in the L4 zone who are permanent to the street above the needs of temporary users.

Although disappointed that the whole road is not up for consultation, I do think that the partial permitting would be a good compromise for all those involved.

6)

Re: Objection to the proposed new parking restrictions in William Street, Leamington Spa.

I would like to make a strong objection to the proposal for the County Council to impose parking restrictions in William Street. It may well be sufficient to have a two hour slot if you come to the town for shopping but for those like myself who are employed in small local businesses who do not have their own parking spaces, this will make life very difficult.

The only option we have is to either walk up to ¾ of a mile away from William Street to the north part of Leamington Spa to find free on street parking or to use the overpriced parking available in the carpark at the bottom of Rosefield Street.

For employees who are only receiving a modest salary who are asked to pay as much as £700 each year to use a Council run town carpark, this is simply too much.

If there was a better way that the Council could arrange parking for employees such as myself in the town carparks for just 5 days a week at a more moderate cost, this would be most helpful.

In the meantime, please register my objection and if you could offer some help by suggesting some other way to help overcome this lack of free on street parking, I will be very glad to hear from you.

If it was possible to obtain a street parking permit like a normal resident in the surrounding streets, this would be very helpful. However, unless one is a resident and can show by submitting the registration document of the vehicle owned, this cannot be done for people who work in properties which were formerly residential but are now commercial offices as we reside elsewhere. Perhaps you could look at a way of doing this which would help people like myself from having to park in other residential streets in different parts of north Leamington Spa.

18 Clinton Lane
Kenilworth
Warwickshire
CV 1AT

Rory O'Connor
Traffic and Road Safety
PO Box 43 Shire Hall
Warwick
CV32 4SX

Date 11th March 2020

Re: Warwick District CPE Variation 6

Dear Mr O'Connor,

Please find enclose my response to the letter received regarding the proposed changes to parking restrictions on Clinton Lane in Kenilworth.

I object to the proposed changes, the grounds for my objection are detailed in the attached report.

I have also provided my opinion on alternative schemes that may be more beneficial to the safety of this particular road.

I would be happy to discuss these and any other points in person or at future public meetings, so please keep me personally informed as your work progresses on this project.

Yours sincerely,



Colin Murray

Mobile: 0779 295 3935
Home: 01926 853 050
E-mail: colinneilmurray@gmail.com

Contents Page

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Background | 3 |
| 2 | Objections to the Proposed Changes | 3 |
| 2.1 | Summary | 3 |
| 2.2 | Review of Historical Accident Data | 4 |
| 2.3 | The Effects of Alternative Parking..... | 6 |
| 2.4 | Increased Likelihood of Collisions | 6 |
| 2.5 | Increase in Vehicle Speeds | 8 |
| 2.6 | Devaluing of Property Prices and Increased Hardship..... | 9 |
| 3 | Alternative Suggestions | 10 |
| 3.1 | Residents Only Parking..... | 10 |
| 3.2 | Weight Restrictions | 10 |
| 3.3 | Beehive Hill Junction | 10 |

Appendices

Collision Data Document – “Clinton Lane, Kenilworth. 01/01/2010 – 17/02/2020”

1 Background

I am the homeowner of number 18 Clinton Lane. We have a drive with suitable space for one vehicle, and a dropped curve. Our second vehicle is therefore parked over the front of the drive.

My wife, Alison, and I live there with our two children, ages 8 and 11, both are pupils at Priors Field Primary School on Clinton Lane. Their route to School is either on foot or by bicycle along Clinton Lane.

I work full time in Adderbury, so I travel to and from work each day by car. Alison is self employed and works from home for the majority of the week, but regularly travels to a business address in Birmingham as part of her work. This means that two cars are essential to our situation, with public transport unable to provide these journeys in a suitable time and at a suitable cost.

2 Objections to the Proposed Changes

2.1 Summary

Upon review of the information published by Warwickshire County Council on the proposed changes I note that the statement of reason given for the proposed change is “avoiding danger to persons or traffic”.

My objection to this proposal is that the changes would not achieve this, in fact my opinion is that the likelihood of dangerous incidents occurring would actually increase.

Further detail is given later in this document but the summary of my points is as follows:

- Accident data for the last 10 years does not show any incidents that would have been avoided if the proposed parking restrictions were in place.
- By introducing the parking restrictions you will be forcing car owners to park elsewhere, thereby moving the perceived problem to another area, and not reducing the risk of future accidents.
- There will be an increased likelihood of a collision due to residents attempting to park on, or drive away from driveways that do not have sufficient space for 2 vehicles but who attempt to park in this manner.
- Removing parked cars with yellow lines creates more road space, which may cause motor vehicle speeds to increase.

In addition to the safety aspect there are secondary affects that these proposals will have,

- Devaluing of property prices
- Increased hardship for residents

Each of these points are addressed in turn in the following sections.

2.2 Review of Historical Accident Data

Warwickshire County Council have kindly provided me with 10 years work of accident data for Clinton Lane. I have appended that report for reference “Clinton Lane, Kenilworth 01/01/2010 – 07/02/2020”.

Based on the data supplied there were 7 accidents on Clinton Lane in that time period, and the majority were at the junction of Beehive Hill. None occurred on the southern portion of Clinton Lane.




Figure 1: Accident Locations 2010 - 2020

Looking at each of the reported accidents in turn my conclusion is that none of these would have been avoided if the planned changes had been in place.

For the following I am using the reference numbers shown on the map above, and as used in the appended report “Clinton Lane, Kenilworth 01/01/2010 – 07/02/2020”

Accident 1:

In this accident a driver was turning left off Clinton Lane onto her driveway.

The proposed parking restrictions would not have avoided this accident.

Accident 2:

This was a collision between a car and a cyclist at the junction of Beehive Hill.

The proposed parking restrictions would not have avoided this accident.

Accident 3:

Again this occurred at the junction of Beehive Hill. A motorcyclist braked too hard and locked their wheels.

The proposed parking restrictions would not have avoided this accident.

Accident 4:

Once again this occurred at the junction of Beehive Hill.

The proposed parking restrictions would not have avoided this accident.

Accident 6:

This also occurred at Beehive Hill and was caused by the poor road surface.

The proposed parking restrictions would not have avoided this accident.

Accident 7:

This occurred when a vehicle travelling north was waiting to turn onto Cobbs Road and was hit from the rear.

The proposed parking restrictions would not have avoided this accident.

Summary

It is clear from 10 years' worth of accident data that the junction of Beehive Hill and Clinton Lane/Birmingham Road is where the Council should concentrate their efforts if the desire is to avoid danger to persons or traffic.

The proposed parking restrictions would not have avoided a single one of all the accidents that have occurred on Clinton Lane in 10 years.

2.3 The Effects of Alternative Parking

By introducing the proposed parking restrictions the owners of numerous vehicles would have to find alternative parking places.

I have surveyed the road on a number of occasions and at different times of the day and typically we see 25 – 30 cars parked in locations that would no longer be available after the introduction of the new restrictions. With all of these vehicles seeking alternative parking locations this would result in the perceived problems simply being moved elsewhere.

There is insufficient additional parking capacity close by the affected properties on Clinton Lane to cope with that quantity of vehicles, and the proposed plans make no mention of alternative parking spaces being provided, so this would result in an increase of poor parking practices, and most likely increasing the chances of danger to persons or traffic, which is the very reason given as the aim for these changes.

2.4 Increased Likelihood of Collisions

There are a number of properties on Clinton Lane where front gardens have been paved over to provide a driveway. The section for Clinton Lane where I live is mostly terrace houses, which naturally restricts the width of these driveways.

For some of these driveways it may be physically possible to park two cars side by side, however this would restrict access to the property as the cars would be so close together, but following the introduction of the proposed parking restrictions the likelihood of residents resorting to parking like this will no doubt increase.

The effect of this would be to increase the likelihood of a collision between cars travelling along Clinton Lane and cars attempt to park on, or leave these driveways.

The reasons for this are that to first park in a tight spot like this the driver will need to position the car perpendicular to the centre line of the road to allow them to reverse onto their drive. This increases the time that the car attempting to park is in a vulnerable position on the carriageway.

Similarly when leaving the driveway if residents have closely parked two cars together on a driveway, where there barely enough space, they will have to drive further into the path of oncoming cars before being able to turn onto the carriageway.

From my own experience of witnessing residents parking practices on Clinton Lane a number drive straight onto their driveways, rather than reversing on. If these drivers continue this practice in the new scenario then they will be reversing out of their space and far across the carriageway before having sufficient space to turn. With restricted visibility due to being parked closely to adjacent cars the poor, but common, practice of reversing out of spaces also increases the likelihood of an accident.

These points are illustrated in the diagrams below, with “before” and “after” scenarios shown.




Figure 2: Driveway Parking Scenarios

Using a standard risk calculation where **risk = severity x likelihood** the severity of the accident remains unchanged, but the likelihood increases, and hence the risk score.

Particularly on weekday mornings and evenings when the volume of traffic on the road is high, and when there is also a high proportion of residents heading to or from work this would massively increase the chances of danger to persons or traffic.

Considering that the statement of reasons for the proposed changes is to reduce the chances of danger then my conclusion is that the effect of the parking restrictions would be counterproductive.

2.5 Increase in Vehicle Speeds

Clearing parked vehicles from roads by means of double yellow lines tends to lead to an increase in vehicle speeds and thus an increase in the likelihood of serious injury if collisions occur.

Implementation of the proposed restrictions could therefore increase the risk of accidents occurring anywhere along Clinton Lane, but as proven by the councils own published figures the junction with Beehive Hill already sees the majority of incidents, which would have an increased severity with comparative higher vehicle speeds.

At the southern end of Clinton Lane there is a near 90 degree bend with Castle Road, and an increase in vehicle speed approaching this bend in a southerly direction would increase both the likelihood and severity of incidents.



Figure 3: The bend at the southern end of Clinton Lane

2.6 Devaluing of Property Prices and Increased Hardship

As shown in the previous sections I see no safety benefit in the introduction of these changes, but the introduction of these changes will certainly have a negative impact on the homeowners affected.

I appreciate that the council does not have any responsibility to provide parking on the public highway, but as parking is currently provided the removal of such can only be seen as a negative change by those personally affected.

A property with no on street parking will command a lower purchase price, and be less desirable to potential buyers.

The proposals also increase the hardship for residents. There are elderly residents on Clinton Lane who rely on external care service providers visiting them during the day, who will be unable to park in close proximity to the property.

3 Alternative Suggestions

Hopefully it is clear from the previous sections that I see no benefit in the proposed parking restrictions. As an alternative I can suggest the following, which would go some way towards fulfilling the desire of avoiding danger to persons or traffic on Clinton Lane.

3.1 Residents Only Parking

With a nearby high profile tourist attraction (Kenilworth Castle) and other areas for leisure activities in the local area it is not uncommon for non-residents to park in the limited valid spaces available on Clinton Lane. I would not object to a residents only parking scheme being considered.

3.2 Weight Restrictions

Clinton Lane is a B road but regularly carries heavy goods vehicles. To reduce the risk of potential accidents I suggest the council investigate weight restrictions and alternative routes for those types of vehicles.

3.3 Beehive Hill Junction

If Warwickshire County Council are serious about avoiding danger to persons or traffic on Clinton Lane then the focus must be on the junction of Beehive Hill and Clinton Lane/Birmingham Road.

From the accident figures provided by the Council it is clear that this is the area where the risk of incidents is highest, and not the stretch of Clinton Lane running south from this junction towards Castle Green.




Figure 4: The Beehive Hill Junction



**Clinton Lane, Kenilworth. 01/01/2010 -
17/02/2020
14 Sep 2011 to 25 Jan 2020**

Report produced: 06/03/2020

Road Safety Intelligence Team
Tel: 01926 412740
Email: rsinfo@warwickshire.gov.uk



ALL ROAD USERS - ACCIDENTS

| Year | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Time | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | District | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
|--------------------|-------|---------|--------|-------|----------------------------|-------|---------|--------|-------|--------------------------|-------|---------|--------|-------|
| 2011 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0000-0059 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Warwick | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| 2012 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0100-0159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Road Class | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| 2013 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0200-0259 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2014 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0300-0359 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2015 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0400-0459 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2020 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0500-0559 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Month | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | 0600-0659 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | | | | | 0700-0759 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | B | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | | | | | 0800-0859 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 0900-0959 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | Speed Limit | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| | | | | | 1000-1059 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 1100-1159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| | | | | | 1200-1259 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | | | | | 1300-1359 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 1400-1459 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 1500-1559 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 1600-1659 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Obstruction (Veh Totals) | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| | | | | | 1700-1759 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 1800-1859 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 1900-1959 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 2000-2059 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 2100-2159 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 2200-2259 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 2300-2359 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | Lighting | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Day | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Weather | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Junction Type | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | Fine without high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| | | | | | Raining without high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | Snowing without high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | Fine with high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | Raining with high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | Snowing with high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | Fog or mist - if hazard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | Road Surface | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Ped Crossing | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Bends (Veh Totals) | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Left Hand Bend | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not at crossing | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | Road Surface | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Right Hand Bend | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| Zebra | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pelican | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Phase | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Footbridge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Refuge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bends (Veh Totals) | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Road Surface | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Dry | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Left Hand Bend | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Wet/Damp | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Snow | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Right Hand Bend | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Frost/Ice | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Flood | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Unknown | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Unknown | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| | | | | | | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

ALL ROAD USERS - CASUALTIES

| Year | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Casualty Age | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | Weather | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
|-----------------|-------|---------|--------|---|--------------|-------|---------|--------|--|----------------------------|-------|---------|--------|-------|
| 2011 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 - 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Fine without high winds | 0 | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| 2012 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 - 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Raining without high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 - 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Snowing without high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2014 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 17 - 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | Fine with high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2015 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 26 - 35 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | Raining with high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2020 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 36 - 45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | Snowing with high winds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | 46 - 55 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | Fog or mist - if hazard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Month | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total | 56 - 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| January | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 65+ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| February | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| March | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | Road Surface | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| April | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Time | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total <td>Dry</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> <td>9</td> | Dry | 0 | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| May | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0000-0059 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Wet/Damp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| June | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0100-0159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Snow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| July | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0200-0259 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Frost/Ice | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| August | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0300-0359 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Flood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| September | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0400-0459 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| October | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0500-0559 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| November | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0600-0659 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | District | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| December | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0700-0759 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Warwick | 0 | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| | | | | | 0800-0859 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Day | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total <td>0900-0959</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <th>Road Class</th> <th>Fatal</th> <th>Serious</th> <th>Slight</th> <th>Total</th> | 0900-0959 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | Road Class | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| Sunday | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1000-1059 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | M | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Monday | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1100-1159 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | A(M) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tuesday | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1200-1259 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | A | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Wednesday | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1300-1359 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | B | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Thursday | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1400-1459 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Friday | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1500-1559 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | | | | | |
| Saturday | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1600-1659 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | Speed Limit | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| | | | | | 1700-1759 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Crossing | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total <td>1800-1859</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>30</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> | 1800-1859 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Not at crossing | 0 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 1900-1959 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Zebra | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2000-2059 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pelican | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2100-2159 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Phase | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2200-2259 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Footbridge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2300-2359 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| Refuge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | Obstruction | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Lighting | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total <td>Sign/Signal</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | Sign/Signal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | Daylight | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | Lamp Post | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bends | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total <td>Darkness</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>Pole</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> | Darkness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | Pole | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Left Hand Bend | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | Tree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Right Hand Bend | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | Bus Stop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | Barrier | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

ALL ROAD USERS - CASUALTIES

| Junction Type | Fatal | Serious | Slight | Total |
|-----------------|-------|---------|--------|-------|
| Not at Junction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Roundabout | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mini R'about | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T or Staggered | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Slip Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Crossroads | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Multiple Junct | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Private Drive | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Other Junction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

D-PRINT CRASH REPORT

6-Mar-2020

09:13:27

| No | Location | Severity | Date | Day | Time | Street Lighting | Road Surface | Weather | Pedestrian Direction | Factors | Involved |
|----|--|----------|------------|-----|-------|-----------------|---|---------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| 1 | Road No B4103 Grid 427844E Section Ref 272853N | SLIGHT | 22/06/2015 | 2 | 15:33 | L | Dry | Fine | | | P/C |
| | B4103 CLINTON LANE J/W DRIVE WAY TO NO. 129 KENILWORTH | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Warwick | | | | | | | | | | |
| | DR/V1 TURNS LEFT OFF MAIN RD INTO HER DRIVEWAY FAILING TO SEE ONCOMING 7 YR OLD CYCLIST CYCLING ON PAVEMENT RESULTING IN SLT COLL | | | | | | Veh1, car, S -> W Veh2, pedal cycle, N -> S | | | Casualties 1 Vehicles 2 | |
| 2 | Road No A452 Grid 427787E Section Ref 273251N | SLIGHT | 25/01/2020 | 7 | 10:09 | L | Dry | Fine | | R.TURN | P/C |
| | BEEHIVE HILL (A452) AT JUNCTION WITH CLINTON LANE (B4103) | | | | | | | | | Warwick | |
| | DRIVER OF VEH01 HAS APPROACHED JUNCTION OF BEEHIVE HILL AND BIRMINGHAM ROAD AND HAS FAILED TO LOOK CORRECTLY BEFORE COMMITTING ONTO THE BIRMINGHAM ROAD AND COLLIDING WITH CYCLIST ALREADY TRAVELLING ON BIRMINGHAM ROAD | | | | | | Veh1, car, SE -> N Veh2, pedal cycle, N -> S | | | Casualties 1 Vehicles 2 | |
| 3 | Road No B4103 Grid 427786E Section Ref 273233N | SERIOUS | 18/05/2012 | 6 | 09:30 | L | Dry | Fine | | S.VEH | M/C |
| | B4103 Clinton Lane, at its Junction with A452 Beehive Lane, Kenilworth | | | | | | | | | Warwick | |
| | V1 tvi N on Clinton Lane rider applied brake and the wheels have locked the bike skidded and the rider fell off | | | | | | Veh1, m/cycle > 500cc, S -> N | | | Casualties 1 Vehicles 1 | |
| 4 | Road No A452 Grid 427786E Section Ref 273256N | SLIGHT | 11/06/2013 | 3 | 15:11 | L | Dry | Fine | | | M/C |
| | A452 Birmingham Rd, at its Junction with B4103 Clinton Lane , Kenilworth | | | | | | | | | Warwick | |
| | V1 trav east, failed to give way at x rds and collided withy V2 trav north on main rd | | | | | | Veh1, car, W -> E Veh2, m/cycle 50 - 125cc, S -> N | | | Casualties 1 Vehicles 2 | |

Key Involved

PED Pedestrian
HGV Heavy Goods Vehicle
GV Goods Vehicle
M/C Motor Cycle
P/C Pedal Cycle
PSV Bus/Coach

Street Lighting

L Daylight
STL Street Lights
USL Street Lights Unlit
NSL No Street Lights
STU Street Lights Unknown

FACTORS

+VE Positive Breath Test
R.TURN Right Turn Manoeuvre
O/TAKE Overtaking Manoeuvre
S.VEH Single Vehicle

Special Conditions

ATS OUT Traffic Lights Not Working
ATS DEF Traffic Lights Defective
SIGNS Road Signs Defective or Obscured
RD WRKS Road Works
Surface Road Surface Defective

D-PRINT CRASH REPORT

6-Mar-2020
09:13:27

| No | Location | Severity | Date | Day | Time | Street Lighting | Road Surface | Weather | Pedestrian Direction | Factors | Involved |
|----|--|----------|------------|-----|-------|-----------------|---|---------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| 5 | Road No A452 Grid 427799E Section Ref 273250N | SLIGHT | 13/07/2014 | 1 | 17:36 | L | Dry | Fine | | S.VEH | M/C |
| | A452 BEEHIVE HILL J/W B4103 CLINTON LANE KENILWORTH | | | | | | | | | | Warwick |
| | V1 MCYCLE TURNING LEFT AT JCT TRAVS OVER POOR RD SURFACE RESULTING IN RIDER BRAKING HARD, LOOSING CONTROL OF BIKE WITH HIM AND PILLION PASSENGER FALLING OFF | | | | | | Veh1, m/cycle > 500cc, N -> SE | | | Casualties 2 Vehicles 1 | |
| 6 | Road No A452 Grid 427785E Section Ref 273255N | SERIOUS | 07/09/2012 | 6 | 21:05 | DRK STL | Dry | Fine | | R.TURN | M/C |
| | A452 Birmingham Road, at its Junction with A452 Beehive Hill, Kenilworth | | | | | | | | | Warwick | |
| | V1 turning R from Beehive Hill onto A452, V1 starts turn and collides with V2 (mbike) tvl S on A452 | | | | | | Veh1, car, E -> N Veh2, m/cycle > 500cc, N -> S | | | Casualties 1 Vehicles 2 | |
| 7 | Road No B4103 Grid 427833E Section Ref 272994N | SLIGHT | 14/09/2011 | 4 | 16:00 | L | Dry | Fine | | R.TURN | |
| | Clinton Lane J/W Cobbs Rd Kenilworth | | | | | | | | | Warwick | |
| | All Vehs Trav N. V3 Stationary in Crown of Rd Waiting to Turn Rt. V2 Stationary Behind. V1 Ran into Rear of V2 Pushing it into Rear of V3 | | | | | | Veh1, car, S -> N Veh2, car, S -> N Veh3, car, S -> E | | | Casualties 2 Vehicles 3 | |

Key Involved

PED Pedestrian
HGV Heavy Goods Vehicle
GV Goods Vehicle
M/C Motor Cycle
P/C Pedal Cycle
PSV Bus/Coach

Street Lighting

L Daylight
STL Street Lights
USL Street Lights Unlit
NSL No Street Lights
STU Street Lights Unknown

FACTORS

+VE Positive Breath Test
R.TURN Right Turn Manoeuvre
O/TAKE Overtaking Manoeuvre
S.VEH Single Vehicle

Special Conditions

ATS OUT Traffic Lights Not Working
ATS DEF Traffic Lights Defective
SIGNS Road Signs Defective or Obscured
RD WRKS Road Works
Surface Road Surface Defective