

**ANNEX 4***A. Statutory consultee responses:*

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
(1) Traffic Management Officer, (Thames Valley Police	<b>No objection</b>

*B. Responses received by email:*

<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
(2) Resident, (High Street, Shrivenham)	As long-term residents on a house in the High Street we warmly welcome these excellent and well-thought out proposals and hope they will fulfil the aims stated in your letter.
(3) Resident, (High Street, Shrivenham)	<p>Post the approval for the development of the sprawling Cross Trees housing development in Shrivenham, I have been in regular contact with the Oxford and Shrivenham councils about the traffic and parking situation. This is the first time anyone seems to be doing anything positive, so I thank you and whoever has been involved to date.</p> <p>Looking firstly at the parking situation, as a High Street resident, my/our concerns are not that have nowhere to park during the hours of 8am to 5pm as we are at work. The issue residents have is that we have nowhere to park when we return home from work after 5pm or at any time on a Saturday. Having provided Simon Howell with detailed feedback about the parking challenges, I suggested that to protect the people who actually live on Shrivenham High Street (and pay council tax), you may want to consider either extending the parking restrictions into the evenings Mon – Sat or creating a residents only Zone that comes into effect at certain times, so that residents parking is always available.</p> <p>What happens now and what will happen post 5pm and on weekends if your plans are implemented is that people will still dump their cars on the High Street overnight from 5pm or from Friday to Monday morning.</p>

	<p>We are seeing a steady stream of residents who live locally moving their cars out on to the High Street to either sell vehicles, accommodate children coming home for the weekend, grandparents, friends staying over etc, etc. Same with the Friday/Saturday night pub traffic – cars are left in the High Street overnight and nothing you are proposing here will help alleviate this.</p> <p>What the proposals here do is make it more likely that a day-trippers may get a park. The proposal to add more disabled parking bays outside the Pharmacy compounds the lack of parking spaces for residents who live in the area between Stainswick Lane and the Co-Op - and this this is where we should be able to park.</p> <p>Your letter says that the purpose of the parking proposals are to address ‘local concerns’ but I am not sure they are. What is being proposed does not help my neighbours and family park near their/our homes when we most need to.</p> <p>What you are proposing is a step in the right direction but are we going far enough?</p> <p>The second issue is the traffic volume on the High Street. When approvals were granted for the Cross Trees development, it was done so on the basis that a Retail Park would be developed in tandem with the house building. This never happened. I contacted Cross Trees several years and was told that the Retail Park would be developed as soon as x number of houses were built but again, this never happened. We now have 100s of new houses and 1000s of new residents all with cars but nowhere else for then to go other than the High Street for essentials. I keep asking the Parish and various local representatives about the development of a Retail Park and everyone cites issues with the planning etc. etc. We have been lied to. If you get the Retail Park within the new estate sorted, you will significantly reduce the traffic volumes into the High Street.</p> <p>A related issue that compounds the parking, safety and traffic flow issues are the incessant deliveries that go to the small One-Stop Store on the High Street. Again, I have raised this with Simon Howell as the number of articulated trucks delivering to this small store is insane. It can be up to 6 or 7 a day. All are articulated. The One-Stop has <b><u>no loading bay for trucks</u></b>, so they simply park on double yellow lines on the High Street or Stainswick Lane – blocking traffic flow, making Stainswick inaccessible for cars and dangerous for kids going to school and pedestrians. The trucks even park on the zig-zag lines in from of the school pedestrian crossing on a daily basis. Something needs to be done here so perhaps, your plans to have a traffic warden in situ here may help. I am not convinced that the addition of more double-yellow lines will help without actual enforcement.</p>
(4) Resident (Hazell's Lane, Shrevenham)	<p>The road outside my house is only 480cm wide at the widest point and already if people park cars badly or larger vehicles such as vans park opposite my drive I am unable to get my cars on and off my drive without a 20 or 30 point</p>

	<p>turn over the pavement. The proposed parking restrictions would in essence mean that we would always have cars and vans parked opposite our drive as we are the very first unrestricted parking on the plan. At the moment it is quite rare, this proposal would make our drive un-usable most of the time. I would not want double yellow lines stopping cars parking but if possible could at least some of the spaces on the Highstreet be un restricted so that we don't get all of the long term parking blocking up Hazells lane?</p>
<p>(5) Business, (High Street, Shrivenham)</p>	<p>Although at the beginning it seemed like a good idea to have some parking restrictions in shrivenham high street, This has now turned out to being a real big problem for the businesses.</p> <p>Staff of most of the businesses do not live in the village and need to drive to work, As most of these are not high paid jobs ,a parking permit looks like it is going to cost a fair bit .</p> <p>We have already suffered a lot with the relocation of the school, this will be yet another nail in the coffin , Nobody wants to actually tell us the cost of these permits but rumours are going round of hundreds of pounds , We will soon be another ghost town when all the businesses start disappearing .</p> <p>Now the school has moved there seems to be ample parking.</p> <p>We would strongly ask that this is rejected.</p>
<p>(6) Resident, (Charlotte Close, Shrivenham)</p>	<p>I support the proposal to restrict wating times on the High Street to 3 hours. This should make it easier to find parking spaces when required by stopping commuters parking on the High Street all day.</p> <p>I support the introduction of 2 extra disabled parking bays adjacent to the Pharmacy, making a total of 3.</p> <p>Even though I am not disabled, I think it would be sensible to increase the number of disabled bays near the Doctors' surgery by 2, also making a total of 3. I suggest that at least one of those extra bays should be in Church Walk to be slightly nearer to the entrance to the surgery.</p> <p>I support the removal of the cycle stands on the High Street near to the bus stop by Church Walk. I regularly walk along the High Street, and it is extremely rare to see those specific cycle stands in use. The ones by One-Stop shop are used and it is appropriate that they are being retained.</p>

(7) Business, (High Street, Shrivenham)	<p>I am unsure from your communication what you are trying to fix and why changes are necessary as the current arrangements allow access to retail/pharmacy/medical premises with good turnover of parking spaces. Changes will inevitably lead to vehicles parked by staff at retail and medical/pharmacy premises parking in adjacent streets. I would encourage a re-evaluation of the scheme as circumstances have changed since the parish Council looked at this in April as the school has moved from the High Street so reducing pressure at certain times of the day.</p> <p>Our staff do a number of ad hoc deliveries during the day which would be restricted by these proposals as vehicles will be distant from the premises. The letter mentions permits being available. Will these be available for staff? Ideally, we would need three/four permits if this scheme is adopted. Could we transfer these permits between staff as these change day to day.</p> <p>If restrictions are to be introduced we would encourage a less extensive scheme with say: all parking on the Barrington Arms side of the High Street left unrestricted or only introducing restrictions between church walk and the old bank site (one side only) and immediately outside the 'One stop' store.</p>
(8) Resident, (High Street, Shrivenham)	<p>In response to additional disabled bays near the pharmacy:</p> <p>On this row, we already struggle with parking as most of us have more than one car, so this would make the space in front of our houses even harder to park on. With two young children, I try to limit needing to cross the road when we park, if I can.</p> <p>Secondly, a disabled person would benefit far more from a space outside the front of the shops. There is plenty of opportunity for a disabled bay outside the Post Office, One Stop Shop and the Co Op. I don't feel it makes any sense to have the disabled bays so far away from the actual shops they are likely to be going to.</p>
(9) Business, (High Street, Shrivenham)	<p>Have the proposals factored in there is a GP surgery within the area that is being proposed as having restrictive parking. I have reviewed documents and I can see 2 permits are being allocated to business, the practice has a minimum of 6 clinicians daily who all commute to work, they also undertake home visits daily so need to have a vehicle within easy access can you please advise if this is being considered as a practice we would not be able to afford the proposed fees to fund these if they are even granted .</p>

	<p>As a several administrative and reception practice staff use the car park away from the High Street and staff are now concerned that how long before this area is made a chargeable car park.</p>
<p>(10) Business, (High Street, Shrivenham)</p>	<p>We have some very serious concerns and objections regarding the proposed 3 hour limit and permit scheme along the high street:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1, A number of our staff live in surrounding villages and towns (eg, Bishopstone, Highworth) with little access to public transport. They have no choice but to travel to work by car and they park in the high street. (The only public car park in the village - in Martens Road by the bowls club - is usually full with local residents vehicles). If the three hour limit is implemented, our staff may have no choice but to park in neighbouring roads, which will inevitably cause problems for local residents and lead to increased congestion.</li> <li>2, There are a number of other businesses in the high street – Chemist, Co-op, two Florists, Barbers, Hairdressers, Property Agency, Treatment Rooms, Gift Shop, Farm Shop, Restaurant, Post Office, Elm Tree Surgery, One Stop, etc – where are their employees expected to park? Again, they will have no choice but to find parking in neighbouring roads - leading to problems and congestion for local home owners.</li> <li>3, The cost of residents and business permits is high. As a small independent business, we are facing rising operating costs year on year. The last thing we need is another cost. Ditto for local residents and other businesses.</li> <li>4, Since the Primary School relocated recently to the new site in the village, the parking issue in the high street has been much improved. Yesterday, Monday 29<sup>th</sup> July, at 11:00am, I counted 19 empty parking spaces. This proposal has come far too late.</li> <li>5, We are a busy high street business – we feel this proposal may put customers off coming to Shrivenham. Free parking is an attraction and enables visitors to take their time to enjoy our beautiful village – to explore, visit the church, walk their dog by the canal, etc - then come to us for a coffee and cake. Why put this at risk?</li> <li>6, It's been mentioned recently on local social media that people use the high street as a 'Park and ride' for Oxford. This is mainly anecdotal – every day we mainly see the same local people using the bus stop.</li> </ol>

	<p>To sum up, we feel the proposal (regarding the three hour limit and permit scheme) has been rushed, over-simplified, poorly thought-out and has not taken into consideration the complex needs of village businesses and residents, nor the impact on the wider village.</p> <p>We object to it in the strongest terms.</p>
<p>(11) Resident, (Shrivenham)</p>	<p>We raise 7 Objections, highlight an omission/error in the proposal, and having completed a parking space availability survey conclude that the proposal as written will negatively impact amenity, introduce hazards and will incur both a financial and administrative burden to both residents and businesses with no material benefit.</p> <p>We would suggest that the challenge is far more complex than the consultation suggests. It is linked to both perception and behaviours. Customers want to park directly outside the retail outlet they wish to use. Surgery clients wish to park immediately outside the Surgery. Employees wish to park adjacent to their place of work. And residents want to park outside their house. These priorities are difficult aspirations to meet. At least two actions are required before any change to the existing provision is made.</p> <p>a. Effective enforcement of existing parking restrictions. b. Complete a professional requirement/needs capture activity to truly and evidentially identify need from which an optimal solution can be developed.</p> <p><b>CONSULTATION - STATEMENT OF REASONS DATED 11 JULY 2024 PROBLEM STATEMENT</b> Issues have been raised by Shrivenham Parish Council and the local County Councillor that the centre suffers from commuter parking which impacts on amenity for residents, their visitors, and users of local businesses.</p> <p>Is the impact on amenity true? The Statement of Reasons provides no evidence to support the Problem Statement.</p> <p>Indeed, it is very important to note that since this issue was raised by Shrivenham Parish Council there has been a significant change in context; namely, the move of Shrivenham Primary School to Cross Trees Park. In addition, once the retail space opens on Cross Trees Park there may be a further change in context.</p> <p>With that in mind, a survey was undertaken during the month of June 2024. Between the hours of 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday inclusive the length of the High Street was surveyed at least twice a day at differing times counting the available parking spaces. Key Points:</p>

1. Parking Spaces were always available on the High Street.
2. Parking was at a premium between the Hours of 11am and 2pm.
3. On only two occasions were there less than 10 available spaces on the High Street. At all other times at least 10 parking spaces were available.

#### OBJECTION 1

The Problem Statement is not supported by evidence. From evidence collected since the location change of the School, even if commuters are using the parking facilities they have no material impact on the existing available parking provision.

#### BENEFIT STATEMENTS

1. More efficient parking provision and effective enforcement of the restrictions.

It is unclear from the proposal who is the beneficiary of more efficient parking provision, given that the survey suggests that parking is invariably available on the High Street. Therefore, the benefit statement is questionable.

Evidence gathered from the survey indicates that parking on existing double yellow lines, parking on pavements and parking in existing Keep Clears is endemic irrespective of the fact that spaces are available nearby. Existing restriction enforcement does not work! The proposal suggests effective enforcement of new restrictions is a benefit. Given that the existing enforcement does not work it is unclear from the proposal what change to enforcement will result in the proposed benefit.

#### OBJECTION 2.

Given that the survey indicated that parking was always available on the High Street, the premise that the change will improve parking efficiency is unfounded.

#### OBJECTION 3

Evidence indicates that existing enforcement does not work. The proposal suggests an enforcement improvement but no detail is provided, and therefore the proposed enforcement benefit can not be validated.

2. Better turnover of available parking spaces, creating more opportunities for users and businesses.

The survey highlighted that parking was always available on the High Street. The minimum number of spaces counted during the survey was 7, the second lowest figure was 8. Both these data points occurred once. At all other times there were at least 10 parking spaces available on the High Street. Given this evidence the requirement for better turnover is moot.

#### OBJECTION 4

Evidence does not support the requirement for better turnover.

3. Permit exemptions for residents to park without limit.

The introduction of a Permit system will introduce an administrative and financial burden for eligible residents and businesses, so that they may manage parking for: themselves, their visitors and contractors. Given that the survey indicates that parking is always available on the High Street, It is unclear why this increased administrative and financial burden is a benefit.

#### OBJECTION 5

Evidence does not support that the introduction of Permit Parking will be a benefit.

4.A reduction of vehicles circulating looking for parking spaces.

Given the existing space availability, it is unclear what evidence exists to suggest circulation of vehicles looking for spaces is an issue. Indeed, while undertaking the survey this issue was not witnessed.

#### OBJECTION 6

Evidence does not support the contention that circulating vehicles seeking parking spaces is in fact a problem.

5.To facilitate the needs of disabled users visiting Shrivenham, it is proposed to increase the number of disabled bays in key locations including in the vicinity of the local pharmacy, areas central to local shops and close to doctors surgeries.

Insufficient evidence to comment.

#### OMISSION/ERROR

The Consultation Plan - Shrivenham Parking Amendments contains an omission/error. A Keep Clear zone on Church Walk is not shown on Drawing No. CILNOWH/SHV/001 Dated 11.03.24. It lies approximately from the point where the proposed yellow lines end to beyond the access to the driveways for Elm Tree House, Pippin Cottage and Lime Trees. To our knowledge the Keep Clear has been in place for in excess of 15 years.

This is a serious omission. This Keep Clear is in place for three reasons, two of which are safety considerations. Church Walk is a cul-de-sac the Keep Clear zone provides a turning area so as to ensure that vehicles are not forced to reverse out of Church Walk onto the High Street, and therefore contravene the Highway Code. Its second aim is to ensure access for Emergency vehicles to the Church and the adjacent properties is not obstructed. Finally, it also endeavours to sustain free access to the drives of: Elm Tree House, Pippin Cottage and Lime Trees.



	<p>Omission/Error: The Keep Clear in Church Walk has been omitted from the proposal. Senior Officer (TRO and Schemes) Oxfordshire CC has also been made aware of this omission under a separate cover.</p> <p><b>CHURCH WALK</b>  Parking on Church Walk faces the competing priorities of retail employees, retail customers, Surgery employees, Surgery clients, Church users and residents. The existing provision can deliver up to 12 spaces subject to vehicle size and orientation. The Keep Clear (currently omitted on the proposal) delivers important safety requirements while also ensuring access for residents.</p> <p>During the working day up to 4 of the existing spaces are usually occupied by retail employees and Surgery employees with up to a further 4 spaces occupied by residents. Church activity is usually, but not exclusively, limited to the weekend. The remaining spaces provide the amenity benefit. Even with the existing provision Church Walk is regularly obstructed.</p> <p>The proposal Drawing No. CILNOWH/SHV/001 Dated 11.03.24 reduces the number of parking slots to 7, limits parking to 3hrs Monday to Friday 8am to 5pm, introduces permit parking for businesses and residents and adds no waiting at anytime Double Yellow Lines. It omits the existing Keep Clear.</p> <p>Given that evidence shows that the existing provision of up to 12 spaces still regularly results in vehicular obstruction of Church Walk, it is unclear how reduction of the available spaces to 7 with the addition of further restriction and the omission of the Keep Clear can improve amenity. The 7 spaces will be occupied by residents and employees leaving no amenity provision. Without an effective change to enforcement the inevitable outcome will be increased likelihood of contravention of parking regulation with the potential increased likelihood of an accident or inability for Emergency vehicles to effectively undertake their role, let alone the inconvenience to residents seeking access to their drives.</p> <p><b>OBJECTION 7</b>  The proposal significantly reduces the universal amenity benefit on Church Walk. Without an effective change to parking restriction enforcement the proposal may increase the hazard to road users, potentially limit access for the Emergency Services and will reduce the amenity for residents.</p>
(12) Business, (High Street, Shrivenham)	<p>While we appreciate the initiative to regulate parking and believe that the three-hour limit can benefit the local community by ensuring a turnover of spaces, we have significant concerns about the current permit system for</p>

	<p>businesses. At the treatment rooms, we have a team of 8 staff members, although typically only 5-6 are present at any one time. The current limit of 4 permits per business is insufficient for our operational needs. Additionally, the requirement for permits to be tied to specific license plates creates further complications. Our team are not all present at one time if permits were business specific rather than vehicle specific my team could share permits, I know we are not the only business on the big street that employs more than 4 people and how this alternative could benefit.</p> <p>I would like to highlight a significant safety concern regarding our team's working hours. Our staff members often have to work late into the evening, and many of them are young females. Having to walk to car parks the opposite end of the village alone in the dark raises serious safety issues. The risk of potential harm or harassment, even with Shrivvenham being a lovely place, is a major concern for us, and ensuring the safety of our employees is paramount. By allowing more flexible and sufficient parking permits near the business premises, would help mitigate these risks.</p> <p>To address these issues, we propose the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase the Number of Permits: Allow businesses to obtain permits based on their operational needs rather than a fixed number. This would better accommodate businesses with larger teams.</li> <li>2. Business Name Permits: Issue permits linked to the business name rather than specific license plates. This flexibility would help businesses manage their parking needs more efficiently.</li> <li>3. Clarification on Car Park Usage: Provide clear confirmation that businesses can use village car parks. For example, the memorial hall currently restricts parking to hall users only, which limits available options for business staff. Understanding which car parks are available for business use would help in planning and reduce parking stress on the high street.</li> </ol> <p>We understand that parking regulations aim to balance the needs of residents, visitors, and businesses, and we are keen to work collaboratively to find a solution that works for all. Addressing the concerns raised will not only support local businesses but also ensure that the high street remains accessible and vibrant.</p>
(13) Resident, (Manor Lane, Shrivvenham)	<p>I am fully supportive of the proposed changes to limit high street parking. I do, however, have concerns about the consequences for other roads in the village that will inevitably be used by those who currently park in the high street throughout the day.</p> <p>The village has excellent bus services to both Oxford and Swindon and as a result a number of people use the village as a daily car park.</p>

	<p>In particular I am concerned about excessive parking in Manor Lane where I live. The lane is narrow, single track and one way for much of its length and has a 90 degree blind bend in the part that is 2 way. Cars are invariably parked either side of this bend requiring drivers accessing and leaving houses in the lane and Manor Close to turn the corner on the wrong side of the road.</p> <p>Additionally I understand that there is to be a new "Special Needs" School opening on the old Village School site. Users of this new school will require vehicle and pedestrian access via Manor Lane. Furthermore cars parked in the lane hamper access for emergency services.</p> <p>I believe that unrestricted parking in Manor Lane is therefore hazardous to both those who will attend the school and those who currently live in Manor Lane and Manor Close and believe that parking restrictions should be put in place.</p>
(14) Business, (High Street, Shrivenham)	<p>We would like to register that we do not support the proposed parking limit as we have eight colleagues in-branch that drive for work, and the proposal would leave them nowhere to park.</p> <p>It is noted that if the proposals are successful, you would provide permits to ensure local businesses can continue to operate and not inhibit attracting new colleagues. Therefore, we could only offer support to the proposal if a total of four permits are allocated to our premises address. As this is the maximum number of colleagues we have operating in the branch at any one time it will ensure our business is not adversely affected by your proposal whilst leaving ample space for other residents in the area.</p>
(15) Resident, (Charlbury Road, Shrivenham)	<p>I have two objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In my view the proposal is not complete in that there is no mention of how the proposed changes are going to be enforced nor is there any mention of any penalties for breaking the rules.</li> <li>2. I do not agree with the residents of the high street being charged for parking permits. Why should these residents fund this scheme? My suspicion is that, after a few months, any policing of the scheme will disappear but the residents will still be expected to pay (as their scheme is easier to manage) therefore all this scheme will achieve is to punish the residents.</li> </ol>
(16) Resident, (High Street, Shrivenham)	<p>My first point is that I have difficulty identifying exactly what problem it is that we are trying to address. From the arguments that I have seen, I gather that there is a feeling that a particular group of motorists, namely commuters who leave their cars here all day and travel onwards by other means, are hogging more than their fair share of available</p>

parking spaces. An alternative view which I feel carries greater weight, is that the number of local cars wishing to park in the High Street for short periods, has increased hugely since the powers-that-be decided to double the size of our village by building new houses over the last 8 years. If this is the case, any restrictions to long-term parking arrangements, including Resident Permits, will have little effect on the availability of short-term parking spaces.

As a matter of interest, we have lived on the High Street for 26 years and have always owned 2 cars, one of which we have kept on our drive and the other parked outside our house. In all that time, I truly believe that I have been unable to park within 30 yards of my front door (my definition of "outside my house") on less than only 20 occasions - in other words, less than once per year on average. That doesn't sound like much of a problem to me! If considerations of "convenience" is a driver for change, and thus relevant in the pursuit of more parking in central Shrivenham (i.e. near the shops), my own circumstances are relevant. Our house is close to the end of the High Street, away from the centre of the village, and thus, in an area where you might expect more available parking spaces, and yet I can walk slowly to the farthest shop or amenity in no more than 5 minutes. That seems pretty 'convenient' to me!

But if the crux of the issue is indeed the commuters who park long-term in the High Street (which seems unlikely to me), my question then becomes 'how will the proposed changes be enforced'? The best-laid scheme, however sound, will be useless unless enforced - and this does not mean today and tomorrow and maybe sometime next month, but everyday, all day, forever, and by an 'official' traffic warden with appropriate powers, and not by another posse of self-appointed vigilantes. Realistically, and because of the proposed 3 hour parking limit, a warden would have to be on hand from before the first illegal parkers arrive until more than 3 hours later; in other words, at least half a day per day, excluding any travel time in working hours. I do not believe that OCC will fund such an arrangement and monies raised from the cost of residents parking permits should certainly not be expected to do so.

Finally, how is the success or otherwise of the new arrangements going to be determined (I hesitate to use the word 'measured' as I doubt that the supposed problem itself had been quantified to any extent)? The proposed scheme will have an impact on people in the village, whether or not they are motorists themselves. For instance, new signage will add to visual pollution, people currently unaffected by the current 'problem', if it exists, are likely to be confronted by additional parking in their streets when 'illegal' parkers are forced off the High Street; and, finally, unless plans are made and committed to now, to assess the efficacy of the proposed changes in due course, all the negative consequences of the proposed changes, including the cost of Parking Permits will exist forever, whether the scheme works or not.

I believe that the risks of the proposed changes NOT improving the situation far outweigh the chances of the new arrangements improving matters. Taking all the above points into consideration, I find myself unable to support the proposed changes to parking arrangements in the centre of Shrivenham. They should be scrapped now.

<p>(17) Member of public</p>	<p>1. The need for implementation of parking restrictions in the central area of Shrivenham is recognised. I have two suggestions.</p> <p>a. Double Yellow Lines (Prohibition of waiting at any time) The north end of Fairthorne Way should be added in addition to those new areas proposed. Quote: New sections of 'No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow lines) will also be introduced on parts of the High Street, Church Walk &amp; Haze/ls Lane in order to better manage unrestricted parking in the vicinity). There is already parking here that is far too near a busy junction (roundabout) to gain a parking space in or near the High Street.</p> <p>b. Signage There is already too much signage in the High Street, for example 20mph, that smacks of urbanisation rather than a centre of a 'quaint' village being in an authorised Conservation Area. New signage must be restricted to the very minimal of necessary and existing poles and other structures must be used.</p> <p>2.Enforcement This scheme is funded by the taxpayer. Following quotes from your Senior Officer (TRO and Schemes), I have severe doubts as to whether the enforcement procedures will be effective, significantly the golden '3 hour' rule. Quotes: Routine, (although I can't comment on regularity), enforcement will be carried out by the contractor, however residents are encouraged to report any additional infringements to ensure the scheme performs as well as it can.</p>
<p>(18) Business, (High Street, Shrivenham)</p>	<p>I will start with a little of the background to the parking issue in the village.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are more than 20 businesses with their own premises in the high street and only three with their own parking.</li> <li>2. There are only seventeen houses or flats in the High Street and Church Walk that do not have their own parking.</li> <li>3. The High Street is a thriving place for shops, a florist, three hairdressers. A pharmacy, estate agent, two supermarkets, two cafe's a farm shop, a delicatessen and a busy GP practice and two pubs. It is more a commercial rather than a residential area.</li> <li>4. Most employees live outside the village and travel by car. An estimate of their number is about one hundred people. Most of these people work full days of eight hours.</li> <li>5. There are approximately 120 parking spaces in the High Street and Church Walk at present, excluding disabled spaces.</li> <li>6. I estimate that out of one hundred business employees at least two thirds (66) will be parking in the High Street, but it could be more.</li> <li>7. Displacement of cars to residential roads is inevitable.</li> </ol>

The proposed changes are undesirable because there are many businesses in the High Street who rely on staff coming to work in the shops, offices, pubs and the doctor's surgery from outside the village. In my estimation, after talking to many business owners is that almost 100 workers rely on whole day parking for full time employees. These include doctors, nurses and other staff at the surgery and 10 who work in the pharmacy. These people have been overlooked in the proposal as they don't fit into the categories of residents or business users and even if they were the cost of a permit would be out of reach of many. The result of restricting parking for these people is that they would have to either park all day in residential roads off the High Street or find other employment. It is hard enough to find qualified employees at the moment and this proposal would make it even harder. There is only one public car park in the village on Colton Road, quite a distance from the High Street.

Residents of the village are very proud of the services and facilities available to them from successful local businesses and we are lucky to have so many amenities close by. These same people will be horrified when sixty or more cars are parked in front of their houses in quiet residential streets because of restrictions where they should be parking in the High Street. Parking in residential streets will annoy residents and cause animosity with local property owners.

A three hour limit is unjustified as the high street is not a supermarket that needs to prevent long term parking. Since the primary school moved out of the village I have been told by many High Street users that parking has been far easier due to the school staff not having to park in the village.

The cost of permits will also limit the amount of residents and businesses who will apply for them and I am shocked at the only way this information has been given to people with notices attached to lamp posts rather than sent to residents. It is likely that less than 17 residents will apply for permits.(see note above) Business owners will only see the charge of £190 per year as a local tax and it is likely that uptake will be small as they too will choose to park in side roads.

The proposed scheme will have a dramatic effect on the commercial life of the village and the whole point of free parking is to allow commerce to continue and thrive.

The net result of your proposed scheme would be that all available roads off the High Street would be clogged with cars for most of the day and there would be most spaces in the High Street unused and a wasted asset for the village. This would be a ridiculous situation that has no benefit to village residents.

	<p>In a comment from the minutes of the last Parish Council meeting it was reported that "some residents were unhappy at having to pay for parking outside their homes but it was thought that the project would benefit the village as a whole". We must ask who you are doing this for and what benefit will it bring. Is it for the seventeen residents who don't have their own parking? They bought or rented their property knowing that there was no private parking. Is it for businesses?</p> <p>Because all the business owners I have talked to are horrified at the difficulties they will face in recruiting and retaining staff who travel to work by car. Businesses have not been complaining about the parking in the village, on the contrary, the present situation has created a place where they are thriving and doing well in a difficult financial climate.</p> <p>We strongly object to the proposals.</p>
(19) Resident, (High Street, Shrivenham)	<p>I live in the High Street and have never found it difficult to park at any time.</p> <p>The proposed scheme will cause problems for many businesses in the High Street most of which have employees who live some distance away and need to park their cars in the village whilst they work for longer than the three hour limit. These cars will be displaced to other quiet residential roads such as Stainswick Lane, Sandy Lane, Vicarage Lane, Fairthorne Way and Cox's Road to mention just a few.</p> <p>Residents of these roads will be swamped with cars outside their homes that could cause some- serious animosity. There are no off road car parks for High Street users.</p> <p>In order to increase the amount of parking places the double yellow lines outside the Methodist Church should be removed. Cars parked here would slow traffic flow and be of benefit to the village. These lines were only necessary when the road was the main A420.</p> <p>When I was on the Parish Council in the naughty's we did a survey over a two week period when we questioned drivers arriving in the village between 7am and 10am and we found no commuters who were parking all day. I believe this is still the case today. There needs to be a new survey done before this drastic action is undertaken.</p> <p>No mention has been made about the cost of the scheme and who will pay for it. It is doubtful that many residents will pay the fee for a permit and similarly business owners will also park in the side roads rather than pay £190 for each vehicle. Any idea that the scheme will be self-funding looks very unlikely.</p>

	<p>No evidence of commuters parking in the village and travelling to work in other places has been put forward by the Parish Council to justify this significant change to life in our High Street. Almost all areas of the village are within walking distance of the High Street so there is no need for residents of the village to use a car to visit the shops, Post Office and the doctors.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposals.</p>
--	--

C. Online responses:

RESPONDENT	COMMENTS
<p>(20) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Charlotte Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  On church walk there is the issue of the dr surgery that doesn’t have any parking but some won’t be able to walk from the car park on martins road</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Parking is hard on the high street but 3 hours will allow shopping to be done and people to go to the doctors</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  It will make the high street more accessible</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(21) As a business, (Shrivenham, Elm Tree Surgery)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>No objection</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>No objection</b>  Since the school moved there have been no issues with accessing a parking space , in the winter staff will be at risk as street lighting is not particularly good in the village , GP need to be able to access vehicle during the day , they would have to park a significant way from the surgery . We have disabled staff members who do not use</p>



	<p>the 1 disabled as it is a short distance and they don't want to affect other disabled badge holders they will be forced to use bays restricting access .</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> There is no longer a need to as lots of parking since school moved</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b> 2 bays when there is aging population and staff will use these as wont be able to walk from public car as to far</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
(22) As a business, (Shrivenham, High street)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b></p> <p>This will have a massive affect on businesses customers are already struggling to park in the spaces has anyone actually done a survey to ask people what and why they are parking there. Lots of houses in the high street don't have parking is it just that more house have more cars per house now</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> If it's 3 hours that ok however if someone comes to town to get a treatment or have there hair done to goes to the post office and has to queue up then goes for lunch 3 hours is that enough time</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> If more is required I have never seen the ones we have taken</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
(23) As a business, (Shrivenham, High street)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Partially support</b></p> <p>As part of a group of girls that work in a salon on the high street,three of us in particular drive to work every day. How will this affect our right to park close to our place of business? Also it will affect our business as clients of ours are generally most weeks in the salon for more than three hours depending on what they are booked in for.</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> As mentioned above,would depend how many permits as a business we would be allowed to apply for and spaces for our clients who also drive from outside the area.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Agree more disabled spaces are needed.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> Do not feel it's overly needed now school has moved etc.</p>
(24) Local resident, (Shrivenham, No)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b> Absolute joke proposal, there is no shortage of parking if people just use their legs and walk a bit further. More rules and confusion will hamper business in the village, which is hardly thriving (see the crown...)</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> Object</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b> Object</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> Rules rules rules</p>
(25) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Hazells lane)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>No objection</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>No objection</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b> Parking down Hazells lane is predominantly that of residents of Hazells lane, who do not have vehicle parking on their property for multiple vehicles or any vehicles at all, therefore instead of adding double yellow lines could it not be permit parking only with each residence being given permits for 2 vehicles max with the option of having temporary permits for visitors. Along with making Hazells lane one way from the high street to vicarage lane.</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  3hrs parking would stop people using the village as a park and ride to Oxford.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  NA</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(26) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Good idea...we have people parking pin front of our access driveway continuously</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Strong objection  We live at 11 High Street  Previously a pub requiring many parking spaces we now only use 2. we are now residential ( 4 bed property)  We need at least 2 parking permits to be supplied by the council otherwise we have no where to park and our overnight visitors are the same</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Good idea</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  Consider residents more</p>
<p>(27) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Barrington Avenue)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b>  There is no requirement for additional limitations on motorists in Shrivenham.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b></p>

	<p>The current parking system has not proven a problem to local residents. There is no requirement for additional measures</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> Nil</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> There is no compelling argument for this proposal. There have been no issues in Shrivenham, this is just a waste of resources that could be better focused elsewhere.</p>
<p>(28) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Benfield Place)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> Logical proposal</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Stop people parking all day and not using local facilities.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Better access for disabled required</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(29) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Berens Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b></p> <p>The parking on the roadside from Co-Op westwards would provide extra spaces for the flower shop and the Co-Op. It is used now and very useful and also provides little or no problem,</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> 3 hrs is plenty of time for use of shop or even lunch at the pub or Bloomfields. We must stop people using the high street to catch the bus to Swindon or Oxford.</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> I don't see we need too many and the proposal increases to a reasonable number.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> Residents do not own or should not expect access to a parking spot outside their property on the high street. Similarly Businesses should not expect their employees to block spaces that should be used by customers. I OBJECT to Businesses being able to h</p>
<p>(30) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Berens Roas)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> Not sure how reducing parking on the high street and church walk will help!</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b> Can see how this would help with the commuter issue. Could some thought be given to those working on the High Street and parking alternatives/ provision for them</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Very limited disabled parking, particularly near the doctors, it needs to be better enforced and a sensible additional amount rather than too many.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b> Could areas next to the shops be specified as 3 hours but others further down the high street left for residents/ as is?</p>
<p>(31) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Carlton Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Church Walk: Partially support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Hazell's Lane: Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – Have witnessed parking in these side streets as excessive on occasions.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Support 3 hour parking limits, concerned the long stay parking issues will move to village hall and martins road. More parking bays would be needed in these car parks or the problem may move to other side streets example: Catherine's Close.</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> Supported as suggested.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> As a regular user of village hall I have experienced and witnessed bad parking. PLEASE can the markings in the village hall car park be improved to be more clearly identified by car drivers. 🚗</p>
(32) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Catherine Close)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b> There are plans to change a number of key public buildings on the High St/Church Walk e.g. the Surgery, Barrington Arms and old Village School which will mean even though the new School is no longer in this area, access for residents from Shrivenham and other local villages will still need to access the High St so it should not be clogged up by those using it as a Park and Ride.</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>No objection</b> I use the High Street on foot at least once a day and irresponsible parking near One Stop Shop and Co-Op make it difficult for crossing the road despite the zebra crossing. However, I am in favour of residents not paying for their permit +1 but paying for more if needed.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> I have to use the Blue Badge spaces on occasion and one of my neighbours all the time, in variably they are not available and more are definitely needed.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> The two spaces outside the One Stop shop that are hatched need something more than just paint to stop people parking there as they invariably take up half the pavement and make visibility difficult when trying the use the crossing.</p>
(33) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Catherine Close)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> Must also be double yellow lines at the north end of Fairthorne Way. This area is heavily used for parking now.</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Must be enforced!</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Fully supported</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> Separate letter sent to Director of Environment &amp; Highways (posted 5th August)</p>
<p>(34) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Chalbury road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b> I support the double yellows on the high street and partially on Church walk and Hazells lane, partially on Hazells lane and church walk because there has to be a bit of common sense applied rather than just a blanket double yellow.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Its a nightmare being able to park on the high street, more so since the ridiculous keep clear box was put back in outside bloomfields, that should never have happened when the change of use/licencing went from a garage to the Deli. Its annoying when you have reduced mobility as i do and cars are dumped on the high street for 8,9 or 10 hours a day and its more of a struggle to get to the shops. The shops are also empty when the high street is full of cars.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> The two disabled spots outside the doctors and Pharmacy are not sufficient, the council missed out on putting a parent and child space and disabled space outside the one stop in the odd shaped bays last time it was all painted.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> Its ok putting these restrictions in place but you have to enforce them, OCC currently use contractors to enforce parking and they charge OCC to come out on average twice a day but don't turn up twice a month. The disabled bays are always being abused by</p>
<p>(35) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Chapelwick Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p><b>Hazell's Lane DYLS – Support</b>  I do not support no waiting restriction outside the Methodist Church on the High Street, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disabled and elderly People attending church need to alight here when parking behind the church is taken particularly funerals.</li> <li>2. When the A420 came through the village, double yellow lines were installed but once the bypass was built, this restriction was no longer required. For the past many years parking has taken place here and is short term to allow access to shops once parking is full outside the shops. Parking here acts as a slow down to traffic even though the 20 mph is in force, there are instances of vehicles driving above the limit see latest traffic surveys.</li> </ol> <p><b>Shared-use' parking bays – Support</b>  Parking should be for those shopping or calling on businesses not for people Woking in the shops for full or half days. There should be a sign to the official car Park on Highworth Road.</p> <p><b>Disabled Persons Parking Places – Partially support</b>  Would like to see disabled parking outside the Post Office otherwise support the improvements.</p> <p><b>Overall opinion – Support</b>  The parking situation in the village has worsened as the housing stock has increased.</p>
<p>(36) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Chapelwick Close)</p>	<p><b>High Street DYLS – Object</b>  <b>Church Walk DYLS – Object</b>  <b>Hazell's Lane DYLS – Object</b></p> <p>There can be some inconvenience with cars parked on the roads highlighted, but by and large, it is a minor inconvenience at best. Adding double yellow lines seems to me to be substantive over-reaction to this.</p> <p><b>Shared-use' parking bays – Object</b>  Only on very rare occasions have I been unable to park on the High Street - and this has been exclusively based on local events i.e. the Shrivenham Annual Fete, which brings in large numbers of people from the surrounding area (good for local businesses).</p> <p>I don't want to see the introduction of permits, which adds, at best, an unnecessary administrative burden to local residents, but also inconvenience and limitations for friends and family visiting - as well as an additional cost to purchase the permits (if the plan is for them to be free, then I suspect this will be only a matter of time before a fee is charged for them).</p>



	<p>3 hours is not a long time for visitors to the village to see friends/family as well as partake in the various sporting and cultural activities which happen here. As such I suspect this will penalise well meaning and welcome visitors more than the intended commuters.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b> I do sympathise with those who are disabled and the additional struggle to access places. However, I often see the reserved space empty. As such, whilst I will admit it is possible that two cars may want to use the reserved space at the same time, I do not</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
(37) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Chapelwick close)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> This will make turning/access/safety for those walking etc better</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> It will mean more spaces becoming available throughout the day. I would however suggest the 3hr rule running only between set times of the day, leaving evenings and into the early morning non restricted for visitors of those living on the high street. This is also outside of busy times where shops are impacted</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> I feel we should try to be more inclusive if those with disabilities are struggling to park</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
(38) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Charlbury)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>No objection</b> Surely the implementation of parking restrictions on the High St will result in the surrounding Rd such as Stainswick Lane, Fairthorne Way etc becoming the new parking for commuters? I agree parking is bad however I’d support a restricted time limit or even pay &amp; display rather than push the problem to surrounding roads.</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> As per previous comments. Church Walk should possibly be limited to disabled parking or permit holders only as this is used by the Drs.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> There are already disabled parking areas which are poorly marked &amp; incorrectly used.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> If a short time limit such as 30 mins or 1 hour is applied this would stop commuters. If you there is currently no parent &amp; baby parking which would be a good idea rather than just disabled parking.</p>
<p>(39) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Charlbury Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> I see nothing against having double yellow lines in those locations</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No opinion</b> I would like to know how many parking spaces are currently used by residents and businesses. Commuters are accused to occupying a lot of spaces, though I have never seen any proof of this.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> I have no objection.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> Certainly something needs doing re parking in the High Street. I live in Charlbury Road and have mobility issues (though am not a disabled badge holder) so I do need to park close to chemist, doctors and post office. I have on more than one occasion had</p>
<p>(40) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Charlotte Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>No objection</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>No objection</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>No objection</b> I'm not sure what difference this will make but I don't object to it.</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  People park in the High Street all day to catch the bus preventing others parking to visit and support local businesses.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  We don't need any more spaces and they will not be used appropriately as not policed.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(41) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Charlotte  close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazel lane is very narrow and parked cars already makes it difficult to navigate.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Parking on the high street to use the local shops is really difficult.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  There are very few at present</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  Parking needs to be improved and a 3 hour time limit will make a big difference.</p>
<p>(42) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Chestnut  Gardens,still unadopted  after 7 years!)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>No objection</b>  People have to park somewhere when shopping in our delightful village</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Good for residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  Too many disabled parking slots already.</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  The High Street and B4000 need resurfacing as well as the footpaths which are treacherous from Queens Crescent to the village along the Highworth Road.  My neighbours have mobility scooter one side and walking frame the other and are unable to go to the vi</p>
<p>(43) As part of a group/organisation, (Shrivenham, Church Walk)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  Since the relocation at Shrivenham Primary School from the High Street there is now plentiful parking. Elm Tree surgery has never had any dedicated parking and staff and patients will park along the roads suggested. Double yellow lines will restrict access to our patients to the surgery and this will put increased pressure on the remaining parking in Shrivenham. It will be a domino effect as different streets close to parking.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Firstly - Since the relocation of the primary school there is no longer any issue with parking in the areas highlighted. There is plentiful capacity. This plan is not needed anymore,. I have parked every monday-friday on the High Street for 10 years. Since the school has moved in Easter 2024 this is the best it has ever been. Now is the wrong time to change things to fix a problem that no longer exists.  Secondly - We have a large number of staff at Elm Tree Surgery including those who work across multiple sites. We also train doctors/ nurses. We would need at least 30 permits to cover all of these staff and these permits would need to be changed frequently as staff / trainees come and go. If we had insufficient permits the high street will be empty but the roads not in this scheme will be full of cars, and next year I would suspect they would complain.  Thirdly- This scheme is unworkable and unfair for our rural patients. If a patient comes for an appointment in the morning and then needs a blood test/follow up in the afternoon or later that morning they would not be able to park as the car would have already been in the area. Or a family member with an appointment at the surgery in the morning and another family member in the afternoon. They would fall foul of being in a parking bay for more than 3 hours even though they were not there all day. We are a rural practice and there is no other way to get here apart from in a car. We also dispense medications to patients (as a pharmacy would) thus commonly a patient would see a clinician for an appointment, go home, and then come back to collect the medication. This would also be very challenging under the proposed scheme.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b></p>

	<p>I would support better accommodation than the current disabled parking places. However the bigger issue patients have had over the last 10 years I have been a doctor here is the uneven state of the pavement. People never complain about the parking. The p</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  Please see my previous comments based on working in Shrivenham for patients for the last 10 years. Parking is currently the easiest it has ever been. We used to have significant issues at school pickup time if we were returning from a home visit and unabl</p>
<p>(44) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Church Walk)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  some waiting time should be allowed for those dropping off or picking up say from businesses or bus stop</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  n/a</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  n/a</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  as a resident (without home parking) it can almost be impossible to find parking. the High Street/Church Walk is used as a 'park and ride'. Noticeably quieter during school holidays.</p>
<p>(45) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Cleycourt)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Good idea to stop park and ride</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b>  Stop park and ride users</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>Necessary in size of village</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(46) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Cleycourt Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b> This would further reduce available parking. I would only support extra double yellow lines if safety was a concern.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> This is OK provided the permits are free.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> An extra 4/5 places would be OK. More than this would leave too many unused spaces.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> Who is going to police the system? We rarely see a warden in the village.</p>
<p>(47) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Cleycourt Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> Current double line provision by Methodist church is widely ignored for short term parking. How are these new restrictions going to enforced? Would 10 minute waiting be more appropriate?</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> I support 3hr overall limit in the High Street. Presumably permit parking will have no more impact than at present?</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> My wife has a blue badge and present provision is inadequate.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> The effectiveness of any changes will very much depend on the quality of enforcement</p>

<p>(48) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Colton)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Too many people think it is their right to park anywhere they like whether they cause an obstruction or not</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Too many people drive to shrivenham and use the bus to go to Swindon or Oxford and some even go on holiday leaving their car in the High Street.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Having had a disabled partner I know how difficult it is to obtain a disabled parking space.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(49) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Colton Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  If I wish to pop to the shops before continuing on my journey I find it difficult to park, going up and down the high street looking fir a spot. Limited parking on the High Street would hopefully solve the problem.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Again limited parking will free up spots in the village for the villagers to park.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  A lot of retired and elderly live in the village.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  Who will monitor the parking limits.</p>
<p>(50) Local resident, (Shrivenham, ConstantineClose)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>Too many cars make walking difficult and access to shops</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Commuters park all day so locals cannot park near shops,pharmacy and doctors</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Only two disabled bays - not enough for ageing population</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(51) Local Cllr (i.e. Town/Parish/District), (Shrivenham, Coxs Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> to ensure clear areas to allow flow of traffic.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> It is known some people park all day and get the bus. Also one mini van has previously parked "all winter" in a space near the doctors. The proposal is fully supported to enable the spaces to be used for the intended purpose - those that live in the High Street or those using the facilities. This will enable that to happen.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Allowing access to area around the Doctors surgery and the Pharmacy seems logical to enable those that need support to get to and use the facilities.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(52) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Cox's Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> As a disbled driver it is very difficult to park to get shopping both form The Co-op and One Stop shop. People are parking at all angle by the Co-op and there are no disabled bays near The One Stop or the Post Office and onl one near the surgery. The three hours is fine as long as it is policed, half the cars are abled bodied shop workers and</p>



	<p>residents who have not got on site parking, a residents only parking area needs to be made somewhere near the village for them. People buy houses with no regard as to where they will park and seem to assume that their road fund licence covers free parking on the road, it does not.</p> <p><b>Shared-use' parking bays – No objection</b>  As a disabled driver it is very difficult to park to get shopping both from The Co-op and One Stop shop. People are parking at all angle by the Co-op and there are no disabled bays near The One Stop or the Post Office and only one near the surgery. The three hours is fine as long as it is policed, half the cars are able bodied shop workers and residents who have not got on site parking, a residents only parking area needs to be made somewhere near the village for them. People buy houses with no regard as to where they will park and seem to assume that their road fund licence covers free parking on the road, it does not.</p> <p><b>Disabled Persons Parking Places – Support</b>  As a disabled driver it is very difficult to park to get shopping both from The Co-op and One Stop shop. People are parking at all angle by the Co-op and there are no disabled bays near The One Stop or the Post Office and only one near the surgery. The three</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b></p>
<p>(53) As a business,  (Shrivenham, Elm Tree Surgery)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b></p> <p>As an NHS employee who works within the village I find the proposed parking restrictions to be unnecessary. Since the school has moved location parking on the high street is no longer an issue. When working at the local doctors surgery I would as a lone female find it uncomfortable to be walking in the dark winter nights to the local car parks, especially so after a long shift. I also feel that the local businesses would suffer loss of trade and the high street would become a dead zone.</p> <p><b>Shared-use' parking bays – Object</b>  Not needed, parking is not an issue on the high street. The proposal would ruin the feel of the village high street. Feel that locals would be pushed out to other localities which offer free parking.</p> <p><b>Disabled Persons Parking Places – No objection</b>  no objection to this option as there is currently only one designated disabled parking bay</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  loss of trade for local businesses, loss of the village feel of the high street, object to locals not being able to park in the high street. Feel that the parking restrictions are very unnecessary.</p>
<p>(54) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Fairthorne Way)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Don't need double yellow on High Street or Church Walk but Hazels Lane needs partial double yellow to prevent blockage</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Will stop parking being taken up by commuters and will encourage shoppers to visit.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  There are already enough disabled bays</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  See previous answers</p>
<p>(55) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Faringdon Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Parking should only be in the designated bays. Currently there is too much abuse of the double yellow lines at the western end of the high street.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  The High Street is treated like a park and ride. local who want to use the shops struggle to get a space. 3 hours is too long - 2 hours is enough even for a doctors or hair appointment.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  The current proposal is sufficient. I do not think it should be increased beyond that as these bays are not filled on a regular basis - look at supermarkets for example.</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  I live 150m from the High Street and this scheme has my support. However, it will need to be enforced otherwise it will be ignored and we will not see the benefit in the village. Sadly, I suspect this will push people to park in unsuitable residential str</p>
<p>(56) Employee of local business, (Shrivenham, faringdon road and high street)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  i work for 8 hours in the surgery</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  i need to park longer than 3 hours, there are always parking available its not like we struggle so therefore we need a permit</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  they should be treated like everyone else</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  for us workers in the street, it makes no sense on why you are doing it</p>
<p>(57) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Hazells Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  I think the most dangerous part of the high street is parking on the quarter spaces on the Onestop side of the zebra crossing. High sided vehicles completely obscure sight of pedestrians approaching rhe crossing. The closest slots could be the bicycle only parking which would be safer, or just bollard them, they're like quarter sized slots that leave the majority of a vehicle on the pavement.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  I support the 3 hour limit but am concerned that residents should have to pay for their permits. I would be outraged if I was in that situation.</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> No objection</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> Overall, pushing all day parkers to the proper car parks is good but would also be a good time to make the area around the zebra crossing safer. I'd like to see bollards at the back of each space too to keep the pavements clearer. Sometimes vehicles park</p>
<p>(58) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Hazells Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Object</b></p> <p>I was at school in this village 65 years ago - a lovely village for the most part devoid of over bureaucratic nonsense. The people make this village and they deserve to live in an English country environment. Yellow lines, restrictions and permits are necessary in our towns but not here. The people that advocate such things have no heart or soul for our village. Parking restrictions in Hazells Lane where we live would be an eyesore, a pain for everyone living here and only serves to boost the ego of someone on a power trip.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> As aboth</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> The disabled need reserved spaces to make their life easier.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> There is no need for any of this - it's just a hugely costly bureaucratic unnecessary nonsense that will simply inconvenience our villagers. Whoever I want to park in the high street it can be difficult but a little perseverance and it's fine. Rather that</p>
<p>(59) Employee of local business, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b> some restriction appropriate</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk could be restricted, but not High Street</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> disabled spaces needed near to Surgery</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> support some restriction, but needs to consider people who need to park for long periods</p>
(60) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>No opinion</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>No opinion</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>No opinion</b> I would hope that the placement of these lines has been carefully planned and are a definite requirement.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> As a local resident - why on earth should I have to pay £110 x2 per year, for no more guarantee than I have now of being able to park? People who park for 3hrs are not paying anything. Why and what is our household's increased outgoing budget of £220 paying for exactly? How will this all be enforced? The current documents do not make any mention of this...</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b> I do not object to disabled parking providing a need has been proved &amp; established. Has a survey been run that concludes the current disabled spots - 2 I believe - are fully utilised most of the day?</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> I object to any plan where residents have to pay for a right to park outside their own house. And at a substantial cost. What is the money going towards? Who will enforce this? Has a survey been conducted - and where have the results been published - t</p>
(61) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>No objection</b> Church Walk DYs –</p>

	<p>Hazell's Lane DYLS –  You have not mentioned the double yellow lines on the north side of the high street running from The Florist Shop west. This area is constantly in use by shoppers and take-away users of the Indian Restaurant. It would be a good idea to create a White Line box with a time limit of, say, 15 minutes to regularise what is already happening.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Should help with parking in general. I am concerned as to how these measures will be enforced.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  Disabled people need help</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(62) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  The High Street in Shrivenham is, as you are aware, being used currently as an all day free car park for commuters to Swindon &amp; Oxford. This does not allow local residents, visitors &amp; businesses space to park themselves.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  This offers potential parking spaces for people attending the surgery in Church Walk.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  Spaces for this is needed.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  People park now on the current double yellow lines in the High Street and also along the zig zag lines at the zebra crossing - who is going to 'police' these new parking restrictions. Our house is on the corner of the High Street and Manor Lane. We normal</p>
<p>(63) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>No objection</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>No objection</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>No objection</b></p>

	<p>The proposal makes formal areas where parking is unsocial and/or dangerous - where sensible and responsible people would not park anyway.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  <b>OBJECT MOST STRONGLY</b> to the exclusion of 7 High Street from eligibility for resident permits. We currently park one car on the High Street. We have a carriage arch accessing a courtyard which is suitable for parking one small car only. There is insufficient clearance to get a large car in there. This proposal would leave us with no practical parking options for our large car, and affect the value of our property.  <b>OBJECT</b> to the parking restriction timings which are unnecessarily blunt. That they should only apply on weekdays 8am to 6pm, and not at all at weekends. This would achieve the aim of the plan but allow residents to have overnight and weekend visitors without the need for temporary permits. It would also allow overnight parking for those frequenting the villages pubs and restaurants, reducing the possibility of drunk drivers.  <b>OBJECT</b> to the lack of detailed thought to maximise space: 1) There is a viable parking space next to the bus stop on the south side of the High St, currently with a (rarely, if ever) used bike rack. Move the bike rack to one of the dead spaces between pavement and trees on the south side and gain another parking space. 2) There is no need to remove the bike racks on the north side by the surgery. Simply reorient them through 90 degrees in situ to take up half a parking space and then extend the parking space further out toward the road.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  NA</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  <b>OBJECT</b> to the lack of strategic thought to reduce car use. If one of the causes of "overuse" of the High St parking is people from outlying villages using it for park and ride on the S6 service, what plans are there to deal with this? Or are we content to</p>
<p>(64) As part of a group/organisation, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Funeral cars and emergency services need to wait on Churh walk. People with poor mobility need access to dr surgery</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b></p>

	<p>This will cause chaos for people working at local businesses who work 11 hour shifts. No provision provided for example doctor has a large number of workers travelling from outside shrivenham . No provision provided for staff to park. 2 permits per business is unacceptable , this also applies to chemist , coop one stop cafes etc It will also put people off visiting businesses. The residents will not like having to pay outside their own front doors</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b> People with blue badges can park anywhere, they don,t need designated spaces.current space used occasionally</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> This a small village. This proposal will disrupt businesses, The parking on high street has improved due to school moving. There are spaces most days. Cannot comprehend why these proposals are needed</p>
(65) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> The most important thing to improve the situation is to stop non-residents parking all-day or all-week as if the High Street is a permanent free car park. The daily restriction should achieve this as long as it is strictly enforced</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b> Nothing further to add</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> This is important</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
(66) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – Hazell’s Lane DYLS – I and my wife both approve wholeheartedly of these proposals. They represent a much needed change for the benefit of all in the village. We look forward to them being installed and, crucially, also enforced.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b></p>



	<p>A much needed change. to enable more appropriate and better use of the existing spaces.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> This change will enable better access for disabled persons to these vital areas.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> We totally support these proposals that have been carefully thought through with consideration for all in the village.</p>
<p>(67) As a business, (Shrivenham, High street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>No objection</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>No objection</b> Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>No objection</b> The double yellow lines are required</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> I think this proposal will just push parking onto other roads in the village, thus creating problems for local residents. Also, before the Primary School moved there was a parking problem - now less so. This morning at 11am, I counted 21 empty spaces.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> There is a need for more disabled persons spaces.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> I support more double yellow lines in appropriate places (eg, close to junctions) and more parking spaces for disabled persons, but to charge local residents and businesses for parking space permits will not work. The problem will just be moved from the</p>
<p>(68) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – Hazell’s Lane DYLS – The proposals are a very sensible solution for the good of the whole village community.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> I live in the High Street and believe that these proposals are much needed.</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Access as indicated for disabled persons is really needed.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  I look forward to the proposals being actioned and subsequently enforced.</p>
<p>(69) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk is where the doctors surgery is, doctors need to park there as do disabled people.  Hazell’s Lane- restrictions here will force residence and visitors, carers onto the High Street.  High Street- parking restrictions will create more congestion in main High Street, this takes away spaces instead of creating more spaces.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Imposed parking permits for residents will not create or guarantee a parking space. Residents are being penalised by having to pay to park outside/near their property. Most visitors do not exceed 3 hours (popping to post office, doctor’s appointments, grabbing sandwich newspaper etc first thing on way to work, lunch in cafe) therefore it is the residents that are being financially penalised once again.  Objection to only 2 permits would be allowed, what happens if 3rd household member works from home sometimes?  High Street parking should be free to High Street residents. High Street parking should be free for High Street business owners and workers, doctors etc.  The point raised re commuters is a minor issue, the High Street has been much better since the primary school moved to its new location in April 24.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  Are the proposed additional disabled parking spaces outside the pharmacy required, could they be for anyone collecting prescriptions? Will these spaces have a time limit? Or can anyone use them when the pharmacy is closed?  Blue badge holders should be abl</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>

	<p>The village has expanded with over 1000 new homes and Planning has given no consideration as to the impact this has had on the village and its amenities. Local authority solution appears to be to penalise the residents on the High Street who are mainly pe</p>
<p>(70) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b></p> <p>Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the new proposals, outlined in your CM/12.6.345/P0217 dated 11 Jul 24, for changes to the car parking arrangements at Shrivenham. My comments below do not touch on the peripheral issues of yellow lines, additional disabled parking etc but concentrate of the prime issue of car parking in the High Street and the introduction of Permit Parking for residents.</p> <p>My first point is that I have difficulty identifying exactly what problem it is that we are trying to address. From the arguments that I have seen, i gather that there is a feeling that a particular group of motorists, namely commuters who leave their cars here all day and travel onwards by other means, are hogging more than their fair share of available parking spaces. An alternative view which I feel carries greater weight, is that the number of local cars wishing to park in the High Street for short periods, has increased hugely since the powers-that-be decided to double the size of our village by building new houses over the last 8 years. If this is the case, any restrictions to long-term parking arrangements, including Resident Permits, will have little effect on the availability of short-term parking spaces.</p> <p>As a matter of interest, we have lived on the High Street for 26 years and have always owned 2 cars, one of which we have kept on our drive and the other parked outside our house. In all that time, I truly believe that I have been unable to park within 30 yards of my front door (my definition of "outside my house") on less than only 20 occasions - in other words, less than once per year on average. That doesn't sound like much of a problem to me! If considerations of "convenience" is a driver for change, and thus relevant in the pursuit of more parking in central Shrivenham (i.e. near the shops), my own circumstances are relevant. Our house is close to the end of the High Street, away from the centre of the village, and thus, in an area where you might expect more available parking spaces , and yet I can walk slowly to the farthest shop or amenity in no more than 5 minutes. That seems pretty 'convenient' to me!</p> <p>But if the crux of the issue is indeed the commuters who park long-term in the High Street (which seems unlikely to me), my question then becomes 'how will the proposed changes be enforced'? The best-laid scheme, however sound, will be useless unless enforced - and this does not mean today and tomorrow and maybe sometime next month, but everyday, all day, forever, and by an 'official' traffic warden with appropriate powers, and not by another posse of self-appointed vigilantes. Realistically, and because of the proposed 3 hour parking limit, a warden would have to be on hand from before the first illegal parkers arrive until more than 3 hours later; in other words, at least half a day per day, excluding any travel time in working hours. I do not believe that OCC will fund such an arrangement and monies raised from the cost of residents parking permits should certainly not be expected to do so.</p>

Finally, how is the success or otherwise of the new arrangements going to be determined (I hesitate to use the word 'measured' as I doubt that the supposed problem itself had been quantified to any extent)? The proposed scheme will have an impact on people in the village, whether or not they are motorists themselves. For instance, new signage will add to visual pollution, people currently unaffected by the current 'problem', if it exists, are likely to be confronted by additional parking in their streets when 'illegal' parkers are forced off the High Street; and, finally, unless plans are made and committed to now, to assess the efficacy of the proposed changes in due course, all the negative consequences of the proposed changes, including the cost of Parking Permits will exist forever, whether the scheme works or not.

I believe that the risks of the proposed changes NOT improving the situation far outweigh the chances of the new arrangements improving matters. Taking all the above points into consideration, I find myself unable to support the proposed changes to parking arrangements in the centre of Shrivenham. They should be scrapped now.

#### Shared-use' parking bays – **Object**

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the new proposals, outlined in your CM/12.6.345/P0217 dated 11 Jul 24, for changes to the car parking arrangements at Shrivenham. My comments below do not touch on the peripheral issues of yellow lines, additional disabled parking etc but concentrate of the prime issue of car parking in the High Street and the introduction of Permit Parking for residents.

My first point is that I have difficulty identifying exactly what problem it is that we are trying to address. From the arguments that I have seen, I gather that there is a feeling that a particular group of motorists, namely commuters who leave their cars here all day and travel onwards by other means, are hogging more than their fair share of available parking spaces. An alternative view which I feel carries greater weight, is that the number of local cars wishing to park in the High Street for short periods, has increased hugely since the powers-that-be decided to double the size of our village by building new houses over the last 8 years. If this is the case, any restrictions to long-term parking arrangements, including Resident Permits, will have little effect on the availability of short-term parking spaces.

As a matter of interest, we have lived on the High Street for 26 years and have always owned 2 cars, one of which we have kept on our drive and the other parked outside our house. In all that time, I truly believe that I have been unable to park within 30 yards of my front door (my definition of "outside my house") on less than only 20 occasions - in other words, less than once per year on average. That doesn't sound like much of a problem to me! If considerations of "convenience" is a driver for change, and thus relevant in the pursuit of more parking in central Shrivenham (i.e. near the shops), my own circumstances are relevant. Our house is close to the end of the High Street, away from the centre of the village, and thus, in an area where you might expect more available parking spaces, and yet I can walk slowly to the farthest shop or amenity in no more than 5 minutes. That seems pretty 'convenient' to me!

But if the crux of the issue is indeed the commuters who park long-term in the High Street (which seems unlikely to me), my question then becomes 'how will the proposed changes be enforced'? The best-laid scheme, however sound, will be useless unless enforced - and this does not mean today and tomorrow and maybe sometime next month, but

	<p>everyday, all day, forever, and by an 'official' traffic warden with appropriate powers, and not by another posse of self-appointed vigilantes. Realistically, and because of the proposed 3 hour parking limit, a warden would have to be on hand from before the first illegal parkers arrive until more than 3 hours later; in other words, at least half a day per day, excluding any travel time in working hours. I do not believe that OCC will fund such an arrangement and monies raised from the cost of residents parking permits should certainly not be expected to do so.</p> <p>Finally, how is the success or otherwise of the new arrangements going to be determined (I hesitate to use the word 'measured' as I doubt that the supposed problem itself had been quantified to any extent)? The proposed scheme will have an impact on people in the village, whether or not they are motorists themselves. For instance, new signage will add to visual pollution, people currently unaffected by the current 'problem', if it exists, are likely to be confronted by additional parking in their streets when 'illegal' parkers are forced off the High Street; and, finally, unless plans are made and committed to now, to assess the efficacy of the proposed changes in due course, all the negative consequences of the proposed changes, including the cost of Parking Permits will exist forever, whether the scheme works or not.</p> <p>I believe that the risks of the proposed changes NOT improving the situation far outweigh the chances of the new arrangements improving matters. Taking all the above points into consideration, I find myself unable to support the proposed changes to parking arrangements in the centre of Shrivenham. They should be scrapped now.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> Is there a demonstrable need for additional disabled parking?</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
<p>(71) As a business, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Object</b></p> <p>A traffic warden has come on Saturdays where my customers run out of the shop and do not return. losing business in fear of yellow lines if no spaces available will not stop in Shrivenham and go to supermarket. Traffic in front of my business turnaround on average 30 mins so very unnecessary for traffic warden. Also the advantage of using yellow lines for a short time is it helps reduce speeding and traffic calming which makes it safer for parked cars leaving. Whilst unloading myself on yellow lines from a car not classed as a commercial vehicle delivering stock I have received 3 parking tickets after only parking for 6 minutes... this is costing the business money reducing our customer base at an already challenging time of increased costs and less customers do you want to support local businesses and keep a high street. Shrivenham is such a unique well served village due to the business available to the residents and local community, why destroy this. Traffic wardens on a Saturday!!!! People are not using the yellow lines to leave</p>

	<p>their cars there all day.... they are using the yellow lines to quickly pop into a local business to support us and keep the village high street alive!</p> <p><b>Shared-use' parking bays – Object</b>  Ridiculous to bring this into a community village some residents on the high street have no driveways and for business we employ people who drive to work and need to park for a whole shift if we have to purchase a permit or several an extra cost we have to pass onto the customers in difficult economic times! Hard to employ good people they may not want to or are unable to park else where the car park at the bowls club could be too full under these new rules and then the problems will move to other residential streets upsetting residents and customers! Outside our premises on average a car is parked less than 30 minutes!!  I value my team who work in my business and do not want to discourage them in any way or feel not supported by the community when they give so much. They should be able to use the parking as they have done for many years.  Also it is not guaranteed we get a permit as a business we have to have a valid reason....again not supporting your local business.  What do we do whilst unloading... no permit but receive tickets from traffic wardens all very unfriendly!</p> <p><b>Disabled Persons Parking Places – No objection</b>  no objections</p> <p><b>Overall opinion – Object</b>  Now the school has moved there seems to be a lot more available spaces all throughout the day perhaps many staff used the high street, sadly the school move has also reduced our customer numbers</p>
<p>(72) As part of a group/organisation, (Shrivenham, High street Shrivenham)</p>	<p><b>High Street DYLS – Object</b>  <b>Church Walk DYLS – Object</b>  <b>Hazell's Lane DYLS – Object</b>  No issues with current system. Will unnecessarily cause complication and problems.</p> <p><b>Shared-use' parking bays – Object</b>  Again, no issue with current system.</p> <p><b>Disabled Persons Parking Places – Object</b>  Works fine as current system</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
<p>(73) Employee of local business, (Shrivenham, High street/church walk)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  Will cause issues on other roads</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Stopping employees of local business and residents parking without a fee  The doctors surgery will lose staff , as can't park near surgery many of us work long hours, shifts lasting between 5 and 11 hours, and admin staff paid low wages , it will not be viable for us to continue working there. We will all have to park on other residential roads, which local residents won't be happy with</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  Most disabled people have blue badgers and park where they want</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  It is going to have a big impact on local businesses and put people off supporting them.  The high street will go downhill, . The parking on high street has improved since school has moved. There is no need for restrictions</p>
<p>(74) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Highworth road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  The parking has been much improved since the school moved. We need the businesses and they will suffer from this proposal.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b>  Seems like a reasonable compromise. Residents would have to be allowed extra passes for guests though.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Makes sense</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(75) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Highworth Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Restrictions needed to prevent people parking inconsiderately and making use of long term free parking without restriction</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  As before</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  As before, current provision inadequate</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(76) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Highworth Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  There is clearly room for additional parallel bays on the High Street in the Methodist Church area, which would be beneficial since I have yet to be convinced that the changes will go 100% of the way to meeting capacity given the huge increase in village population due to massive new housing developments on the outskirts.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  I support this proposal to overcome any problem of all day parking by those commuting to surrounding towns</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  A total of 3 disabled parking bays in front of the Pharmacy, i.e, an extra 2 bays, seems overkill since the current single bay appears to be rarely used and there are many surrounding High Street homes in this section with no driveways/garages.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>



	Please see comment regarding as many as 3 disabled parking bays outside the pharmacy
(77) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Highworth Road)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p> <p>If vehicles were allowed to park in these areas it would lead to issues with pedestrian safety, limit visibility for users parking in the controlled zones and also cause issues for vehicles needing to turnaround if they have entered the roads in question.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  At present, so many of the bays are occupied by commuters for the complete day, leaving it extremely difficult for local residents to find a parking space, whether this be to visit the shops, doctors, post office, chemists, etc. Local residents have to keep driving up and down the high street, literally waiting for a space to become available. This can cause congestion and also frustration for other road users, who then exceed the 20mph speed limit as they rush by to make up for lost time. I do not support the high annual cost of the residents permit. Any charge made should be to just cover the administration / cost of printing the permit. £25 per annum is a more reasonable charge.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  There are insufficient disabled bays in the high street, and as there is very little parking enforcement in the village, these get used by anyone.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  This is long overdue and if successful, will make visiting and supporting the local businesses much easier for the local residents.</p>
(78) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Lawrence Avenue)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p> <p>Supporting. Proposals should allow better parking for all local people.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b></p>

	<p>Partially support. As before, Proposals should allow better parking for all local people BUT residents on the high street should not be charged for permits.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Current disabled provision is inadequate</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> Support proposal with the proviso expressed re high street residents permits.</p>
<p>(79) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Lawrence Avenue)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> High street always too busy with cars making or king difficult.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Support</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Useful for those in need</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(80) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Manor Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p> <p>I live in Manor Close, Shrivenham and currently there are times when due to the overspill from the village centre, cars park on both sides of the road in Manor Lane leading to the High Street. This leads to many residents having verbal altercations with mainly outside workers into the village. In addition to the frustration for local residents, there are times when larger delivery vehicles have been unable to access Manor Close from the High Street and have had to be directed via Manor Lane one way street next to the memorial hall. It is unfortunately inevitable that if Church Walk and Hazell’s Lane as well as the High Street have double Yellow Lines then the next nearest road is Manor Lane leading to Manor Close. In reality Manor Lane needs Double Yellow lines on the left hand side as you enter from the High Street to prevent parking on both sides and therefore allowing both access in and out of the road. In addition further</p>

	<p>up Manor Lane there is a blind bend where non residents park which is an accident waiting to happen when coming in or out towards Manor Close. Again Double Yellow lines here make absolute sense. This would still enable a dozen or so vehicles to park in Manor Lane and as there are only 3 cottages on this stretch there would also be capacity for non resident vehicles ultimately seeking alternative extended parking spaces.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> I am objecting based on the fact that Manor Lane is already used as an overspill car park for the High Street and imposing time restrictions in the High Street will only exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Based on the number of disabled parking spaces being in line with the real demand.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> I do not support the scheme as it stands for the reasons previously noted.</p>
<p>(81) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Manor Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p> <p>In addition to the above, I wish to comment on the changes proposed for Manor Lane. Currently the parking regulations for this lane creates a major problem and potentially a disaster waiting to happen. Frequently the parking on both sides of the lane leading from the High Street is such that a large vehicle such as an ambulance or Fire Engine would not be able to get through to Manor Close via Manor Lane from the High Street. Such vehicles could, of course, access Manor Close from the other entrance to Manor Lane by the Memorial Hall, but then their exit would be blocked, as this way in is one-way.</p> <p>The proposed changes only consider double yellow lines on both sides of Manor Lane from the High Street entrance to the bus-stop. The bus-stop is now, I understand, redundant anyway, as it was there for the use of buses dropping off or picking up children attending the Primary school. This school has now relocated to the Cross Trees development.</p> <p>With the implementation of the restrictions proposed for the High Street, Church Walk and Hazells Lane, there is certain to be additional parking pressures resulting in greater parking in Manor Lane.</p> <p>I would propose that the bus-stop is removed and double yellow lines implemented for the whole length of Manor Lane. Failing this, I would suggest that the double yellow lines be extended from the High Street, on both sides of Manor Lane along until the entrance to the driveway outside Fern House. Further that some kind of restriction similar</p>

	<p>to the 3-hour limit proposed for the High Street, be applied for the rest of Manor Lane. Alternatively the residents permit scheme could be applied for the rest of Manor Lane.</p> <p>There are currently white lines along parts of Manor Lane adjacent to the 90 degree bend. I'm not sure what restriction these lines impose. They seem to have the effect of double yellow lines. However, it is still the case that if vehicles are parked on either side of the 90 degree bend, but not encroaching on the white lines, they still cause significant difficulties for large, indeed any vehicles attempting to navigate the lane. With the implementation of the restrictions proposed for the High Street, there is certain to be additional parking along Manor Lane for any unrestricted parts right up to the junction with Manor Close. The unrestricted parking along the lane is ALREADY a problem for access. The current proposals will give an opportunity to resolve this concern.</p> <p><b>Shared-use' parking bays – Support</b> This seems like an excellent idea, as long as knock-on effects, particularly to Manor Lane, as I outlined in the previous question are considered.</p> <p><b>Disabled Persons Parking Places – Support</b> Fully support</p> <p><b>Overall opinion – Partially support</b> While I support the proposals as outlined, in my opinion they do not go far enough in considering the likely impact on other roads in the village, particularly Manor Lane. I also wonder how the new regulations are going to be policed. If the regulations</p>
(82) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Manor Close)	<p><b>High Street DYs – Partially support</b> <b>Church Walk DYs – Partially support</b> <b>Hazell's Lane DYs – Partially support</b></p> <p>Putting in additional double yellow lines is not going to solve the problem but just move it somewhere else. No-one takes any notice of the existing double yellow lines. We have lived in the Village for over 30 years &amp; cars are parked on the double yellow lines by the Methodist Church all the time &amp; always have been. Where double yellow lines are needed &amp; always have been is the blind bend in Manor Lane not far from Manor Close. It is extremely dangerous &amp; needs addressing.</p> <p><b>Shared-use' parking bays – Partially support</b> As with the double yellow lines I just feel that this is not going to solve the parking problem but just move it elsewhere. People will start parking in the side streets instead of on the High Strre.</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> I am happy to have more disabled parking places</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> Not solving the parking problem but just moving it elsewhere</p>
<p>(83) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Manor Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> Restricting the parking in the high street will only move the problem to surrounding side streets.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> It makes sense to put Double yellow lines in Church Walk and Hazells Lane but as already stated restrictions on High Street parking will only move the problem particularly in Manor Lane effecting the 50 residents with 35 cars needing access to the High Steet via the only road - Manor Lane</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> No objections.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> See above</p>
<p>(84) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Manor Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b> It will cause people to park in other side streets.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> It will cause people to park in other side streets.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Disabled people need this.</p>

	Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>
(85) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Manor Lane)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b></p> <p>I would like to put the case for double yellow lines in an area that has not been mentioned. I live in the one way bit of Manor Lane and to exit I have to go past Manor Close. At this point parking is allowed up to the corner and then resumed just past the corner. This area of parking is frequently used. So to navigate by any vehicle past the parked cars it means going round the blind corner on the wrong side. Very dangerous and a nasty accident waiting to happen. So is it possible to put double yellow lines from Manor Close, round the corner and a safe length past the corner. Currently the safe area round the corner is not big enough to use when the parking spaces are in use.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No opinion</b>  I do not use the High St for parking.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  Not an area I have knowledge of</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  Is there going to be any provision for the cycle stands to be replaced ? It seem a shame to discourage cyles.</p>
(86) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Medlar Road)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>No opinion</b></p> <p>To help regulate parking and congestion in the area and to make it safer for pedestrians.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Too many vehicles are parked for the day or longer, meaning it can be hard to find a space for a short time to visit local facilities.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  This is not something I am affected by.</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(87) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Medlar road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b>  These are rarely used</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  The number of drivers that you use the parking spaces on the high Street as parking ride and then go onto take the S6 bus to Swindon train station is incredible. I have a disabled son and it is possible to find parking spaces during the day on the high street. The businesses are losing so much trade. Free parking really has to stop.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  There are currently only two disabled spaces in the whole at the high Street.  My son is disabled and it is impossible to park on the high street during the day. There is also just no enforcement of who parks in the Disabled bays</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  It’s about time that’s paid parking is introduced. Or some kind of measure that limits people dumping their cars for the day to go and work in London and further a field. The high Street should belong to the residence and those who use the businesses ther</p>
<p>(88) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Miles Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>No objection</b>  It is getting too busy already in the high street, so action is needed.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  We need to stop long term parking there. This seems the best way to do it</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  no opinion</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(89) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Miles Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b></p> <p>The High Street is often difficult to navigate when cars and Lorries are parked outside normal Parking bays. Church Walk is narrow and anyone parking outside a bay makes it very difficult for residents visiting the Doctors surgery, particularly if they have Mobility issues.  Hazell’s lane is incredibly narrow and any street parking should be limited to those areas where there is enough room. Making Hazell’s Lane a one way road may help as would encouraging residents of the flats on the corner of Vicarage Road to park in their allocated parking spaces.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Residents of those areas need parking facilities if they don’t have access to a private driveway or garage. Car share commuters should be dissuaded from using the available spaces ... the 3 hour limit is perfectly fine to do this as it enables residents plenty of time for at least 99% of visits to High Street facilities.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Disabled parking is very limited at present</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  The huge Lorries that restock the Coop, One Stop and Florist shops often cause havoc and great difficulty passing through the High Street.</p>
<p>(90) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Northford Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>No objection</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>No objection</b></p> <p>I consider the current parking arrangements are good as they are.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  A large number of people come to Shrivenham on a daily basis to work in the shops, pubs and school and need to park their vehicle all day. Most residents have already parked their cars overnight, so do not want to have to pay for a</p>



	<p>permit. Visitors can use the main car park in the village. Also elderly/infirm people need to park in the village for daily coach outings, normally well over 3 hours duration, as the coach picks up in the High Street.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> An increase in the disabled bays is a good idea.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> The current parking works reasonably well. A 3 hour limit will cause real problems. There is no evidence that people are parking in the High Street and then catching the bus into either Swindon or Oxford for work and leaving their vehicle all day.</p>
<p>(91) Employee of local business, (Shrivenham, Prefer not to say)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b> Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b> Parking restrictions will impact people working &amp; visiting the village &amp; the only reason seems to be financial nit fir the improvement of the village, it's inhabitants and visitors</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> See previous, applies here</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> Disabled persons Nedd to park close to amenities</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> The scheme does not support the village &amp; will cause loss of revenue &amp; footfall for visitors</p>
<p>(92) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Prince Drive)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Cars obstruct the roads parking on double yellow lines constantly, causing disruption to the flow of traffic. We need to ensure allocated bays are used and reduce unnecessary blockages</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>It's evident during the week that people use the Shrivenham parking bays as a park and ride to Oxford given how much busier the village appears.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> It's important to have adequate provision for disabled users</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> Better sign posting to the car park opposite the memorial hall will also help reduce high street parking</p>
<p>(93) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Prince drive)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Driving down the high street and surround roads can be tricky due to parking</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> I've seen cars park up in the morning while walking the dog they then get on the bus to Oxford</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> There isn't enough</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(94) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Queens Crescent)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>No opinion</b> I agree with the proposals for the high st as there seems to be lots of cars parked but with no one around. Also when people do park on the yellow lines outside the Methodist church, it blocks the road which can be busy with buses and can cause delays. I partially support the proposals for church walk as the GP surgery is there so there may be people who need to park up so this needs to be carefully reviewed</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> I think it's good to restrict time so people can't park all day</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  There should be adequate parking for disabled drivers</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(95) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Raven way)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Because the parking is getting ridiculous around there sometimes can’t even park to go shop</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Yes I highly recommend this as it’s an nightmare</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  Shouldn’t need that be unfair on the locals who isn’t old and can’t get a parking but they can</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(96) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Raven way)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  There also needs to be double yellow lines added to Raven way. As the problem parking as moved with the school.</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Good idea</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  Not enough need</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  Good idea</p>

<p>(97) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Ravens Way)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Commuter parking does need addressing but this will drive them to park in other streets nearby</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  How would this be enforced? Take a ticket from a machine?</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  No real opinion on this as don't use them.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  Clearer info on how it would be run. Would be in favour of parking machines as they have in Faringdon but not on parking permits or vouchers for residents which they have to pay for</p>
<p>(98) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  The parking is not that bad that double yellow lines need to be put in place</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No opinion</b>  The parking is really not that bad you can always find a space somewhere</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  We only have a couple of disabled parking spaces and I do think there should be more</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b>  If timed parking restrictions or double yellow lines are put in place its clearly demonstrating that Shrivenham village will then seems to be more and more like living in a town.</p>
<p>(99) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Roman Way)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> It is becoming increasingly difficult to park for the shops</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Parking difficulties</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> There is inadequate provision</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> Things need to change</p>
<p>(100) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Roman Way)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> Reduce congestion around narrow toads</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Spaces currently used by those catching the bus to Oxford/swindon, leaving no spaces for people actually visiting the highstreet</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> Do not agree with the removal of a bike rack to replace with disabled space (better to remove a regular space. Please reposition bike rack, say outside the Prince of Wales pub, or donate it to them when removed?</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(101) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Salop Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> Far too many cars parked in the High Street - and since many back out of spaces without checking, there's a risk of collision with traffic moving up/down High Street.</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  Three hours seems a long time. I would support one hour max (until 18:00, for pub, etc).  When the Neighbourhood Plan was being drawn up, there was talk of making a Park &amp; Ride parking area available on the outskirts of the village. I would encourage this for longer term parking - hence my 'one hour max' parking in the centre of the village.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  No problem with disabled persons parking, and hopefully there's a mechanism to check compliance.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  Does the proposed scheme risk simply driving longer term parking into surrounding residential streets? We don't want this outcome... central village residential streets shouldn't be blocked by car parking, particularly caused by people outside the village</p>
<p>(102) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Sand Hill)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Shrivenham is not a park and ride scheme. with an aging population it is inevitable that people will need transportation to local services especially the surgery</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b>  3 hours is plenty of time to go about your business and it should also be possible for guests of residents to apply for a temporary permit for overnight parking if needed</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  priority should be given to disabled parking</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(103) Local resident,  (SHRIVENHAM, Sandhill)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>No objection</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>No objection</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>No objection</b>  Parking has become ridiculous on the high street .. it's time for change</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b> As previously stated</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> Definitely need designated disabled</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(104) Local resident, (shrivenham, Sandy Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> Because of the anti-social nature of some motorists when parking and the impact that has on other road users - particularly vulnerable road users</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> I only partially support these moves on three points. Firstly these measures will not reduce the number of vehicles parking and without enforcement will only increase the anti-social parking we see currently. Secondly while a 3 hour limit will reduce the number of shop and restaurant staff who currently take up a number of the parking bays there is little activity in Shrivenham that takes over 1 hour which is a more appropriate free limit as in Faringdon. Finally fundamentally I object to the notion that residents should be able to store their private property at public expense and specifically outside their private residence. Either they should buy a house with off street parking, not drive or be charged at a rate commensurate with the cost of the provision and there is no mention of resident permits being charged at a private parking space rate. If parking bays are to be allocated to High street residents than they should be off the High street and paid for.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> I support the idea but again without enforcement these will be utilised by other motorists</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> A good start but does not go far enough. Resident permits should be strictly limited and charged. Parking should be limited to 1 hour not 3 . Alternative parking locations need to be clearly signed. Restrictions need to be enforced. Bays need to be clear</p>

<p>(105) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stainswick Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk - need parking for Doctor visitors  Hazell's Lane - too narrow for parking</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Church Lane - limit to 1 hour for doctor visits</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  As long as not too many</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  What is decided, it need not be permanent.  Give it a try for a year or too then revisit.</p>
<p>(106) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stainswick Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  Overburdensome and unnecessary regulation</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  3 hours allows for shopping, which is the function of the High Street, and deters people taking bus into Oxford and leaving cars there all day</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  Too many are frustratingly left unused when others are trying to find spaces</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  The biggest benefit will be the 3 hour parking on the High Street. All else is overkill.</p>



(107) Local resident,  
(Shrivenham, Stainswick  
Lane)

High Street DYLS – **Object**  
Church Walk DYLS – **Object**  
Hazell's Lane DYLS – **Object**

I object to the proposals because:

1. The proposals were formulated before Shrivenham Primary School moved from the High Street to elsewhere in the village. Teachers, support staff and visitors to the school accounted for around 20 to 30 parked cars on the High Street, Church Walk and Hazell's Lane from about 8am until 4pm every week day. There is now plenty of parking at all of these locations throughout the day (whether during the week or at the weekend). I walk up to the High Street 2 to 3 times a day and there are always parking spaces now. The proposals are in search of a problem that simply does not exist. It will be a waste of tax-payers money. At the very least a further survey should be carried out now that the Primary School has moved.

2. No consideration has been given to the impact of the proposals on Stainswick Lane. This is the closest, easily accessible road, to the High Street. As there will be no restrictions in Stainswick Lane, the alleged problem will just be forced on to different local residents. The top of Stainswick Lane is already extremely dangerous: 3 times a day lorries deliver to the One Stop shop and park at the top of the road. There is no pavement either side so pedestrians are forced to walk around the lorries in the middle of the road. Increased traffic from the High Street will exacerbate this problem.

3. Although many houses in Stainswick Lane have off-street parking, the entrances to drives are very narrow and many drives are not big. There is a need for some residents of Stainswick Lane to park outside their houses. It is already a problem for us to gain access to/from the public highway due to close parking each side of our drive.

Shared-use' parking bays – **Object**

I object to the proposals because:

1. The proposals were formulated before Shrivenham Primary School moved from the High Street to elsewhere in the village. Teachers, support staff and visitors to the school accounted for around 20 to 30 parked cars on the High Street, Church Walk and Hazell's Lane from about 8am until 4pm every week day. There is now plenty of parking at all of these locations throughout the day (whether during the week or at the weekend). I walk up to the High Street 2 to 3 times a day and there are always parking spaces now. The proposals are in search of a problem that simply does not exist. It will be a waste of tax-payers money. At the very least a further survey should be carried out now that the Primary School has moved.

2. No consideration has been given to the impact of the proposals on Stainswick Lane. This is the closest, easily accessible road, to the High Street. As there will be no restrictions in Stainswick Lane, the alleged problem will just be forced on to different local residents. The top of Stainswick Lane is already extremely dangerous: 3 times a day lorries deliver to the One Stop shop and park at the top of the road. There is no pavement either side so pedestrians

	<p>are forced to walk around the lorries in the middle of the road. Increased traffic from the High Street will exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>3. Although many houses in Stainswick Lane have off-street parking, the entrances to drives are very narrow and many drives are not big. There is a need for some residents of Stainswick Lane to park outside their houses. It is already a problem for us to gain access to/from the public highway due to close parking each side of our drive.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> There is a need for disabled parking.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> I object to the proposals because: 1. The proposals were formulated before Shrivenham Primary School moved from the High Street to elsewhere in the village. Teachers, support staff and visitors to the school accounted for around 20 to 30 parked cars on t</p>
<p>(108) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stainswick Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> Makes sense for safety reasons</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> A lot of people park all day so that they can use S6 to Oxford. Surely the use of public transport is to be applauded and encouraged A number of workers in the retail outlets in Shrivenham high street also need to be able to park all day, current car parks in the village don't allow for both these needs.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Its needed</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> 3hr parking is not workable, this will lead to more people parking in the side streets which is an accident waiting to happen. Charging residents of the High Street to park is outrageous, as is the number of passes they will be allowed Parking passes for</p>

<p>(109) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stainswick Lane.)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  I live on Stainswick Lane. Already, it can become clogged with cars from people using the High Street. The changes will only increase the congestion as cars relocate, especially 'long stayers'. If it leads to cars parking on both sides of Stainswick Lane, unless cars park on the verges and paths, then access becomes impossible for delivery lorries and very tight for larger vehicles, such as the emergency services and grocery deliveries. Perhaps one side of Stainswick Lane should also include 'double yellow' marking.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  If helps local business then a good thing.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  So long as subject to same restrictions as everyone else.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  What is the cost?</p>
<p>(110) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stallpits)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  The church walk and hazels way get over crowded and difficult to navigate due to the amount of cars parked there. The High Street has so many cars parking on the current double yellows but this should be enforced more.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Many people are just leaving their cars on the high street all day and catching the bus to Swindon or Oxford which means there is no parking for anyone actually shopping/visiting the village high street</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  N/A</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>How will all of this be enforced as the current restrictions and measures are not enforced in any way with cameras/other means.</p>
<p>(111) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stallpits Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  It depends on the extent of the double yellow lines. We need some to stop parking causing obstruction, but in some areas (eg at the Methodist church) parking has been going on for decades without causing obstruction. Ideally, the road at the Methodist church should not have yellow lines.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b>  I have no objection.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  Providing it is a sensible and proportionate allocation I have no objection.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  We need some ideas to make parking in the village less of a trial.</p>
<p>(112) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stallpits Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Many people who do not live in Shrivenham park in Shrivenham and catch the bus to Oxford. Parking should be for residents of the village only.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  Parking bays on Church Walk should be for residents and disabled people only.  High street parking should be limited to a maximum of 30 mins or permit holders who actually live on the High street.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Disabled parking is essential on the High street</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b></p>

<p>(113) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stonefield Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Too much random and selfish parking atm.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b>  This seems to be a fair proposal.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  This seems to be a reasonable proposal.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  Certain people are currently spoiling things for the majority so controls are needed.</p>
<p>(114) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stonefield Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  The map seems to show that the proposed additional double yellow lines will stop people parking partially on the pavement at the ends of the permitted parking bays which I support. The double yellow lines which are currently on the High Street by the Methodist church are unnecessary as vehicles can park there without causing an obstruction and this would provide additional parking bays. Is there any provision planned for delivery vehicles which need to park near the shops in the High Street?</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Restrictions on parking in the High Street will just make commuters park on the surrounding roads as they have to park somewhere in order to access public transport to Oxford or Swindon as the buses do not serve the neighbouring villages. There is also a possibility that if it is easier for village residents using the shops to park outside the shop they may be less inclined to walk to the High Street.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>Disabled bays are necessary particularly near the doctors surgery.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  There needs to be improved signage for the village car park which is currently under used, rarely more than a handful of vehicles in there at any one time. Signs as you enter the village for 'Free Car Park xxx yards' and a more visible sign at the end of</p>
<p>(115) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Stonefield Close off Stainswick Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  The additional parking restrictions in these areas will result in more parking in nearby residential streets, Also patients need to park in Church Walk to attend the GP surgery.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  As well as diverting parking to other residential streets commuters are encouraged to use public transport (buses) to access Oxford and Swindon. As the buses do not serve all the local villages they need to park to take the bus which is an environmentally positive option.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Disabled parking places are valuable to those who are less mobile.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  I accept that there is a parking problem in High Street Shrivenham but the current proposals are likely to cause more problems than they solve for residents of surrounding streets. There is a free car park in Martins Lane which is hardly used, at least in</p>
<p>(116) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, The Green)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>No opinion</b>  Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>No opinion</b>  Are you doing your best to kill the high street? You now won't be able to park at the eastern end, for a quick nip in to the shops.  Result more pollution as on my way home from work I'll drive somewhere else to shop. And a deader high street.</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Enforced how, what appeals process? Do I need to waste my time taking a photo of my car each time I park, or do I have to spend £100's of pounds on a dash cam to do the same thing. I'll do neither I'll just shop elsewhere.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  From memory, when I used to ferry a blind friend &amp; and his guide dog arround London, using his blue badge when he was in the car with me and his dog. With it I was advised you could park any where if you were not causing an obstruction. If this is still t</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  This is a direct consequence of building all of the extra houses in the village, what the village needs is a dedicated (poss pay and display) car park closer to the village centre, not this plan to drive the local residents who are still working so don't</p>
<p>(117) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Townsend Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Because the village has always been a place to park your car for the day and car share to work, residents have been stopped from using the available parking places. This has not improved by the ever-expanding number of new houses being built. It makes sense to limit the amount of time people can park here, as long as it is policed properly and parking fines are issued.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b>  See previous views</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  At present there are only 2 disabled parking places in the High Street - this is not enough to cover the elderly population</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b>  I think it's about time this was put in place as there have always been problems to find places for residents parking in the village. The removal of the allowed parking outside the Methodist Church is a retrograde step, as it helped slow down the speedin</p>

<p>(118) Local resident, (Shrivenham, South side of High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Due to mobility issues and lack of parking spaces (too many commuters parking) often have to shop in Watchfield where there are parking opportunities. Would like to support High Street shops but .....</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  See previous answer</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Have a “blue badge” but limited parking options</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(119) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Alexander Way)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  The parking on areas which block traffic’s and obscure the view of oncoming traffic is increasing - mostly due to the lack of parking in the first place</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Happy to support this, as long as local residents are able to park to use local services free of charge.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  I think a few of these spaces along the high street would be beneficial for those with mobility issues etc</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b>  The problem is mainly those who park in the high street then get the bus into Swindon/Oxford etc for work. I think these proposals will help stop this.</p>



<p>(120) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Ballingers)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  The High Street is incredibly busy</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Support</b>  I am sick of seeing people from the surrounding areas parking in the High Street to use the bus service to commute to work. At times it is nearly impossible to park when wanting to use the shops</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  There are too few disabled bays</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  There needs to be a financial commitment to ensure that if restrictions were put in place then there would be penalties for those who do not comply. Parking fees similar to that in Faringdon could do a possibility. But there are far too many non locals ta</p>
<p>(121) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Ballingers)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b></p> <p>Parking along the high street outside the designated parking bays causes visibility issues and problems for vehicles to pass each other. I do not see any reason to enforce any other form of parking restrictions as there is always somewhere to park during the day. A three hour parking restriction is totally unnecessary and the introduction of parking permits is not needed as this will only increase local council costs in respect of having to employ someone to enforce it.</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Object</b>  I do not feel that any change to the current parking provision is necessary. Enforcement of this would only end up in increased council tax and provide no benefit to the general community</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  There is insufficient allocation of disabled parking therefore the provision of additional spaces in key areas would be most beneficial</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  This proposal only facilitates the ability for individuals who live on the high street to park outside their property and does not benefit the local community</p>
<p>(122) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Ballingers)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk is in need of parking restrictions on the opposite side to the GP surgery and additional disabled parking should be added outside the surgery</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Object</b>  I see no reason for this as there is always parking available. There is then the cost implications of enforcing the restriction when money should be spent on fixing the pavements and the potholes in the road</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  The provision of disabled parking is currently inadequate and needs improvement</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  Disabled parking and limited double yellow lines I am in favour of but strongly object to any form of time limited parking or permit parking being introduced</p>
<p>(123) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Beckett Stables)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  Already too many double yellow lines in Shrivenham.</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Some people park all day, which is wrong. A 2-hour parking slot would be ideal.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  There are already disabled spots that are often unused. Disabled parking is essential, but should only meet the actual need,</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  Parking has worsened since the increase in the number of houses in the village. More parking is needed and a more ambitious plan will be required.</p>
<p>(124) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Berens)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Inconsiderate parking is a problem right now so parking restrictions are the way forward</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Agree but 3hrs is too long, this should be 90mins max to encourage parking rotation.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  There is already enough provision and I believe the bays will be better utilised if available to everyone.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(125) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Bingham  turner way)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Because the problem is not an all day problem</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Something needs to change as very often I can’t park yet no one is around</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  See previous comments</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b>  Decent consideration should be given to those working in the shops in the high street</p>

<p>(126) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Buckland Drive)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  Only the main rd through the village should be double yellow. We don’t have the police to give tickets to those that park illegally now.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  I think the parking bays should be 2hr restriction to prevent people parking all day and getting the bus to work in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Disabled people should have convenient parking with the caveat that those that park in disabled spaces without a badge should be fined.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(127) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Charlbury)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Currently dangerous</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Stop commuters</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  As long as not abused</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(128) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Charlbury Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>Parking spaces are impossible in Shrivenham. There needs to be an urgent review &amp; implementation of restrictions</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> Support 2 hour bays</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> There are two current disabled bays. Any more needs to be proportional to the few other bays available</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(129) Local resident, (SHrivenham, Charlbury Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Object</b> Unnecessary</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b> 3 hours should be long enough for shoppers</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> As a disabled person there is never a space when you need one</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> I do t agree with this yellow lines</p>
<p>(130) Local resident, (SHrivenham, Charlbury Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Object</b> Where are residents and visitors going to park After all the resident permits there will be no Spaces left. Where are the shop workers meant to park ?</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b> As a disabled resident I feel that locals will get no choice</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  There is such a need for more disabled parking in SHrivenham 2 spaces is not enough. There are so many disabled people that use the high street and it gets unpleasant when trying to get a space</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  I agree with the extra disabled parking, residents parking/3 hour parking should only be on one side Thought needs to be given to locals and shop workers who need longer than 3 hour parking.</p>
<p>(131) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Claridge  Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Current parking in some of these streets is dangerous and blocks access.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  Good idea, except this will penalise those living in surrounding villages that don't have shops or bus services, so they need to be considered in your plans.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  If there is a requirement for more, then yes I support.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  You need to make it fair for residents living on the High Street, so free permit.  If commuters are parking on the High Street what provision will you make for them when they travel in from villages with no or limited bus service?</p>
<p>(132) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Claridge  Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Parking in the High St should be for visitors to shops and pubs and therefore any parking restrictions should not impact on existing parking. Similarly there needs to be no impact on existing parking in Church Walk.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b></p>

	<p>I think 3 hours should be reduced to 2 hours. Parking in these locations should be for shoppers or people having lunch or coffee and 2 hours is ample time for that in this village location. In Church walk parking should be for the surgery and again 2 hours is ample time. The time limit could be lifted after, say, 7:00pm to accommodate evening restaurant or pub users.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> The disabled bay outside the pharmacy is frequently empty so I support the introduction of a limited number of bays</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> 3 hours is too long for parking for village shops and amenities. I also wonder how the parking restrictions will be monitored and policed.</p>
<p>(133) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Claridge Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Local residents should be allowed to park in the village to enable shopping and catching the S6 bus to Oxford or Swindon</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> When parking to use S6 bus...3 hours parking is insufficient.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Only 1 facility now...insufficient.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> The problem is daily use of parking facilities for convenience and using S6 bus,probably by non residents.</p>
<p>(134) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Cleycourt Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> Support but something needs to happen to those who still park in the double yellow lines as currently people ignore them and park on the double yellow lines frequently with no consequences</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Some people live in the high street. They shouldn't be limited nor should their visitors</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> I think maybe one more but not enough space for more than that</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> No thanks</p>
(135) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Colton Road)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> It is currently very difficult to find a space, even for a short time, during busy times of the day. The proposed 3 hour limit will ensure turnover of at least some of the spaces provided it is enforced.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> .</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> .</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> Current double yellow lines on the high street to the west of the florist / outside the Methodist church are never enforced. People frequently park here causing blockage and significantly reducing visibility for pedestrians.</p>
(136) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Constantine Close)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> I would prefer a three hour limit maximum</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Current commuter parking is unacceptable</p>



	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Insufficient at present</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> I do not support proposal for double yellow lines</p>
<p>(137) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Cowleaze Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> There needs to be adequate parking for residents and local businesses first</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Opportunity for more consumers to use local businesses</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Equality</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(138) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Cocks road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> I agree with the commuter parking in the areas mentioned and making it difficult for local businesses to get custom when people can’t park nearby.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b> No objections</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> .</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b></p> <p>.</p>
<p>(139) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Cozens)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  It’s a nightmare trying to drive through Shrivenham at times when there’s cars parked on double yellows both sides of the road</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  I’ve never parked for longer than an hour in Shrivenham, for the use of the GP surgery/post office or quickly nipping to co-op to pick up one or two bits. At times I have had to drive up and down the high street 4 or 5 times just to find a space. I have the option of walking but when I’m busy with work and don’t have time to make the journey it’s a nightmare. There is a free car park by the bowls club that is always empty yet people park for hours and hours down the high street.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  I feel there are disabled bays in the most important areas and even when it’s busy they are often free. A few more designated bays near the surgery and pharmacy would be beneficial for those that need it. The spaces generally are very very tight and it’s</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(140) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Cozens Grove)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>No opinion</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>No opinion</b>  High street has a lot of traffic buses and lorries, people waiting can be problematic.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b>  Sounds reasonable.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Being disabled, it is rather frustrating that there are so few places to part.</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(141) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Cozens grove)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>No opinion</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>No opinion</b></p> <p>Personally I don't see how this would solve the main challenges associated with congestion...it would force those vehicles that do occasionally wait into already restricted parking spaces....e.g I do see an occasional delivery van parked at nearby shops dropping off or picking up goods....would these vehicles be exempt from restrictions. I'd rather they park respectfully on the side of the road for 5 minutes to drop off goods than to take up the 2 spaces it would cost to park 'properly'</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Unless a permit holder e.g you live directly on the highstreet, or you work on the highstreet... I see no reason for any car to be parked for longer than 3 hours. I feel this is long enough for those that want to support the local business that are there to park up ..any less might impact the revenue of those businesses.  I do not agree with forcing those that live or work directly on the highstreet to apply for a permit that costs. This should be applied for and allocated freely. Those requiring an 'unfair share' of parking should absolutely apply and pay for additional permits that may or may not be granted by exception</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  Always in favour of additional disabled persons parking but should be appropriately assessed.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  I think the suggestions will help us move in the right direction but not 100% convinced they will work unless you have traffic wardens monitoring...which doesn't feel very 'Shrivenham' to me. It would be a shame to see yellow lines painted all over our lo</p>
<p>(142) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Cozens Grove)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p> <p>Shrivenham is a nightmare for residents  Longterm parkers taking valuable spaces</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  No one needs to park longer than that during the day, unless disabled using public transport sport.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  There are only 2 spaces at the moment.  Shrivenham needs to be more accessible</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  Proper marked out bays not ones people dump their car in any which way. More needed too</p>
<p>(143) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Cozens Grove)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b></p> <p>There are many in the village who are only access shops by car. There are many with mobility issues who have to drive, our local bus S6 is too unreliable to depend on instead of a car.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Even a 2 hour 'no return ' option would be acceptable. Many of those who need the facility cannot afford another bill. Which permits would incur.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  I have previously stated the importance of access to many in the village.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  As previously stated, designated disabled parking, 2 hour 'no return ' parking.</p>
<p>(144) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Cozens Grove)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b></p> <p>I support this as parking is so difficult, also people park and catch the bus to Swindon, Faringdon and Oxford.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>No parking</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b></p> <p>More spaces</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(145) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Curtis rd)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b></p> <p>Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b></p> <p>Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b></p> <p>I feel there should be a timed parking so as no vehicle can sit in a parking spot all day.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b></p> <p>A concerned resident</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b></p> <p>As stated previously</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p> <p>None</p>
<p>(146) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Damson Trees)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b></p> <p>Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b></p> <p>Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Object</b></p> <p>The village needs parking for all in the centre and surrounding roads. Restricted parking just pushes the problem further out and increases the issue</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b></p> <p>Residents should not have to pay, without school teachers and staff taking places it will get better. Even more if for example Drs provided off street parking for staff.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b></p> <p>Not needed, just move the one near chemist to the end of the bay to make access easier</p>

	<p>Bike racks should be smaller easily sited so no parking is lost</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  Increase spaces in village, eg remove double yellow lines outside Methodist Church, add an extra space opposite old post office (nr Prince of Wales) widen parking bays to create drive in spaces at Bowls Club. Finally either get Martens Rd residents to us</p>
<p>(147) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Days Ground)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b></p> <p>I agree with a couple more disabled parking spaces but adding other restrictions in a restriction clustered country is not my wishes for a breathtaking village which has no rules for once. Also giving residents permits will only clog the system. Can we not look to build or utilise some free land as a better parking area?</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Permit holders will then retain the slot constantly and who's going to police that?</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  A few more but not more than 4</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  Keep it as it is. Why are we always wanted to enforce laws!!!</p>
<p>(148) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Fairthorne Way)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b></p> <p>Any restrictions will lead to more parking in Stainswick lane and Fairthorne way and Manor lane</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Better turnover of spaces to allow use of amenities</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Essential but they need to be used by genuine people and not abused, how will it be policed?</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b>  Concerns over it just being abused as the existing double yellow lines are ( outside Methodist church) Also speed restrictions no effect.</p>
<p>(149) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Fairthorne way)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  High st should allow parking after 6 pm for local pubs and restaurants.  Church walk should not be restricted as people can’t always walk to the Drs surgery.  Hazels lane is so narrow that it should be restricted parking.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  To help the local businesses and Drs surgery patients.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  There are enough disabled parking bays already</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  I live on Fairthorne way and worry that commuters will be forced to park on Fairthorne way unless other public parking is provided.</p>
<p>(150) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Fairthorne way)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Much needed proposals, but need to be enforced</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  I am concerned that those that park all day currently without restriction will just park elsewhere in the village. This must be monitored.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Much needed and has my full support</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  These measures are sensible however I do object that residents will have to pay for parking permits. This should be funded by council tax.</p>
<p>(151) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Hazells  Land)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  As a resident of Hazells Lane my concern would be whether the whole lane would be designated no waiting, as fear that if only the top end of the lane was covered it would move cars further down the lane to park thus restricting access to and from driveways, which already occurs as the lane is already narrow. My other concern is where on occasion would resident cars and their visitors would park and whether or not a resident permit area would be better for the whole lane which would be in operation at the peaks times.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  .</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  Not applicable</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  As already noted - our concerns are that cars restricted from parking in the upper part of Hazells Lane would move further down the Lane causing issues for residents accessing their own driveways. Often drivers currently parking down the lane park partly</p>
<p>(152) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Hazells  Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  The double yellow lines outside the Co-op mean cars stop briefly which is fine and I wouldn’t want it to be enforced. Hazells Lane and Church Walk don’t seem to have a problem with cars parking in a dangerous manner although some do park on the pavement which isn’t really necessary or a good thing so perhaps double yellow lines might stop this</p>



	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Free the parking spaces for the users of the shops or residents who live on the High Street</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Disabled and elderly who struggle to carry their shopping would benefit and be able to shop locally</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> The 20mph limit is great and makes traffic far more passive for cyclists and walkers. The proposed restrictions would mean less cars parked in the high street which would make it better for the shops and more pleasant for residents</p>
<p>(153) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Hazells lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Hazell's Lane: Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – For households with not enough parking on driveways or with no drive at all this would mean not being able to park at/near our home and would then move the problem to another location so I propose that the councillors consider making it residents parking only with the ability to have visitor permits to give guests, from a selfish prospective i have two neurodiverse children so to have the cars close incase of needing to get somewhere is of the up most importance , could it also be considered to turn HL in to a one way road for safety as people cut down it at speed with a blind bend halfway at the narrow bit</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No opinion</b> All i care about is HL and parking near my house and my neighbours who also park on the road</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Mother in law is disabled</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(154) As a business, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>No objection</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>No objection</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>No objection</b> No objection to double yellow lines but have strong views on the parking bay time limits</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  I run Salon 36 in the High Street. We are an extremely busy Salon and some clients will be in the Salon for greater than 3 hours due to the hair treatment they are having (colours). I believe I'm the only business on the village who needs customers /  Clients who have the ability to park for greater than 3 hours so I oppose these proposed restrictions based on the impact on my business</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  We need more</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  I will send an email</p>
<p>(155) Local resident,  (shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>No opinion</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>No opinion</b>  23 years of never been able to park outside my house this will still not help us what so ever</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  pay to park not outside my house pure madness</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  one space is enough outside the chemist  put more down the high street</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  waste of my money to never park outside my house</p>
<p>(156) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  These roads need to have restrictions in order to allow traffic to move freely</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  I'm not sure that these proposals will free up much space and it will just force parking onto smaller side streets. The fact that local villages do not have an adequate bus service forces many people to use Shrivenham as an effective park and ride. Improving bus provision for Longcot, Fernham, Uffington, Ashbury, Idstone etc would reduce the need for car travel to Shrivenham</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  disabled parking in the areas near the surgery and pharmacy seems logical, increasing the amount of disabled parking seems less useful</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  I support the proposals but as an nhs worker employed in Shrivenham I hope that the permits issued would include people who work in the village and would not incur costs to the individual or their employer</p>
<p>(157) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Because these areas very often get log jammed particularly in church walk where emergency vehicles need untrammelled access at all times also for hearses at funerals and not least of all the residents living in the area</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  As long as residents can park. What is irritating is the parking of some vehicles on the high street that are long term parked and never move</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  We might need such parking if a special needs school takes over the former primary school as is mooted. Having lived facing the high street for 29 years I do see LOTS of able bodied drivers using the disabled spaces "just for a quick nip  Out somewhere "</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  Great idea and fully support ... as long as it's got teeth and can be enforced</p>

<p>(158) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>No objection</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>No objection</b>  It would be extremely helpful if the double yellow lines outside the Methodist Church could be removed for a short distance (so it doesn’t affect house opposite getting out of their drive), but allows the two independent shops next to the Co-op to carry on their business as they do at present, needing to load and unload their goods several times a day.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  I wish to support the 2 independent shops next to the Co-op and it will allow a few more parking spaces.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  Wish to support our High Street businesses.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(159) As part of a group/organisation, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>No opinion</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>No opinion</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>No opinion</b>  If there are more parking places made available, then the no waiting shouldn’t be needed anyway</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  3 hours free parking is enough time for anyone to use the local shops and facilities etc. and with the issue of parking permits which allow free parking , for longer periods for those who live or work in shrivenham, this is a good idea</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  More disabled parking close to gp and pharmacy would be helpful for those who need it</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  I support the proposal as hopefully it will increase the availability of parking spaces for those who want to work or shop etc in shrivenham, on the condition that as I need to park daily for more than 3 hours due to my job in the high street , I would b</p>

<p>(160) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  As a resident I think the parking needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  This is a good idea in principle but you Must give all residents on the high street parking permits!</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  It is very important to make sure disabled people have designated parking space.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  I don’t think the scheme is a bad idea. Although it might affect business on the high street.</p>
<p>(161) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS –  Hazell’s Lane DYLS –  No waiting at any time reduces the number of available space and forces more people onto the High street.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  The majority of people coming onto the High Street do not stay for more than three hours. Therefore the proposed restrictions will not easy the number of vehicles only penalise residents who live on the High Street and paid dearly for the privilege to do so. Parking should have been considered by the local authority and planning before the village was expanded to the extent that it has.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  No problem.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  Not happy as High Street resident at being told how many vehicles can be granted a permit ie two, what about family and those working from home. If this was enforced it would have to be policed during the restricted hours, if not things will remain the sa</p>

<p>(162) Member of public, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  I work on shrivenham high street and need somewhere to park 8-7pm</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Object</b>  I work on shrivenham high street and need somewhere to park 8-7pm</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  No objection to disabled</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  I work on shrivenham high street and need somewhere to park 8-7pm</p>
<p>(163) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  The proposals will make the village quieter safer and greener as perhaps people will walk more</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Support</b>  As q4</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  Not sure if needed</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  Well thought-out proposals</p>
<p>(164) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  Restrictions in these areas will not aid prolonging the life of the high street</p>

	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Why should residents have to pay to park outside their homes. With the loss of the school and potentially in years to come the doctors surgery parking will become more fluid</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  Allocated parking restricts options for all. Increase parking by removing double yellow lines in front of methodist church</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  Increase spaces, remove double yellow lines and add spaces by widening parking bays to become drive on spaces opposite the bowls club</p>
(165) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Will high street residents have to pay and will one permit cover the household for both cars, I also hire cars for business travel and they are dropped on the high street how will that work</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b>  Na</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  No further comments</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  No comment</p>
(166) Local resident, (Shrivenham, High Street)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  I have not found that these restrictions have generally a problem so happy to support</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>I hope this would ease problems for high street residents parking</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Having had need of disabled parking provisions I support this</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> 'Resident only' marked bays would be ideal especially for retired and aged (over 75) residents</p>
<p>(167) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Highworth Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> The local community need better access to parking in the village</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> The local community need better access to parking in the village</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Disabled users need more access to parking in the village</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> The local community need to be able to park in the village and not have to struggle because users are parking there to then use the bus to go to work for the whole day</p>
<p>(168) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Longcot Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> This should reduce the “park and ride” cars parking in the centre of the village.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Village residents will be able to access parking.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> More Disabled parking is necessary</p>



	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  They should reduce congestion and reduce the appeal of using Shrivvenham for “park and ride”.  However, the problem will simply move somewhere else, such as Watchfield!</p>
<p>(169) Local resident,  (Shrivvenham, Manor  Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  ) I have objected to the scheme on the basis that in addition to restricting the parking time in the High Street you are also putting in Double Yellow lines in Church Walk and Hazells lane which I think will lead to even more congestion in Manor lane. I would be in agreement with the scheme if Double Yellow lines were also painted on the left hand side of Manor Lane as you enter from the High Street as well as the blind bend further up Manor Lane towards our homes. This would still leave parking for residence of Manor Lane and some Non residents but in an organised way.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  X</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  This would depend on the ratio of other spaces. Need to consider for surgery.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  As mentioned previous.</p>
<p>(170) Local resident,  (Shrivvenham, Manor  Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  This will just move parking to other places such as Manor Lane and Manor Close.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  A friend lives in Church Walk and they are often blocked in by people visiting the Drs Surgery.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Disabled spaces need to be spaced out along the High St.</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  I believe that there are often still parking spaces at all times in the High St especially since the Primary School has moved. If restrictions are put in place parking will move Manor Lane and Manor Close. Before the school moved we had people blocking o</p>
<p>(171) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Manor Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  Putting in double yellow lines in Church Walk and Hazells Lane will likely lead to even more congestion in Manor Lane where people already park inconsiderately &amp; sometimes dangerously. The scheme would be acceptable if double yellow lines were also painted on the left hand side of Manor Lane as you enter from the High Street as well as on the blind bend further up Manor Lane. This would still leave parking for residents of Manor Lane and some non-residents but in an organised and safer manner.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Parking is already extremely difficult for residents of the High Street. A permit still wouldn't guarantee them a space &amp; the provision for visitor permits is not generous enough. Some people have daily visitors: grandchildren, etc.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  There are sufficient disabled spaces already.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
<p>(172) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Martens Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  The proposed yellow lines will prevent vehicles being parked dangerously. There is a blatant disregard for yellow lines in the village.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Max stay of 3 hours hopefully will stop parking all day. Making it easier for those who live in the High Street</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Essential to have disabled bays</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> It was important to review the parking in the High Street . A headache for many people</p>
(173) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Martens Road)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> Yellow lines in front of the Methodist are frequently ignored, but there is little or no adverse impact on traffic in this part of the road as it is wide enough for traffic to pass in both directions avoiding parked cars in this area. It would make more sense to allow restricted parking for say 1 hour in this area</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Likely to provide more parking for shoppers in the street.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> Not sure they will all be regularly utilised</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> No evidence of any consideration being given to likely impact on roads near high street that will now be used by visitors requiring all day parking</p>
(174) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Martens road)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> Why block all these places with cars who obviously have caught the buses to Swindon or Oxford it dose not give locals a chance to park near the shops or doctors</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> As in my previous answer</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>Of course I will support this being a disabled driver</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> No comment</p>
<p>(175) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Miles Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> Having access to the facilities in these areas is required as a village member on occasions.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> Control is required on who has access to these bays.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> Don’t over load a shortage of parking areas in favour of disabled bays</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> The issue is restricting casual parking 5-10 minutes to collect from shops etc. and leaving the vehicle on yellow lines. Restricting passing through traffic busses etc. You might want to check with Bud route S6 driver’s opinions!</p>
<p>(176) Rather not say, (Shrivenham, Orchard View)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> .</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> .</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> .</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>.</p>
<p>(177) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Orchard view)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p> <p>.</p>
<p>(178) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Prince drive)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b> Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>No opinion</b></p> <p>People are going to park there anyway unless more spaces are added. The bigger issue are the HGV parking in the road to make deliveries to COOP. A better plan would be to ban them between 0700 and 2000.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> I think this is how most of the spaces are currently used.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Good proposal if you can actually keep them painted so that they are visible.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> No real benifit to residents, just a possible cash grab..</p>

<p>(179) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Prince Drive)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk and Hazells Lane are narrow and can be dangerous to pedestrians when congested with cars. Cars park on the pavement in Hazells Lane meaning I have to walk my dog in the road sometimes. High Street needs to be better managed with some areas being kept completely clear for the safety of road users</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Residents in the local area should be given priority to park near their houses rather than spaces being taken by commuters.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  I support more disabled bays to a certain extent in the High Street as long as they are put in an area that is suitable. I once parked in the space in front of the disabled bay near the chemist, and the driver with the disabled badge was shouting at me be</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  According to the planning notices in the village, there was mention of cost for residents to pay for residential parking. I think this should be scrapped and one parking place if needed should be given freely to each household that qualifies.</p>
<p>(180) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Prince drive)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  I believe parking is needed to have access to the highstreet but this should be restricted (limited time)</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b>  Time limited will stop people leaving cars all day, permit holders should have free access</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b>  Accessible parking is important</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  Parking is limited in a growing village, we want to support fairness and not just make everyone pay.</p>

<p>(181) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Queens Crescent)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  It will make the movement of vehicles safer and prevent blockages.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  3 hours is ample for local residents to access the shops and other facilities in the location.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Inclusive approach to the changes proposed.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  Restricted Staff permits for workers in the local shops needs to be considered as part of the proposal. None of the shops have dedicated staff parking areas.</p>
<p>(182) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Raven way)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b>  There is more and more residents now in shrivenham the shops will take loses if permits restrictions go ahead</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  I work on one stop 3 hour restrictions will impact me on my job and parking  Need to make park and ride for people useing bus to Oxford</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Suport disabled persons spaces as I am disabled myself and no provision for parking for disabled  So about time there was</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  Business may suffer if permits go ahead hence impact the highstreet</p>

	<p>Also local residents should not have to suffer because people parking to go bus Oxford they should do park and ride facility for this reason</p>
<p>(183) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Recreation Ground)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>No objection</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>No objection</b>  High street has limited parking and adding more restrictions will not only affect the business but the new school</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Where are the people who have to travel to the village as they have no bus going to park? They are trying to reduce single vehicle use this will add more traffic on roads increasing road risk for all. The darker nights and the very poor state of all roads makes it more dangerous to ride a bike to the village</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  More of these spaces reduce the number of parking for all, as blue badge holders can park on solid lines why ??????</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  As the dual no real thought about what the high street is for and the many reasons why people park on the high street. The 20 limit was sold as the golden bullet to all the problems and what has that done apart from increased the rat runs</p>
<p>(184) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Roman Way)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b>  You need to control the high street but you need to leave the side streets along for now .</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  You need to stop vehicles parking all day but you also need to look after staff who work in the local business</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  I don't like to see too many disabled parking bays as quite often they are left empty</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  It is difficult to get a parking spot in the high street so it needs addressing</p>



<p>(185) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Sandhill)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Much needed new bays and restrictions to people parking all day to travel out of the village.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Absolutely support, permits will also discourage people having 5-6 cars parked as part of property ownership.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  More suitable provision</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(186) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Sandhill)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  The village cannot support the number of people who dump their cars for the day to get a bus into Swindon or Oxford as part of their commute.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  As per my previous comment re commuters</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  There should be a couple, but without monitoring I guarantee selfish people will park in them anyway</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>

<p>(187) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Sandy Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Too many cars parked where they shouldn't be already</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Far too many using the village as a commute car park</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Not enough places for those users on the high street</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  Can only help to make the High street better as long as the parking is enforced correctly and isn't used as a money making scheme</p>
<p>(188) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stainswick Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b>  I live in stainswick lane and fully object to the 3 hour parking limit that appears to have been decided in the high street. This will likely cause anyone wishing to park longer to use adjoining residential roads. There is no parking problem in the high street now the primary school has closed. Please look again and stop wasting money.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  It works perfectly fine at the moment. More signs, restrictions are a waste of money.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  Disabled people should be able to park more easily close to the doctors surgery.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  Please look again.</p>

<p>(189) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stallpits)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  It’s hard for locals to park for the doctors and shops</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>No objection</b>  Same as before</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  Same</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b>  Same</p>
<p>(190) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Stallpits Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Stops people parking on junctions and narrow street</p> <p>Shared-use’ parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Reduce the all day parking</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  I work by the chemist the disabled bay is empty almost all day when the shops are open. There are more further down almost always empty. No additional spaces are required</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  Properly mark bays outside 50 - 54 High Street</p>
<p>(191) Local resident, (Shrivenham, This is identifying)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b></p>

	<p>I would query whether any changes are currently needed except for some additional disabled bays. With the recent change in location of the school is there still an issue with parking on the High Street? I can usually get parked. I would suggest a review of parking should be pushed back until the effect of moving the school is seen.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No opinion</b> As previous comment - I do not think any changes need to happen at the moment</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> .</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> I would query whether any changes are currently needed except for some additional disabled bays. With the recent change in location of the school is there still an issue with parking on the High Street?</p>
(192) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Vicarage Lane)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Sometimes there are no parking spaces and therefore it's helpful to drop off less able-bodied passengers. The implementation of no waiting at any time would prevent this.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> Permit holders may park permanently and restrict access. I would support a mix, no return within an hour for example.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Inadequate provision currently.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> Why not consider building a Park &amp; Ride car park near the village hall? That way you would prevent commuters from just parking in residential areas? The scheme would have to be applied more widely if you are going to introduce residents permits and restri</p>
(193) Local resident, (Shrivenham, Vicarage lane)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  There are not enough spaces on high street and sometimes you just have to park especially in front of the Methodist church area which I don't consider as a problem . Church walk is very tight and so are some areas of hazels lane</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Non residents don't typically need more than 3 hours at a time in shrivenham</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  We have enough disability spaces</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(194) Local resident,  (Shrivenham, Vicarage Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church walk - some parking is required outside the doctors. Where church walk narrows there should ne double yellow lines.  High street - we need parking in the village, in order to use the shops and facilities. The parking should be time limited.  Hazel lane - is too narrow, double yellow lines make some sense.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  3 hours allow people using the hair dressers to park without worrying about the time.  By restricting parking the people who park all day will have to reconsider where to abandon their vehicles.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  Some disabled parking is a necessity.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  Please remember that parked cars are a very effective way of slowing down the traffic on the high street, so excessive use of double yellow lines, will lead to speeding problems. I am thinking of the piece of road from the coop / ivy florists to the roun</p>

<p>(195) Local resident, (Ashbury, Wixes Piece)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  Agree some management needed but do not believe it needs to be overly enforced and deter use of people visiting shrivenham for shops etc. It is currently a thriving town and don't want it to become a ghost town like so many places.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Stop people parking all day and commuting to Swindon or Oxford by bus leaving no space for anyone else</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  Often too many disabled spaces allocated and left empty with other car users struggling to find a space.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  Keep free parking and restrict to a 3 hr limit. Do not install too many disabled spaces that could remain largely empty at the expense of other users.</p>
<p>(196) Member of public, (Bishopstone, Mount Pleasant)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  I use shrivenham frequently as live locally to use the local businesses and I support restrictions on all day park &amp; ride parking however I don't agree with residents having to pay for permits (they should be able to obtain 1/2 by evidence of their address). Three hour limits should help free up more spaces but will this be monitored?? And will it end up with ticket machines and then later charges introduced?? As I think this will impact the local businesses</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  Agree to help turnover spaces to be able to use the local businesses- 3hrs should be sufficient for this however will resident parking (with permits) take over the space from the park &amp; ride parking?</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  More disabled parking needed</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>

<p>(197) Local resident, (Bourton, Cleyfields)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>No objection</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p> <p>I do not feel the High Street presents enough of an issue to justify this. Sections of the High Street which already have double yellows are casually ignored and I've never known action taken, I've also never noticed cars parking on these existing lines cause difficulties to traffic or other operation on the High Street</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Since the relocation of the primary school, I have never encountered difficulties parking on the High Street. I feel a negative impact will be made on the High Street if these are imposed, for example it is very possible to spend over 3 hours at the Treatment Rooms, one of the hotel/public houses and church. A combined visit as a family which could incorporate a family walk, visiting the park, having lunch and attending church as examples could often exceed 3 hours. Also, as a local resident I would rather cars parked and used the bus service, instead of clogging up the commuting roads such as A420 through encouraging driving to work instead of utilising buses. Residents of close villages, such as Longcot, Bourton, and Ashbury can drive a short commute to Shrivenham and then get on the bus to complete their journey, which is far better environmentally than if they drove their entire commute. I also feel this enforcement would encourage people to park in surrounding residential streets, pushing the issue to areas where children play, and crowding narrower streets making it difficult for emergency vehicles to pass.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  I agree that disabled accessible spaces on the High Street need to increase and I think the proposed positions suit the needs of accessing the High Street</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
<p>(198) Local resident, (Bourton, Silver St)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p> <p>We have witnessed remarkably dangerous parking on the High St - close to the pedestrian crossing and opposite road junctions. The effectiveness of the proposal will depend on the monitoring of the double yellow lines though.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>We live in a village close to Shrivenham and frequently visit businesses in the High St (by foot, bike and car). The parking availability has reduced significantly over the past ten years to the extent that we often have to give up and travel to Highworth or Faringdon. We also formed the view that many of the vehicles parked during the day are due to commuters travelling into Swindon or Oxford.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> While not disabled drivers ourselves, we have driven disabled passengers. The increased availability of disabled spaces makes sense, especially around the surgery. They really do need monitoring - even more than the proposed double yellow lines. It's a</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> As a local resident of over 25 years, it's a shame that restrictions need to be implemented, but with the rapid expansion in the population of shrivenham it seems inevitable. Unfortunately the High St has remained the same size! This seems to be a reaso</p>
(199) Local resident, (Bourton, The hill)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> If the restrictions open up the parking considerably fine if not it is some times useful to be able to wait in the car whilst my husband pops to the chemist, shop etc</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> As long as no charge in the future is levied for parking or permits</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> I have seen so called disabled drivers hop skip out of their cars before and appear to be more able than myself</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
(200) Local resident, (Coleshill, Coleshill)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Support</b> Should help</p>



	<p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> Should make parking easier</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Needed</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>No objection</b></p>
<p>(201) As a business, (Elm Tree Surgery, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – Hazell's Lane DYLS – As a key worker for the local doctors surgery our ability to deliver care throughout the working day is essential. Patients, carers and colleagues will be impacted if our inability to park is enforced.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> Key Healthcare worker at Doctors surgery</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> No objection</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
<p>(202) Employee of local business, (Elm Tree Surgery, High Street)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b></p> <p>The surgery has no allocated parking at all and so staff and patients rely on using the on-street parking daily. I expect that parking restricts as suggested would have a significant detrimental impact on public and colleague access to the surgery.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> '-</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b></p> <p>'-</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
<p>(203) Local resident, (Faringdon, Gilligans Way)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Object</b></p> <p>Even with the proposed time limits on parking there is still insufficient parking for people to use the businesses on the High St</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  This should ensure no blocking of bays by commuters using buses from Shrivenham</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  Of course it is necessary to have adequate provision for differently-abled people</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b>  The 'direction of travel' is good, but businesses should not be made to suffer by too many restrictions on parking. (I lived in Shrivenham for 15 years and still use the High St businesses although now living in Faringdon)</p>
<p>(204) Rather not say, (Faringdon, Coxwell Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Object</b></p> <p>Why is it that throughout the county the resolution of parking problems is only restrictions and control of the motorists?  Clearly there is a shortage of parking spaces The logical solution is to provide many more free spaces not to restrict those inadequate spaces already existing. Pity for those who depend on their car or who are elderly,sick ,disabled or infirm. The proposed solutions indicate a lack of care and compassion</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  Lack of creative thinking</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Best. Indicator of caring community</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  See other comments</p>
(205) Member of public, (Faringdon, )	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Object</b>  I drive through there all of the time and never have any issues with people stopping, if they are it’s not for long and there’s barely anywhere to stop as it is</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  It will definitely put people off from visiting the local businesses, I often meet there with friends for a meal and to have a walk around but if it’s permit holders only we would find another village to go to</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b>  There are always so many disabled parking spots that are empty in other areas, whilst other people are struggling to park</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
(206) Employee of local business, (Lambourn, )	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  This will improve safety</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  I am extremely concerned that as someone who works in Shrivenham but lives 10 miles away, I won't be able to easily commute to work. Assuming here that permits would be issued only to certain street residents, finding parking elsewhere or not at all will add time to commute, and make it impossible to continue with existing childcare arrangements if parking too far from work.</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Support</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> Whilst I appreciate the need for change of parking arrangements in Shrivenham, worried that local businesses and residents will lose out.</p>
<p>(207) As a business, (Live in Swindon, Work at Elm Tree Doctors in Shrivenham, Church wlk)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b> I agree for the smaller roads, Or maybe just yellow lines but the high street isn't fair for people that work on the high street unless we also get permits.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> Where do local businesses park?</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b> There are some already and hardly in use so no more are needed</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b> If it does go ahead then all the roads around will become very busy including stainswick lane</p>
<p>(208) Local resident, (Longcot, Kings Lane)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b> As resident of outlying village require more help to access facilities,shops,buses.Alt villagers have great disadvantage</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> Need more access not less</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> Need extra help, but don't need to be disabled to need extra help.eg bus stops with shelter NEXT to carpark, doctor's carpark that you can park in</p>

	<p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> Same</p>
<p>(209) Member of public, (Longcot, Priory Mead)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>No objection</b> I see no reason for additional parking restrictions on the High Street or Church Walk, however as the road narrows down Hazell's road I believe it would make it safer for pedestrians.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> We need to stop commuter parking - always more spaces available on Saturdays/Sundays!!!!</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> So long as there are not too many disabled spaces - I get really fed up of searching for a parking space when there are several disabled spaces available.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(210) Local resident, (Longcot, Shrivenham rd)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Partially support</b> Need to be able to park near surgery if you live outside Shrivenham Not same for Hazel's lanr</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> Seems sensible to restrict all day parkers</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> Don't know how many disabled plots are being proposed</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>

<p>(211) Local resident, (South Marston, COXS ROAD)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  People collecting prescriptions need to pop into doctors to collect. Blue badge holders can't walk from the high street. May be space with 10 minute limit.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Stop people using shrivenham as car park and getting bus to Swindon or Oxford.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  Elderly people in surrounding villages need access to chemist and doctors.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(212) As a business, (Swindon living, shrivenham working, grange drive/ high street working)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b>  staff in local businesses, many of which who don't live local will have nowhere to park. permit costs to residents and business have never been shown and the rumours are extortionate prices</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b>  same reason as previous question</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  same as usual</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b>  we feel this is just another nail in the coffin for local businesses after the school relocating and business being significantly down, and now restricted parking.</p>
<p>(213) Local resident, (Watchfield, Barrington Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Parking is needed I. The high st</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Time restrictions are good but should be limited to 1.5 hours</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  It's a good standard to have available parking for disabled drivers</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(214) Local resident,  (Watchfield, Hill Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(215) Local resident,  (Watchfield, Lydander)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Will take the look off the area. Will also restrict parking opportunities</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  Thus will support locals and provide timed stays for visitors</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>Disability should have opportunities to park. With the go surgery supporting people from a wide radius the disabled need these bays</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> I have found it impossible to park for my doctors appointments recently and it's getting worse. I am not disabled</p>
(216) Local resident, (Watchfield, Lysander)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>No opinion</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>No opinion</b> Stopping to drop people off when not causing an obstruction should not be an issue on the high street</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> I think 5 would be better as if I'm out for a meal etc 3 hours can come round quickly</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Object</b> These bays wherever I see them are abused or empty.. most blue badge holders park where suits them best and not specific bays</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
(217) Local resident, (Watchfield, Oxford Square)	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYs – <b>Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYs – <b>Object</b> Obviously double yellow lines cause cars to park elsewhere but this in turns leads to congestion and almost invariably further double yellows so in effect a self perpetuating problem with cars forced to park away from shops and in residential areas. Having originally supported parking restrictions the removal of the school has freed up numerous places and not just at start &amp; finish times. Over the last few months I have had no problems parking in the Eastern ( Longcot ) end of the High St and Church Walk normally seems to have one or two spaces. In short there is currently no need to impose parking restrictions. I would go further and suggest that the removal of the double yellows outside the Methodist Church at the Western end of the High St would aid shopping at that end of Shrivenham High St.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b></p>



	<p>Apart from residents and shop workers there is no need for anyone to park for more than 3 ( three ) hours - but if you are a commuter from one of the neighbouring villages just where else would you park on a dark,rainy morning whilst waiting to catch your bus ? On balance I'm for lifting the existing double yellow lines in the High St and marginally in favour of BST 3 hour restrictions in the High St ( but not in the winter) and against double yellows in both Church Walk and Hazell Lane. Parking for shoppers should be as easy as possible. I am a Blue Badge holder.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No opinion</b>  Blue Badge holders are allowed to park on double yellows so if double yellows ( which I object to ) are introduced then there's no need to introduce more disabled parking places; if 3 ( three) hour restrictive parking is introduced then that would cater t</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
<p>(218) Local resident,  (Watchfield, Pilgrims Close)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p> <p>.</p>
<p>(219) Local resident,  (Watchfield, Shute Avenue)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b>  This will keep the road clear of parked vehicles and be easier for traffic to get through.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b></p>

	<p>I think there should be permits and time limits on parking bays as this will help to manage traffic and parking. However, 3 hours seems a long time, especially if people park and get the bus somewhere. I believe the time should be reduced to 1 hour as this is sufficient time to run errands in Shrivenham i.e. get a treatment, go for lunch, visit the shops. The only exception may be the hairdressers but perhaps there could be a special permit given by hairdressers to clients.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> It seems appropriate to have a few disabled bays outside the doctors and pharmacy.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(220) Local resident, (Watchfield, Squires Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>No objection</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>No objection</b> Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>No objection</b> As a Watchfield resident I have had issues trying to find parking specifically attending the surgery or chemist. The inability to park must be having a knock on effect to the Shrivenham businesses.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b> See previous comments</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> See previous comments.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(221) Local resident, (Watchfield, .)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> .</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> .</p>

	<p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b></p> <p>.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p> <p>.</p>
<p>(222) Local resident, (Watchfield, Ansond Drive)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Object</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Partially support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p> <p>Definitely need some regulation in the high street as almost impossible to park due to commuter parking. But needs to be still be accessible for the sake of both businesses and residents.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  This would mean more spaces available for shoppers on high street and is just a fairer system than the current free for all that is jammed up most of the time</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b>  Disabled parking spaces are generally not used so as long as not too many given over that could also stand empty most of the time I agree with it</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  No it's long overdue to have timed parking in place the businesses must suffer as well as the residents</p>
<p>(223) Local resident, (Watchfield, Barrington Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYs – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYs – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYs – <b>Support</b></p> <p>These areas can become dangerous for pedestrians if vision of the road is obscured.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b>  Whilst I do agree with limiting the time, there are no buss services to the local villages. This means that rather than drive all the way to Swindon/Oxford, people who do want to use public transport, have to drive to their nearest bus stop - Shrivenham being the most local for many. There is a big drive to reduce the use of cars and increase the use of public transport, but by limiting the number of people being able to access these services, they will either become</p>

	<p>redundant or too expensive for those who do use them. You are targeting people who do want to do their best and use public transport.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  There is only 1 disabled space at the moment. I assume that this percentage of disabled spaces to non-disabled is not representative of the percentage of blue badge holders in the area compared to other drivers.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b></p>
<p>(224) Member of public,  (Watchfield, Blenheim Road)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b>  Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b>  My GP surgery is in Shrivenham &amp; I use the other facilities as I live in watchfield. THE PARKING SITUATION IS HORRENDOUS. People use it as a Park and Ride or park an hour earlier than needed to do the school run</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b>  In essence 3 hours is OK as long as a no return within a certain amount of time is required. Permits should be residential  I'd happily pay for parking eg. 2 hours free , like Faringdon</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b>  My husband is a Blue badge holder, so this is very important to us</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b>  Pay to park , 2 hours free &amp; then pay . £1 for an hour max is 3 hours in a space . No return within a time frame . Permits for residents . Disabled bays / parent and child spaces are needed  Double yellows by Co op  Indian restaurant etc.</p>
<p>(225) Local resident,  (Watchfield, Elm Tree Surgery)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Partially support</b>  Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b></p>

	<p>Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>No opinion</b> Church walk needs parking for GP practice.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Partially support</b> Depends if the permits will be for those working in Shrivenham. I need to travel by car to work as a nurse in the surgery and would not be able to do this if I was nit able to park close by.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> I have a disabled relative and up till now have not been able to use the disabled parking spaces as they are always occupied.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> All these proposals are only useful if it is enforced. There must be some permit parking for those of us that work in the area or else you won't need parking any longer as Shrivenham will become a ghost town - no shops, businesses or services.</p>
(226) Local resident, (Watchfield, High Street)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> I support the parking restrictions but they need to be enforced. There are cars often parked on double yellow lines near the Methodist Church that cause traffic problems and this is never challenged.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> I think it would help people park who are using the shops/Drs/pharmacy.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>No objection</b> A lot of the parking bays are narrow so more wider disabled bays would be a good idea.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
(227) Local resident, (Watchfield, Lapwing lane)	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Object</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>No opinion</b></p>

	<p>No parking at anytime would kill the high street</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> It allows people to come into the village to use the local shop's hairdressers doctors etc without having to worry about parking</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> Disabled spaces are needed for those that cannot walk short distances</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> I very much support the 3 hour parking restriction</p>
<p>(228) Local resident, (Watchfield, LYSANDER CRESCENT)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> The number of cars in this area is increasing. Originally thought that the primary school drop and pick up times were a big factor but now the school has relocated, it is obvious that it is people parking for free in Shrivenham to get the bus to Oxford and surrounds for work.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b> .</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Partially support</b> None of the facilities are far from parking spaces, so I see little need for a large number of disabled spaces</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b></p>
<p>(229) Local resident, (Watchfield, Lysander Crescent)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>No opinion</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>No opinion</b> Any proposal to restrict unreasonable parking is welcome, as long as it's fully policed</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Support</b></p>

	<p>We have always thought that parking in the High Street should be time- or permit-restricted, though the residents who will need a permit may object to the costs</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> As a disabled badge holder, my wife welcomes the proposal for more designated spaces</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> The sooner this scheme is in place, the better!</p>
<p>(230) Local resident, (Watchfield. Responding on behalf of myself and use village regularly for DR,s, shopping, Hairdressers etc., Queens close)</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Loss of parking for visitors, shoppers, and residents if you don't live on High Street. We all pay the same rates, they will have free parking 24 hours we have 3 hours if any space’s available.</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>Object</b> Unfair for permit holders to have unlimited parking and the rest of us have to try and find spaces left. There are bound to be a lot less parking spaces with yellow lines etc so harder to park.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> More disabled people shop locally and need disabled spaces near Drs, shops etc.</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Partially support</b> Worried that plans will reduce number of spaces for general public. Concerned that number of resident permits will fill most of spaces and we will be unable to park at all. Numbers of spaces now, proposed spaces and number of permits that may be issued w</p>
<p>(231) Employee of local business, (, )</p>	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>No opinion</b> Hazell’s Lane DYLS – <b>No opinion</b> Objecting on the high-street - due to being an employee of a business it poses impacts on workers who will not be able to park near their place of work. it also opens a question of permits? will employees be responsible for paying for</p>

	<p>these? will enough be provided for all workers? As their is a cost of living crisis it makes those who make ends meat will therefore me imposed to pay for the parking..</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No opinion</b> n/a</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> n/a</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Object</b></p>
(232) Employee of local business, (, )	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Support</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Support</b> Too many people double parking</p> <p>Shared-use' parking bays – <b>No objection</b> Workers in the area only want to park for short periods of time to use the post office, get food or spend their lunch hour there.</p> <p>Disabled Persons Parking Places – <b>Support</b> There does not appear to be sufficient disabled parking</p> <p>Overall opinion – <b>Support</b> Parking needs to be better accommodated for everyone. Not just residents!</p>
(233) Rather not say, (, )	<p>High Street DYLS – <b>Object</b> Church Walk DYLS – <b>Partially support</b> Hazell's Lane DYLS – <b>Object</b> Any parking restriction will just move the vehicles elsewhere. This will the become a concern/danger to those who use the footpaths like wheelchair users, those with pushchairs and the partially sighted etc as most cars park on the curb, so this in itself will create a further problem whereas on the high street there are designated bays for those visiting and shopping.</p>



Increased traffic on the surrounding residential areas may be of a safety concern with child playing and crossing the roads.

Some people may just go to places that dont have any parking restrictions which will effect business locally. For instance I will always shop in Witney rather than Swindon as the parking is free and unrestricted.

**Shared-use' parking bays – Object**

Any parking restriction will just move the vehicles elsewhere. This will the become a concern/danger to those who use the footpaths like wheelchair users, those with pushchairs and the partially sighted etc as most cars park on the curb, so this in itself will create a further problem whereas on the high street there are designated bays for those visiting and shopping.

Increased traffic on the surrounding residential areas may be of a safety concern with child playing and crossing the roads.

Some people may just go to places that dont have any parking restrictions which will effect business locally. For instance I will always shop in Witney rather than Swindon as the parking is free and unrestricted.

**Disabled Persons Parking Places – No opinion**

/

**Overall opinion – Object**

Any parking restriction will just move the vehicles elsewhere. This will the become a concern/danger to those who use the footpaths like wheelchair users, those with pushchairs and the partially sighted etc as most cars park on the curb, so this in itself