

3 properties	<p>GENERAL RESPONSES for A "ROAD BLOCK" ON GREAT PARKS.</p> <p>With 7 additional thoughts from residents who oppose/support idea of a road block.</p>
LP	<p>Firstly a huge thank you to the Parish Council for the hours that they are putting in to secure the most sympathetic development at the land off Great Parks, it is greatly appreciated.</p> <p>As a resident of Little Parks, we received a letter from the Parish Council seeking views on a vehicle block in Great Parks. We have since received further letters from neighbours who are either in favour of or against the proposal.</p> <p>We are relatively ambivalent regarding the vehicle block, there are pros and cons to both. Regardless of what happens, we are going to suffer from increased traffic. The block is more likely to cause difficulties for us as we currently have two ways to leave the estate if necessary. A block will reduce this to one and cause both inconvenience and potential danger when emergency vehicles are prohibited from easily entering the estate. The block will definitely cause more traffic past my house.</p> <p>Rather than discussing a block, I firmly believe that we need to be putting our energy into getting the vehicle entrance moved altogether from Great Parks and onto the B3107. It currently is unrealistic to expect the traffic from the new development to join the road at its narrowest with limited visibility each way where traffic is entering the village in excess of the speed limit. The current access arrangements will lead to accidents especially if a bus stop is created on the small patch of grass reducing visibility further.</p> <p>I hope that the Parish Council will not pursue a block but rather focus on getting the entrance moved and letting us know how we can support this.</p>
CL	<p>Thank you for your communication outlining a proposal to block vehicle access through Great Parks.</p> <p>I am not convinced that this would improve the potential situation. While blocking traffic from the new development, it would have the effect of diverting all the traffic from the properties in Great Parks through Little Parks to leave and access their homes. This proposal would seem to guarantee an increase in traffic to try to address a potential, unquantified risk.</p> <p>I don't know if any studies have been conducted to understand the volume of traffic from the new development that would be likely to drive through Great Parks / Little Parks but I don't see what their motivation would be to turn this into a 'rat run' and the 'saving' to current residents could be outweighed by the traffic from Great Parks residents forced to use that route.</p> <p>If the concern is that there will be a significant volume of traffic choosing to exit the development and access the Melksham Road via Little Parks, then it may be more effective to simply make the relevant section of road one-way at a suitable point on Great Parks to prevent this while still allowing residents of Great Parks the option to access the Melksham Road that way.</p> <p>The most sensible solution to ease the impact would seem to be to provide for a main access to the development directly to and from the Melksham Road (but presumably this has previously been discounted) and to consider the design of the junction of Great Parks and the Melksham Road (including appropriate traffic management) to ease the flow at that point.</p>
LP/GP	<p>I'm really sorry this is past the deadline for comments on the 4th. Thank you for distributing the letter around Little Parks, it's great to see an active parish council trying to solve issues residents face.</p> <p>I think the "vehicle block" is something to consider, however, it would be good to understand the number of car trips we would expect to use Little</p>

Parks/Great Parks as a cut through from the new development, as I can't see it being much, if any quicker turning left out of the new development through the current residential area than turning right onto Melksham Road.

There are some other issues I would want addressed if Great Parks residents were to start using Little Parks entrance formally, including the removal of parked cars from the entrance to Little Parks on the right. These cause a few issues now so I would expect this would be slightly exacerbated with the proposed arrangement.

I am cautious however, that removing trips from GP/LP residents would create spare capacity at the existing GP junction. As such, there could be further development proposed using that junction as the main access. I believe this is already being looked at as in the revised document, the landscape strategy plan figure includes a road to the neighbouring field (see below image). The field this road would be entering is also included within the 2017 Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment ref 1037. Given access was a hot topic within the 2022 outline application, I wouldn't want the new arrangement to be a cause for future development to come forward. I am aware, however, this is very hypothetical so should only be considered lightly. Nevertheless, while Wiltshire Council wouldn't like to admit they have much in common with our neighbours in Bath & North East Somerset, they have previously introduced modal filters or "vehicle blocks" so this is something they have experience implementing. I include reference to a Traffic Regulation Order in Devizes which closed a well-known rat run <https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=1740>. Given the Wiltshire Council elections next year, this could be a good campaign for our local candidates to get behind...

My final point would be that I'd suggest renaming the proposal from "road block" to something more optimistic and inclusive such as "Great Parks cul-de-sac" or "Elmbridge Meadows walking and cycling route"? Although it is technically a road block, calling it something more inclusive is more welcoming and easier to gain buy in.

Hopefully that's been of some help and happy to chat further if required!

OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS WITHIN SUPPORT/OBJECT TO CONSIDER....

- LP
1. Firstly I would like to thank Holt Parish Council for the effort, dedication and substantial amount of work done on behalf of the village in general and in particularly the residents of Little Parks, Great Parks and Crandon Lea.
 2. With regard to the proposal to block off Great Parks to vehicular access from the Bewley Development I have the following comments :-
 - a. A much better solution in my opinion would be for Holt Parish Council to lobby Wiltshire Planning Authority to change their minds and allow vehicular access to the Bewley Development from the B3107 Melksham Road further towards Melsham and away from the existing entrance to Great Parks. Precedence for junctions adjoining Melksham Road already exists in abundance: Wessex Water Pumping station, Stables, Farm entrances, Equestrian Centre, Private dwellings, a small housing development and a vehicle repair centre!
 - b. The addition of a mini-roundabout at the entrance to the Bewley estate (which could align with the entrance to the proposed Redcliffe Development) would have several advantages , it would remove excess traffic exiting onto

	<p>the B3107 at the Great Parks entrance, it would reduce the speed of vehicles entering the village from the Melksham direction and it may even result in the 30 m.p.h speed limit being moved closer to the Broughton Gifford junction.</p> <p>c. Although Bewley, in their revised plan, have included <u>many serious deviations</u> from the original development plan approved by the Government Inspector following a Public Hearing, (for which they should be held accountable), I understand that they have offered to partially fund the moving of the speed limit signs and the cost of providing an entrance from the B3107 (which should include a roundabout) and this would reduce the financial impact of such provision.</p> <p>d. If the vehicular entrance to the Bewley Development is moved onto the B3107 then there is no reason why a footpath could not be provided from the development into Great Parks to facilitate a safer pedestrian access to school routes for future residents of the development.</p> <p>3. If common sense does not prevail and the development's vehicular access remains in Great Parks then I would be in favour of blocking vehicles from using the Little Parks exit onto the B3107.</p>
LP/GP	<p>As a practising civil engineer, I make the following suggestions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parish Council should consider including a removable barrier within the roadblock, which the fire brigade could access; there are fire hydrants south of the roadblock, which would serve No 2 and No 3 as well as the substation. • The County Council would likely want to move the vehicle barrier south to enable emergency service vehicles to respond to an incident at No 4 or near the new entrance. • The district network operator of the substation would be a statutory consultee of the proposed roadblock. Good access through Little Parks and Great Parks remains for any future works by the DNO, and this should be included in the initial proposal to the CC. • Some consideration will be needed to accommodate the roadblock and the new service connections to the Bewley site, marked in red. • One idea worth considering is locating the roadblock at the substation's southern edge and formalising the road's current use as a car-sharing facility.
LP	<p>Great Parks & Little Parks Traffic Options</p> <p>I set out my views suggestions to the Parish Council. I have considered the two letters from my neighbours at 7 and 10 Little Parks – both make valid points, albeit arriving at different conclusions.</p> <p>Minimal Proposal – Traffic Calming/Discouraging</p> <p>I suggest the existing roadways should be narrowed to slow and discourage traffic. I find the square “blobs” on the road very hostile to residents who must traverse them. A better option is to create from existing kerbs two small mounds outwards, offset from each other, so that vehicles must slow to go between them on a diagonal line, but can do so without bouncing over them. Larger vehicles such as ambulances and white vans will ride over the low edges of the mounds whilst staying level.</p> <p>Three calming locations have merit:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Near the new entrance to the Bewley site as suggested in the Parish Council's letter, to create a strong deterrent to turning left into Great Parks; 2. Somewhere midway along Great Parks (approximately 17 across to 26) to deter the acceleration along the straight road; 3. By the green area in Little Parks (approximately opposite 8,10,12) again to deter acceleration up the straight. <p>Preferred Option - Closure and Calming/Discouraging</p> <p>Three closure locations have merit:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Near the new entrance to the Bewley site, so it is visible from the Bewley entrance and the main road; 2. By 3 Great Parks – this provides easy turn-arounds for vehicles on both sides of the closure; 3. At the juncture of Great Parks and Little Parks, where the small green areas can be converted into a turning head. This also better balances the lengths of culs-de-sac, and simplifies access to addresses; Great Parks is approached one way off the main road, Little Parks another way. <p>With any of the closure options, the traffic calming offsets should also be created.</p>
GP	<p>I would be in favour of any measures that could encourage the residents of the new development to turn right instead of left, for example improving visibility at the main road junction / street architecture as they leave the development that encourages a right turn; as well as being preferable I also feel this to be more realistically attainable</p>
LP	<p>In my opinion that there should be a restriction of any "Bewley Homes" vehicles to use either Great Parks or Little Parks during the building period. They have a perfectly good access on the main road, and I do not feel that after the estate is complete a physical barrier is required.</p> <p>During the building phase the priority should be for resident's comfort and safety.</p> <p>I believe that there should be a total restriction of all Bewley employees using Little Parks and Great Parks. It is Bewley's responsibility to make sure that the entrance on the main road is wide enough to take all traffic in and out of the site and use traffic management equipment, as necessary. People using the main road to travel through the village will have to slow down, be patient, or use another route to their destination.</p> <p>The domestic roads of Little Parks and Great Parks are not designed to take this elevated level of large heavy traffic. It is a main drop off place for parents taking children by foot to school, and the coach arriving each morning to collect youngsters for St. Laurence. The top end of Little Parks is already packed with cars parking to access homes on the main road, visitors to dwelling to deliver care, taxi's collecting and dropping off, people stopping to answer their mobiles and people using the post box.</p> <p>After the development is complete and development traffic is reduced to domestic vehicles, then I do not see a major problem. Usually, drivers exit via their nearest route, which would be right onto the top of Great parks and on to the main road.</p> <p>I do not think that a physical barrier needs to be constructed. A "no site access" notice at the top of Little Parks and Great parks would be adequate and the estate opening onto Great parks should be kept closed until the works are finished.</p>

GP	<p>I am also concerned about the junction of Great Parks and Melksham Road once the development is completed as it will obviously become extremely busy and possibly dangerous at peak times. I feel that consideration of a roundabout or traffic lights would be advantageous or even better to have the entrance to the new development further along directly onto Melksham Road also controlled by lights or a roundabout. This last option would also not require the Great Parks block.</p>
LP	<p>Unfortunately, if the Wiltshire roads department had agreed to let the new development direct access to the main road originally then none of this would have been necessary</p> <p>Instead, by allowing this development access to Great Parks road instead of the main road, they have created a very dangerous precedent and therefore unfortunately the only way to handle this is to allow this area to become a <u>cul de sac</u>.</p> <p>In addition - either at the end of Little Parks onto the road or where access is given to Great Parks by the main <u>road</u> we will need a traffic light.</p> <p>A roundabout will not work as giving way to the right from Little Parks will ensure a steady stream of traffic thereby cutting off all access during busy periods from Little Parks to the main road. <u>Alternatively</u> even a pedestrian crossing perhaps to break up the flow of traffic at the busiest time.</p> <p>P.S. We would like to request that Wiltshire council looks more carefully at possible danger zones when allowing new developments to take place. Already because of the recent changes on the main road going through Holt, it has become a much more dangerous area by the bus stop and the shop. The road narrows there and already there have been a few near misses. You cannot park on both sides of the road and allow two traffic streams to pass each other, especially if it is buses. There is no notice to motorists to slow down before they reach this section coming from the Bradford on Avon side.</p>