

Summary of responses to draft TRO (Traffic Regulation Order) for Atcham (November 2023)

Total number of responses: 20

Responses expressing support for the proposed TRO: 9

Responses opposing the proposed TRO: 3

Responses expressing qualified or partial support: 8

Key concerns raised:

The implementation of the TRO may simply displace the problem to other parts of the village (particularly The Glebe, also St Eata's Lane and Close, and private parking areas) - expressed by 11 respondents.

The parking problems should be addressed by Brunning & Price (Mytton & Mermaid) because they have insufficient parking for staff and customers – expressed by 9 respondents. (Longner Estate also mentioned by 1 respondent.)

The proposal would make the junctions much safer – expressed by 3 respondents

How would the restrictions be monitored and enforced? - expressed by 3 respondents

Would residents be able to have parking permits? - expressed by 3 respondents

Other key points made:

"We would not want any yellow lines on Malthouse Lane beyond the junction of the Glebe and no lines in St. Eatas Lane. This would affect parking for family and friends cars. Also the church has services which often many cars park on the road beyond the Glebe near to the church."

"The church drive should also be a nonparking area, except for those attending the church and the occupants of The Vicarage Cottage. Otherwise the church gates will have to be closed."

"Is it intended for the double yellow lines to be extended to the end of St Eata's Lane? If so, this will cause problems for residents in St Eata's Lane as there will be no space for visitors/tradesmen/deliveries."

"If double yellow lines are put in the village as a whole then people like myself will be affected since I will not be able to have visitors."

"Yellow lines ... are only required on Malthouse Lane and not St Eatas or The Glebe - as residents and their visitors need to park on the road - but do request as I have seen in other areas recently that a sign is placed at their entrance that says "Parking for residents and their visitors only".

"I understand that staff parking is under review at the farm as no planning permission was sort. I was surprised that given the level of objection to any construction or new resident traffic to the farm using the lane - during their planning request - hence the requirement for a new road way entrance - that we suddenly had up to 30 cars parking at the farm which are coming and going from around 7am up to 1 am... If the new road to the farm was up and running then Mytton staff could use that roadway and I would have no objection to them using the farm yard for staff parking - but am not happy that there is all this extra traffic using our lane without any consultation."

"I'd like to see the double yellow lines come up to back entrance of the church. [Residents of] The Glebe [are faced] with daily challenges of getting access to driveways... People also park on the paths down The Glebe as well. It's been very stressful."

"It appears that the only part of Malthouse Lane not to be covered by double yellow lines... is also the section of the road where there is a slight bend in the lane. This makes visibility of oncoming cars more of an issue for residents of Atcham using the lane when cars are parked in this area. Therefore, if double yellow lines are to be implemented then this is the one area of the lane where we would approve their usage, rather than their omission, to ensure that cars don't park here. As an alternative... we would suggest that the area outside of the Village Hall could be left without double yellow lines to allow for a few parked cars."

"Why has this become an issue for the parish council and the village itself to address?"

"There is no doubt that the parking issue has hugely changed the face of the village and, at busier times, access to and from the village and our properties has become increasingly difficult for residents."

"I feel that all of the possible options should be presented to the residents so that they can all be considered. I'm assuming actions such as 'residents only' signs, parking permits etc. could all be considered as part of the solution."

"We [long-term residents] are aware that traffic and parking issues relating to the hotel are nothing new and that in fact the situation at the moment is in many ways less difficult than experienced in the past. We believe that the introduction of parking restrictions is not necessary, would be inconvenient for residents, and is the wrong response to the issue. The difficulties on Malthouse Lane are the inevitable result of the hotel owners attempting to do more business than they have the parking provision to cater for... Before opening, Brunning & Price assured us that they would not allow their customers to park in the street, as they turn customers away when it got so busy that the car parks were full. This sounded unlikely, and obviously it has not proved to be the case. However, it remains their responsibility to manage this situation, since their business is its sole cause."

"It has been suggested that parking on Malthouse Lane obstructs traffic along the lane. However, in the time we have been living here, the only vehicles we have seen genuinely obstructed from passing have been the excessively large farm vehicles using the lane. These vehicles cause their own problems to residents, and given that there is the option of a route across farmland, we feel that this should not be used as a justification for introducing restrictions on Malthouse Lane."

"If you...can demonstrate that the majority view is that restrictions are necessary, we would ask that the rural, village setting and listed buildings are at least respected by opting for "conservation" type lines (narrower primrose rather than fluorescent yellow), to reduce the visual intrusion."

"At a PC meeting it was suggested that land adjacent to the old school yard be used to create additional parking space and a gate allowing pedestrian access be fitted. This would take parking off village roads."

"Many Mytton customers are unaware that there is a car park at the rear of the pub. Clear signage should indicate this."

"At present, pub traffic is illegally parking on footpaths, illegally parking too close to junctions, and illegally parking on planted grass verges. There is no policing of this behaviour now, so what would change?"

"The pub management have been looking for a solution to their "overspill parking problems". May I point out that the Mytton does not have an overspill problem, it has a normal trading day problem, caused by planning permission being given for a large enterprise with little or no thought for disruption to the village. The pub management should be doing all they can to alleviate this problem themselves, on their own site, before trying to acquire packets of land around the village. I refer of course to the grass area in front of the pub, currently covered with tables and umbrellas, which should have been used for parking from the very start. Only after

the Mytton sorts out it's own mess should the subject of parking around the village be re-visited."

"The double yellow lines on Cross Houses Lane are a must."

"Since, the Mytton and Mermaid has reopened, we have experienced daily issues with the parking situation. This is seriously impacting the quality of our lives. Whilst we wish for the Mytton and Mermaid to be successful, it delivers no benefit to the village and local residents. It should be incumbent on businesses to make arrangements for patron parking and this should not impact negatively on their neighbours."