

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RECEIVED TO THE PROPOSALS TO EXTEND RESIDENTS' PARKING ZONE C AND OFFICER RESPONSE

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
1	Concerned that the proposals for Shady Bower will continue to allow parking to take place opposite Bower Gardens and this will result in the existing safety hazard of cars travelling in opposite directions along Shady Bower being forced into the middle of the road and this will lead to a collision occurring.	2	This issue has previously been raised with the Joint Transportation Team (JTT). Records show that there have been no recorded accidents at this location as a result of parking taking place opposite Bower Gardens. This situation will continue to be monitored and if accidents occur as a result of the parking, the introduction of appropriate waiting restrictions will be progressed.
2	Bower Gardens already suffers parking problems caused by commuter parking and the proposals for Shady Bower will displace further commuter parking into Bower Gardens.	2	<p>Prior to the advertisement of the proposals only one complaint about commuter parking in Bower Gardens had been received by the JTT.</p> <p>Survey work undertaken, both prior to the advertisement of the proposals and since receipt of these comments, has indicated that on average 11 cars are parked on Shady Bower during the daytime. Of these 11 cars typically 3 park opposite St. Martin's School, 6 park in the lay-by outside Shady Bower Close and 2 park opposite Bower Gardens. The proposals will displace the 3 cars parking opposite St Martin's School. However, this parking can be accommodated on Shady Bower opposite Bower Gardens given the layout of the proposed waiting restrictions.</p> <p>The Council undertakes monitoring of the impact the introduction of waiting restrictions has on displacing parking 12 months after restrictions are installed. If significant parking problems are found to be occurring in either Shady Bower or Bower Gardens as a result of displaced parking proposals, the introduction of residents' parking will be progressed.</p>
3	The proposals do not address the problem of commuters parking at the junction of Shady Bower and Bower Gardens.	1	A request for the introduction of waiting restrictions at this location has already been added to the list of locations awaiting the allocation of funding to allow the necessary TRO work to be progressed.
4	Could the introduction of waiting restrictions at the junction of The Avenue with Laverstock Road be considered?	1	This issue has never been raised with the JTT prior to the advertisement of these proposals. A request for the introduction of waiting restrictions at this location will be added to the list of locations awaiting the allocation of funding to allow the necessary TRO work to be progressed.
5	According to the proposals I am due to have a parking bay outside of my property but this would prevent me from using my dropped kerb.	1	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.
6	We have grown up children living at home meaning that we will need to park 4 vehicles, given the rules of the residents' parking schemes where will we be able to park them?	1	Each residence is entitled to a maximum allocation of two permits unless off-road parking is available. If off-road parking is available at the residence the permit allocation is reduced by one permit for each off-road parking space (driveway and/or garage) present.

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
			If it is felt that there are mitigating circumstances that need to be considered when determining a property's permit allocation, residents can make reference to these in writing when applying for their permits. The District Council Parking Office considers requests for additional permits on a case by case basis.
7	Why does Saturday have to be included in the scheme as there are no commuter parking problems on this day?	1	It is the District Council's current policy for waiting restrictions within residents' parking schemes to operate between 8.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. Monday to Saturday. This is to protect parking in residential areas when commuter and shopper parking problems are most likely to be experienced.
8	At present many people park outside their own dropped kerbs which will be stopped by these proposals therefore reducing parking places for all residents.	1	Currently 37 households in Wain-A-Long Road are able to park in front of their dropped kerbs at any time of the day. If implemented the proposals will mean that 28 households in Wain-A-Long Road will be able to park in front of their dropped kerbs at any time of the day, with the remaining 9 households being able to park in front of their dropped kerb overnight and on Sundays.
9	While parking bays may be created in the lower part of Bourne Avenue very few residents live there and will be unable to offer an unofficial neighbourhood watch as happens in Wain-A-Long Road. Therefore, vehicles will be more vulnerable to car crime, which is already a problem there. We know of several incidents of cars being broken into and possessions stolen.	1	Officers have contacted the Police to try to ascertain the recorded level of car crime in Bourne Avenue to see if the concerns of the objector have any foundation. Unfortunately, the Police have been unable to supply any information in relation to this matter. Officers therefore cannot comment.
10	In your scheme there is no allowance to swap permits between vehicles even for maintenance purposes if you have off-road parking. For example, if I wish to put the car that is usually parked on our drive onto the road, and then, I put the car parked on the road on the drive, I will have to buy a day pass for £5 if I do more than 2 hours work?	1	This objector has a driveway protection marking in front of the dropped kerb. This means that the resident could put the car usually parked on the driveway on the driveway protection marking in front of their dropped kerb for as long as is necessary. Residents do not require a permit to park on their own driveway protection marking.
11	As there will be more yellow lines and reduced parking is the Council going to reimburse people with permits if permits outstrip parking bays?	1	No. The rules of the residents' parking schemes operated in Salisbury do not guarantee any residents a parking space. However, it should be pointed out that currently RPZC is the only residents' parking scheme in operation in Salisbury where there are more parking spaces available within the zone than permits issued.
12	We sometimes have problems with cars from Wessex Road parking in Wain-A-Long Road at weekends because they do not have a permit for their own zone. Where are they going to park? I know - Westbourne Close or Manor Farm Road.	1	Residents of Wessex Road park in Wain-A-Long Road, primarily due to the lack of available parking spaces within their road. Given their relative distance from Wessex Road it would be unlikely that residents would choose to park in either Westbourne Close or Manor Farm Road should these proposals be introduced. If introduced, it is more likely that residents of Wessex Road will apply for permits to park in the extended RPZC.
13	A better use of money would be to introduce a one-way system to assist the flow of traffic at all times. This could be done by making traffic go down Bourne Avenue and go up Wain-A-Long Road.	1	This is an issue that has been raised before and never progressed, due to concerns that the introduction of a one-way system in Bourne Avenue and Wain-A-Long Road will lead to an increase in traffic speed in these roads. A request to introduce traffic calming in the area already sits on the County Council's list of schemes awaiting funding.

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
			If the proposals are implemented, the removal of commuter parking from Wain-A-Long Road would help to improve the flow of traffic along the road as there would be fewer vehicles using it.
14	The introduction of scheme is clearly against the democratically expressed wishes of the majority of the residents, voiced on several occasions and most recently in the 2006 consultation exercise.	1	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.
15	As the road safety aspects of the previous proposals have already been implemented, the new proposals are clearly not intended to benefit residents, but to cause inconvenience and impose additional stealth taxes at a time of unprecedented increases in the cost of living, particularly for the pensioners amongst us.	1	<p>The proposals are designed to remove problems associated with commuter and shopper parking within Wain-A-Long Road. These will help to improve road safety and the flow of traffic along the road which will be of benefit to residents.</p> <p>It is the stated policy of Salisbury District Council to charge for parking permits within residents' parking zones.</p> <p>This charge contributes towards the costs of administering the permits. It also helps pay for enforcement action, during the schemes' hours of operation, which preserve parking rights for permit holders in residents' parking zones.</p> <p>It would be grossly unfair to make residents across the whole of Salisbury District bear the entire cost of administering and enforcing residents' parking zones which they are barred from using during their hours of operation.</p>
16	The new proposals ignore the decision taken in 1998 that Wiltshire County Council would not proceed with a residents' parking scheme for the two roads until Salisbury District Council wished to proceed, and Salisbury District Council would defer any scheme until there was clear support for it. The consultation exercise held in 2006 showed a majority of residents to be against the scheme. No subsequent attempt has been made to consult us again.	1	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.
17	The new scheme is pernicious in that it will introduce problems which do not at present exist, by proposing substantial and unnecessary reductions in the parking stock available to residents, despite the reductions already made on road safety grounds following the 1998 review. It also worsens availability by amending the nearby Zone C 'no waiting' times from the original 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. to new times of 8.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. Why is all this now deemed essential? Certainly, the documents lodged at Pennyfarthing House do not justify the extension of the scheme to our suburban roads.	1	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
18	<p>The extended Zone C parking scheme is grossly unfair and punitive to the residents, as the following points demonstrate:</p> <p>(a) Residents' permits will be restricted to 2 per residence no matter how many car or motor cycle owners live there. (Tough if you have grown up children with their own vehicles, or a lodger who drives). The purpose of this is stated to be to give residents a fair chance of finding a parking space within their zone. In practice, it will deny many vehicle owning residents any chance of being allowed to park in their zone.</p> <p>(b) If a property has a drive or a garage, the allocation is reduced by one permit, for each parking space available within the residence. (Tough if you have paid for a garage or hardstanding to be built, because the property will be more highly rated when the new valuations take place, but you will be unable to choose how to use your expensive facility now.</p> <p>(c) Residents will have to pay £15 a year for each permit for which they are eligible to enable them to hopefully park somewhere within Zone C. (Parking in your own zone, let alone street, is certainly not guaranteed under the terms and conditions of this scheme).</p> <p>(d) Residents may choose to spend another £15 to purchase a year's supply of 50 visitor permits, which allows less than one visit per week. If they expect more than one visitor a week they will have to purchase (in advance) a further supply of visitor permits (up to 50) at £2.50 each, then after that at £5.50 each per day. Not surprisingly, there is no limit on how many can be purchased at the top rate. There is no right to a refund if you find you have over-estimated and purchased too many at these exorbitant rates. This seems a highly dubious decision which needs to be reconsidered by the Council.</p>	1	<p>In general these comments appear to be a recap of the District Council's published policies and rules regarding the issuing of parking permits in residential parking zones. More specific comments are listed below:</p> <p>(a) Please refer to officer response to Comment 6 above.</p> <p>(b) Under planning law both garages and driveways are defined as intended to accommodate parked vehicles. The reduction in permits for those residents who have access to a garage or driveway is designed to make them use these facilities to try to ensure that people who do not have access to off-street parking facilities have a reasonable chance of finding an on-street parking space close to their home.</p> <p>(c) This is in line with the District Council's published rules regarding the issuing of parking permits in residents' parking zones.</p> <p>(d) It is the stated policy of Salisbury District Council to charge for visitor parking permits within residents' parking zones.</p> <p>The reason that a charge is made for visitor parking permits is to act as a deterrent to residents selling their visitor parking permits on to commuters/shoppers. Selling visitor parking permits leads to a reduction in the number of spaces available within which residents and their visitors can park. This is a problem that previously has been experienced within residents' parking zones in Salisbury.</p>

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
	<p>(e) If we have a tradesman doing work at our homes, or making a delivery/connection, we face having to give up one of our precious 30p daily visitor permits and then risk having to buy more at £2.50 or £5.50 each if we then exceed our limit for the year.</p> <p>(f) Non car owners over 60 or housebound may apply for an annual free open visitor permit. This will allow one car visit at a time. If more visitors are expected for more than two hours (e.g. for birthdays or anniversaries, etc) the resident must purchase the scratch cards at 30p each for the first 50, then at £2.50 for up to the next 50 and £5.50 beyond that. (People in this grouping are far more likely to receive frequent visits from family and friends than those who are able to drive themselves).</p> <p>(g) There will be more areas of yellow lines than at present as they are to be extended further around corners and much further down the road, thus further reducing parking opportunities for residents, (Remember, residents will still be competing with the 2 hour shoppers and commuters for fewer spaces).</p>		<p>(e) Tradesmen working/delivering in Wain-A-Long Road would be entitled to park in the proposed on-street parking bays for up to two hours without needing any kind of permit. Tradesmen undertaking work taking longer than two hours could either be given a visitors parking permit or apply for a tradesmen's waiver from the District Council.</p> <p>(f) This is in line with the District Council's published rules regarding the issuing of parking permits in residents' parking zones.</p> <p>(g) In the proposals advertised for Wain-A-Long Road there is no overall increase in the length of double yellow line restrictions present within the road.</p> <p>Several lengths of single yellow line restrictions will be introduced in the road which, whilst preventing daytime parking, do allow for parking overnight and on Sundays when demand from residents for parking space within the road is at its greatest.</p>
19	<p>Other drawbacks in the small print which are less readily apparent are:</p> <p>(a) Some residents choose to keep caravans, trailers, boats, etc on their drives, or use their garages for storage purposes; (Indeed, one neighbour had to have a garage built to store surplus household effects as she was not allowed to erect a shed because it would be visible from the road)! The Council are now demanding we get rid of all such items and park a car or motorcycle there, as we will not be eligible for a street parking permit. If residents prefer to keep a caravan or boat or do not empty a garage, it could ultimately cost as much as £1,672 a year for extra visitor permits to park the car on the road. This is a scandalous price to have to pay for making what you feel is the best use of a facility you have paid for at your own property.</p>	1	<p>(a) Please refer to officer response to Comment 6 above.</p>

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
	<p>(b) If one qualifies for a residents' street parking permit, it will carry the registration number of one nominated vehicle. If another resident in the same property has a car or motorcycle kept off the road in a garage or parking space, they will not be allowed to change the parking arrangements (eg for maintenance purposes or in an emergency) unless for under two hours or on a Sunday, without using one of the precious visitor permits. If he forgets and leaves the wrong vehicle out on the road, he will be liable for a fine of £30 or more. More flexibility for the interchange of vehicles is definitely required here.</p> <p>(c) The second-tier parking tickets will be charged at the rate of £2.50 each for up to 50, then the city centre all day parking rate of £5.50 will apply even if the visitor or tradesman stays for just a few minutes over the two hour free parking limit. This is a disgrace, as city centre parking rates have no relevance to street parking in the suburbs, where most of the residents live more than a mile from the city centre.</p> <p>(d) If a residence has more than two cars or motorcycles, the Council will now require the owners to either get rid of them, park them somewhere outside the permit zone or pay as much as £1672 a year for £5.50 a day permits to keep them at home.</p> <p>(e) The requirement for a resident to check his or her validly parked vehicle at least every 24 hours is quite impractical at times, for example when a family is away on holiday. Many people go on coach or train holidays and leave the car at home. Others even use taxi transfers to airports, etc. One of my neighbours – a single lady – has been taken into hospital, but her car is still on the road. Neighbours may be asked to check in one's absence, but would not be able to move a car for insurance reasons, so the car will presumably be towed away.</p>		<p>(b) This issue is something that will be considered the next time that the District Council's rules regarding the operation of residents' parking schemes are reviewed with particular reference to those who do not have the option of using a driveway protection marking as outlined in the officer response to Comment 10 above.</p> <p>(c) Please refer to officer response to Comment 18(d) above.</p> <p>(d) Please refer to officer response to Comment 6 above.</p> <p>(e) The requirement to check that your vehicle is parked correctly is general advice offered to residents and not a legal requirement.</p> <p>The only power that the District Council has to remove a vehicle from the public highway is if it is classed as abandoned. For a vehicle to be classed as abandoned its tax disc must have expired and the Council must have completed the relevant legal processes.</p>

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
	<p>(f) There is no provision for residents to be able to call at the office to obtain a visitor permit, in an emergency, or if an unexpected visitor arrives before a new supply of tickets has been received by post. This surely needs to be addressed.</p> <p>(g) Wiltshire County Council is clearly now aiming to control how residents use their garage or drive, and to dictate how few visitors they are allowed each year and this is in a supposedly free and democratic country !</p>		<p>(f) This issue is something that will be considered the next time that the District Council's rules regarding the operation of residents' parking schemes are next reviewed.</p> <p>(g) Under planning law both garages and driveways are defined as intended to accommodate parked vehicles.</p> <p>This is in line with the District Council's published rules regarding the issuing of parking permits in residents' parking zones. There is no limit on the number of visitor permits that can be purchased.</p>
20	On a personal note, for the 30 years I have lived in my property my growing family, visitors, neighbours and I more recently, fugitives from the present Zone C have all made use of the three parking spaces on the road outside my house. Now, suddenly, it appears necessary to replace these three spaces with yellow lines, which might also be extended across my hardstanding! It cannot be argued, validly that road safety is the reason for this decision, as in my 30 years here there have been no accidents at this spot, and if safety really had been an issue, yellow lines would have been introduced years ago. This is a clear indication that the scheme is not, as stated, for the benefit of the residents, but is another stealth tax on motorists.	1	<p>The single yellow restrictions that are proposed to be introduced outside the objectors house are on the grounds of helping the daytime traffic flow along Wain-A-Long Road. Careful consideration has been given to the location of both parking bays and yellow line restrictions so as to allow parking to continue to take place on both sides of the road, whilst keeping a safe and adequate traffic flow along the road and protecting visibility and turning manoeuvres at the junctions of Wain-A-Long Road with Bourne Avenue, Wessex Road, Manor Road and St. Mark's Roundabout.</p> <p>During the day the closest parking bay that the objector will be able to use is approximately 10 metres away from where they currently park. The single yellow line restriction line restriction will still allow parking directly outside the objector's house overnight and on Sundays.</p>
21	The proposed substantial new reductions in parking spaces will mean that the parking stock will have been deliberately reduced below the level necessary to accommodate all the vehicles owned by residents, although we are to be charged for permits which will not necessarily allow us to even park in our zone. This seems a highly dubious point, which will not enamour the proposals to those who have investigated them. If the Council forces this issue, they should be required to provide us with a new overflow car park nearby, ideally just under the railway bridge on the way to Laverstock, to take the residents' vehicles which have been forced out and to provide some spaces for our visitors. This should be priced very reasonably for residents, as it would have been made necessary by the unreasonable reductions in the parking stock in Zone C. Commuters using this car parking should pay a higher rate - but not that appropriate to city centre parking.	1	<p>In the proposals advertised for Wain-A-Long Road there is no overall increase in the length of double yellow line restrictions present within the road. Several lengths of single yellow line restrictions will be introduced in the road, which whilst preventing daytime parking, do allow for parking overnight and on Sundays when demand from residents for parking space within the road is at its greatest. It should also be pointed out that the level of overnight and Sunday parking available within Wain-A-Long Road would remain at the current level even if the proposals are introduced.</p> <p>It would be illegal for the District Council to use public money to build what would be in effect a private overflow car park for residents of Wain-A-Long Road.</p>

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
22	<p>A fairer residents parking scheme was introduced a few years ago in the Heath District of Cardiff (where one of my daughters lived) to protect residents from staff and visitor parking for the nearby Heath hospital. Each local resident was invited to apply for up to three free parking permits for themselves and potential visitors with no limitations introduced for garages or drives they owned.</p> <p>The permits were printed on thin card, not the commercial expensive scratch cards Introduced by Salisbury District Council, and therefore cost the Council very little to introduce, with no ongoing running costs. Why do you not look at the idea of such a scheme for residents' parking outside the city centre, with consequently lower administrative costs and no running costs? This might even find more ready acceptance by local residents, if also combined with no further reductions in our parking stock. One can see the reason for parking restrictions in our busy city centre, but not for the suburban roads. One local resident told me he had moved out from the city centre to get away from parking restrictions and is now horrified to see them proposed for the streets around his new home.</p>	1	<p>Whilst the visitor permits referred to may be cheaper to produce than the scratchcards used by the District Council this would not remove the administration costs of issuing the permits or the costs associated with enforcing the waiting restrictions.</p> <p>The District Council used to offer both free and unlimited residents/visitors parking permits within residents parking zones in Salisbury. However, the reason that a charge was introduced for residents/visitor parking permits was to act as a deterrent to residents selling their permits on to commuters/shoppers. This was a problem previously experienced within residents' parking zones in Salisbury and consequently leads to a large reduction in the number of spaces available within residents' parking zones that can be used by residents and their visitors.</p>
23	<p>A residents' parking scheme was first offered to Bourne Avenue and Wain-a-Long Road by Salisbury District Council as a 'benefit' to protect us from commuter parking. Examination of the extended Zone C proposals shows that, far from being beneficial to residents, the introduction of such a scheme would be grossly punitive, which is why many residents have been so loathed to accept it - the 'cure' being worse than the condition. Others, unfortunately, have not studied the small print, and believe that for a modest fee they will get parking for themselves and their visitors at their homes - something which is far from the truth. A fairer scheme, on the lines of Comment 22 above, coupled with cancellation of the proposals for further reductions in our parking stock, might prove more acceptable if bureaucracy refuses to defer to reason. However, having spoken to many of my fellow residents on this subject, we can still see no genuine need for a residents' parking scheme in the two roads.</p>	1	<p>This is just a recap from the objector of points 14-22. Please refer to officer responses to Comment 14-22 above.</p>

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
	The biggest risk to safety at present comes from speeding motorists in Wain-a-Long Road. Residents have long argued the case for a one-way system down Bourne Avenue and up Wain-a-Long Road, backed by a few speed reducing measures, to resolve this problem. Fewer parking spaces in the two roads will only encourage higher speeds.		
24	<p>The Council's "no waiting at any time" proposal for Millbrook would leave us with no alternative parking and without safe access to our property thus putting our children and ourselves in danger as well as other road users. Could the following alternative proposals for the 33 metre length of roadside adjacent to the wall of No. 3 Millbrook be considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 metres of "no waiting at any time" from the junction with Laverstock Road • 23 metres of Residents' Parking Zone C parking bay • A further 5 metres of "no waiting at any time" 	1	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.
25	Whilst we have a drive when friends and family visit it is impossible for them to park on London Road so they park in Bourne Avenue. Restricting the parking in Bourne Avenue would prevent us from having friends and family visit. If the proposals do go ahead we feel that we should be entitled to residents and visitors parking permits.	1	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.
26	Byways House is a large guest house with 23 letting rooms on Fowler's Road. If the proposed changes to the hours of operation of the restrictions are applied it would create a lot of difficulties for our guests and our staff. If the proposals go through our staff will not be able to come to work by car and the hours that they work and our location make it impossible for them to rely on public transport. Furthermore our guests do not have any viable alternative car parking facilities.	1	If approved, the impact that the changes to the hours of operation has on the running of byways Guest House will be monitored by officers of the JTT with a view to making changes to the residents' parking scheme should significant problems arise.
27	I am an employee of Bonallack & Bishop and travel from Warminster daily and my car is required frequently to travel to and from Rougemont Close to meet with clients most of them elderly or disabled. In these circumstances I would find it very inconvenient and costly to use Park and Ride as I would need access to my car quickly and conveniently and add an extra half an hour trying to get to and from Park and Ride would be unacceptable.	1	Agreed. If implemented the proposals would make accessing a car to attend meetings more inconvenient. However, this situation is no different to that already experienced by the majority of staff working in Salisbury; including District Council officers.

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
28	I park in either Wain-A-Long Road or Bourne Avenue and part of the reason I took the job with Bonallack & Bishop was that there was some nearby parking. I have to drop my children off at school/partner at work and be at work by 9.00 a.m./9.15a.m. Having to park elsewhere would mean that I would not be able to get to work on time and therefore would have to find other employment.	3	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.
29	Currently the parking in Wain-A-Long Road and Bourne Avenue is free and if the proposals are introduced it would be difficult to meet the additional financial burden of having to pay to park elsewhere.	2	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.
30	I am concerned (especially in the winter months) that the walk to the local car parks is very dark and I would have particular safety concerns about using the subways in either Greencroft Street or Winchester Street.	5	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.
31	I am an employee of Bonallack & Bishop and travel from Trowbridge daily and my car is required frequently to travel to and from Rougemont Close to meet with clients most of them elderly or disabled. In these circumstances I would find it very inconvenient and costly to use Park and Ride as I would need access to my car quickly and conveniently and to add an extra half an hour trying to get to and from Park and Ride would be unacceptable.	1	Agreed. If implemented the proposals would make accessing a car to attend meetings more inconvenient. However, this situation is no different to that already experienced by the majority of staff working in Salisbury; including District Council officers.
32	I live in Salisbury but due to having had a knee replacement in June, I am unable to walk any distance so am unable to walk to work from home. I currently use Wain-A-Long Road and after work can just about manage to reach Wain-A-Long Road. When I am returned to fitness I do intend to walk to work from home but the introduction of the proposed changes at this stage would be a real problem for me.	1	Objector may be able to apply for a temporary Blue Badge. This would enable the objector to park in any residents' parking bay within RPZC without restriction. Alternatively the residents could seek to hire a mobility scooter from Salisbury Shopmobility until such time as knee is fully healed.
33	It is impractical for me to use the Park and Ride service. The most convenient Park and Ride service for Bonallack and Bishop staff to use would be London Road but the bus service does not pick up or drop off at St Mark's Roundabout but runs directly into town or to the Park and Ride site.	6	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.
34	I would consider using the Park and Ride service if a bus stop was introduced at St Mark's Roundabout.	4	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	No. of Times Received	Officer Response
35	<p>I have had concerns raised by several members of staff regarding the proposed introduction of waiting restrictions in Bourne Avenue and Wain-A-Long Road and I am concerned about the knock on effect that the changes will have on my business. Concerns raised by staff include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no convenient alternative locations for staff to park • The additional cost of parking elsewhere that would have to be borne by staff. • Concerns from female staff about the safety of using the subways, particularly at night. 	1	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.
36	Businesses have to be accessible both for clients and staff. At the moment, we have a few on-site parking spaces, we allocate some of these to staff but must retain a number for our clients – these days if you cannot be accessible to clients (especially our older and disabled ones) we will be out of business.	1	<p>Clients could park in any of the on-street parking bays in RPZC for up to two hours without needing any kind of permit.</p> <p>Blue Badge holders are entitled to park in any residents' parking bay within RPZC without restriction as long their badge is correctly displayed.</p>
37	My wife and I have lived in Wain-A-Long Road for 12 years and have never had any real problem in parking. The worst that occasionally happens is that our car has to be parked perhaps 20 yards from the house. Equally I am unaware of anybody else on the road having any major problems.	1	Please refer to paragraph number 19 in the main body of the report.
38	Outside our house, for example, there are spaces on the roadway for three parked cars. We do not have three cars - so what is going to happen to the remaining spaces outside our house - will they simply remain empty whilst my staff have to park at a distance with the accompanying security and the financial implications? I should point out that this will make it harder for me as an employer to recruit - hardly the outcome I would expect the Council would wish, especially given the current economic climate. I expect the Council to assist rather than hinder my business.	1	Objection was received via email so officers are unaware at which property in Wain-A-Long Road the objector lives and therefore cannot comment further.
39	It is noted that Manor Road, Wain-A-Long Road and Bourne Avenue all have a number of vacant parking spaces during the day. Could the District Council allocate business permits to staff of Bonallack and Bishop to allow them to utilise the vacant parking spaces.	12	Please refer to the main body of the report as this matter has been considered as a substantive objection.