

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE PROPOSED PROVISION OF
'NO WAITING AT ANY TIME' RESTRICTIONS IN LOWER BEMERTON, SALISBURY AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	Officer Response
1	<p>I comment on behalf of my mother, for whom I have power of attorney. She lives at 87 Lower Road.</p> <p>We agree with the comments already submitted by Chris Cochrane. I copy part of it here: "Mother's drive is offset from the dropped kerb. Hence if ever somebody wants to widen the drive, I suggest move the gateway towards No 89 and widen the drive itself on the other side. I doubt planning permission will be appropriate for this very minor change to the frontage.</p> <p>In the meantime, I suggest you ask for the no-parking area in the street in front of your mother's property to be reduced so there is plenty of room for one car to park and, hopefully then won't encroach on the access to your mother's drive which is not at right angles to the street. I think Wiltshire Council could allow 5.5m from the top of the dropped kerb to the start of the yellow lines and still leave plenty of room for people to get onto and off the pavement from and into the roadway."</p> <p>If one car space is allowed to the southwest of mother's drive, that should allow one space across her drive for her carers or other callers (she is registered blind)</p>	<p>There is a break in the footway provision on the north-east side of Lower Road which runs between Nos. 71-87. The break in footway provision at this location means that pedestrians have to walk on the carriageway for a short distance. The purpose of the length of No Waiting At Any Time (NWAAT) restriction in front of No. 87 Lower Road is to keep this length of carriageway clear so that pedestrians can step off of the footway into the carriageway and vice versa.</p> <p>Although a car should already be able to park between the end of the dropped kerb access to No. 87 Lower Road and the start of the NWAAT restrictions it would be possible to shorten the length of NWAAT restriction at this location by 3 metres without adversely affecting its intended purpose.</p> <p>It should be noted that somebody visiting No. 87 Lower Road already has the option to park on the driveway of this property or, with the permission of the homeowner, to park in front of the dropped kerb access to the driveway. The Council's proposals will not impact on these options in any way.</p>
2	<p>The lack of canvassing within the community undertaken by the former Councillor Mr Cochrane prior to this proposal about the need. It is unclear who benefits from this proposal. The rationale which accompanies the plan is short on detail and does not appear to have been fully thought through.</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p>
3	<p>There has been a lack of initial analysis of the impact of reducing the quantity of on-street parking to a level below what is currently required to serve existing car ownership</p>	<p>Highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods, and consequently any parking on the highway is an obstruction of that right of passage. There are no legal rights to park on the highway, or upon the Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking on the public highway, but parking is condoned where the right of passage along the highway is not impeded.</p> <p>Whilst being under no legal obligation to provide parking spaces the demand for parking in the Lower Road area has been an important consideration for the Council in developing these proposals. The Council has sought to maximise the number of parking spaces retained within the area whilst addressing the safety concerns raised by residents.</p>

		<p>The Council's approach in seeking to maximise the number of parking spaces retained is most evident in addressing the comments raised by this correspondent. The correspondent lives in No. 46 Lower Road. This property is located on a blind 'S' bend situated between Nos. 65 and 83 Lower Road.</p> <p>In response to the first consultation on the Council's proposals this correspondent expressed concern at how far they may potentially have to park from their property if the Council's proposals were implemented. The local Wiltshire Council and Salisbury City Council members asked officers to revisit their proposals to see if the length of NWAAT restrictions around the 'S' could be reduced to aid the correspondent. Subsequently, the length of NWAAT proposed at was reduced this location, allowing additional parking to take place.</p> <p>This reduced length of NWAAT restriction on the 'S' bend has been retained in the Council's current proposals.</p>
4	<p>The failure to present any rigorous evidence of what problems this plan is designed to solve. There has been no recorded accidents in the village caused by parked cars, particularly around the main bend (see the proposal.</p>	<p>Happily, Lower Road has a good road safety record with only two collisions recorded as having occurred in road in the past three years. However, the number of recorded collisions in an area would be just one of a number of considerations for the Council in determining if a scheme, such as the introduction of waiting restrictions, is taken forward.</p> <p>The Council's proposals are aimed at addressing safety concerns raised by local residents. The concerns raised focus on the lack of visibility at certain junctions, parked vehicles obstructing the public highway and parking at unsafe locations (with one such location being the 'S' bend). The introduction of waiting restrictions is an appropriate measure to address these problems.</p>
5	<p>The impact of dramatically increasing the distance to available parking upon the value, functionality, and safety, of particular houses (this includes my own, number 46, and the adjacent two properties), has not been fully considered. NONE OF THE RESIDENTS DIRECTLY AFFECTED BY THIS PLAN IN THIS AREA HAVE BEEN CONSULTED BY ANY DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED OFFICE-HOLDER.</p>	<p>Whether the correspondent has been directly consulted by a 'democratically elected office holder' – by which it assumed they mean a councillor – is irrelevant. Councillors are not obligated to consult directly with residents on proposed TROs. However, when proposing the introduction of a TRO the Council in its role as the local highway authority is legally required by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to publish its proposals for public comment. The Council has met this obligation.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the correspondent has submitted comments on the Council's proposals in response to the previous TRO consultation as well as the current consultation. The correspondent's comments in response to both TRO consultations have been considered in detail by officers and as outlined in the Response to Comment 3 directly resulted in the Council's proposals being amended.</p> <p>Turning to the correspondent's comments concerning the impact that the Council's proposals will have on their property. As there are not currently any no waiting restrictions in situ on the 'S' bend the closest the correspondent</p>

		<p>could park to their property is approximately 5 metres away. If the Council's proposals are implemented the closest the correspondent could park to their property would be approximately 25 metres away. An increase of 20 metres is not considered dramatic.</p> <p>The Council's proposals will not result in diminished functionality for the correspondent's property. It is permitted to stop on NWAAT restrictions to load and unload goods and to pick up or drop off people. However, in such situations it is up to individual motorists to determine whether it is safe and practical to stop and use NWAAT restrictions for such purposes.</p> <p>The impact on the value of houses is not a due consideration for the Council when proposing the introduction of waiting restrictions.</p>
6	<p>I am concerned at the uncoordinated application of existing and proposed restrictions. For instance, two disabled bays opposite 44 Lower Road, do not use the available space in an efficient way. To add further restrictions in this area would compound the waste of space available for parking.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the two existing disabled parking bays referenced by the correspondent have been marked in an inefficient manner by virtue of a small gap having been left between the two bays. Irrespective of whether or not the Council's proposals are introduced on the ground the Council will re-mark the two existing disabled parking bays to remove the gap between them.</p>
7	<p>The proposal benefits motorists using the road as a through-road rather than residents. Specifically, parts of the proposal would increase the speed of vehicles traveling through the village. This would contradict recent plans to improve safety around the primary school.</p>	<p>The proposed NWAAT restrictions at the junctions of various residential roads in the Lower Bemerton area are specifically to the benefit of local residents as they will protect visibility and maintain access to those roads. More generally, the removal of parking from unsafe locations will benefit all motorists using the public highway be they local residents or through traffic.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the Council's proposals will result in an increase in the speed of traffic travelling through Lower Bemerton. None of the proposed lengths of NWAAT restriction are long enough to result in an increase in the speed of traffic when coupled with the traffic calming effect of the physical layout of the road network and the parking that already (and will continue) to take place in Lower Bemerton.</p>
8	<p>I have seen your 3 proposals for No Waiting Restrictions on Lower Road in Lower Bemerton. I have comments on the most easterly of these, i.e. the one which borders on Cecil Terrace. This last corner before Churchfields is, I think, the most dangerous bit of the whole ride into Salisbury from Bemerton Farm which I have driven almost daily for 11 years.</p> <p>In all that time I've never seen a car parked on the left of the road which you have highlighted yellow. But I have suffered, on a significant number of occasions, from a car/van parked outside house 42 on the <u>other</u> side of the road. When this happens to you travelling towards Salisbury you can come face-to-face with a car a few feet away on your side of the road. If going the other way you are liable to pull out only to meet a car in your path. I have had near misses in both these situations. Your diagram only shows the restriction applying on one side of the road. If it can be applied to the other side <u>as well</u></p>	<p>If the Council's proposals are implemented their impact on road safety at this location will be monitored. If road safety problems arise as a result of the implementation of the Council's proposals the need for additional waiting restrictions to be provided at this location could be revisited.</p>

	then that would be fine. But if you are restricted to only one side then it should be applied to the right side of the road when you are travelling towards Salisbury because you are far more likely to find a car parked there than on the left.	
9	My second suggestion is that, if the restriction continues to be applied as shown in in your diagram then it should be extended up to the Disabled parking space which is already there. There is often a vehicle parked <u>before</u> the space and it blocks your view of oncoming traffic which has priority. The chances are that you will pull out, see something coming, and then hope you can reverse to clear the way for them. I have found the bus behind me on occasions and clearing the way for the oncoming car can be very difficult. Extending the restricted area in the way I have suggested would be a big improvement.	<p>The proposed NWAAT restrictions on the 'S' bend would mean that if a vehicle travelling towards Salisbury City Centre was to meet a vehicle travelling away from Salisbury City Centre they would be able to pull over onto them to allow the vehicle to safely pass by.</p> <p>The presence of the NWAAT restrictions on the 'S' bend should also serve to reduce the number of occasions on which a vehicle has to reverse at this location to allow a vehicle travelling in the opposite direction to safely pass by.</p>
10	<p>I strongly oppose the proposal. My concerns are:-</p> <p>The current issues over negligent parking are rare, and usually carried out by visitors to the social club and not residents. This is unlikely to be resolved by the proposal, as this is in the evening and the offenders will likely ignore any new restrictions feeling it is unlikely to be enforced at this time of day. Perhaps more consideration should have been given prior to residential development being consented on the social club car park.</p>	<p>The Council's parking enforcement officers typically undertake enforcement activities between the hours of 7.00am and 8.00pm Monday to Saturday and 7.00am and 4.00pm on Sundays. However, NWAAT restrictions can be enforced at any time of the day. Should the Council's proposals be introduced, and it is found that parking problems occur outside of the times that enforcement activities typically take place, then targeted enforcement action could be arranged to address them.</p>
11	<p>The speed of vehicles using the viillage as a 'rat run' is already an issue especially as there are large sections with no pavements - clearing the roadway will only enhance this issue.</p>	<p>There are no speeding problems in Lower Bemerton. The result of the most recent speed survey undertaken in Lower Bemerton (undertaken within 25 metres of the correspondent's property) recorded the 85th percentile speed of traffic to be 24.8mph. Significantly below the posted 30 mph speed limit.</p> <p>For information the 85th percentile speed is the speed that 85% of vehicles do not exceed and is the standard parameter used to determine if the road is experiencing speeding problems.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the Council's proposals will result in an increase in the speed of traffic travelling through Lower Bemerton. None of the proposed lengths of NWAAT restriction are long enough to result in an increase in the speed of traffic when coupled with the traffic calming effect of the physical layout of the road network and the parking that already (and will continue) to take place in Lower Bemerton.</p>
12	<p>Residents who leave refuse/recycle bins on the road all week are also reducing available space for sensible parking.</p>	<p>Under Section 46 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 it is illegal for residents to keep their bins on the public highway outside of their allotted time for collection.</p> <p>If residents are leaving their bins on the public highway all week, as suggested, then I would advise the correspondent to report such instances to the Council's Waste and Recycling Team who will investigate the matter and take remedial action if appropriate.</p>

13	As the residents parking restrictions have been implemented in adjoining areas this has also caused more commuters using the train station and working on the industrial estate to use the village as a 'free car park'	This comment is noted.
14	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed NWATT changes for Lower Bemerton as I believe it will have a negative effect on the quality of the amenities for the local residents. My main concern is that these changes will have a detrimental impact on the parking availability in the Lower Bemerton area, which as I am sure you are aware, is already at a premium.</p> <p>My partner and I live on the north side of St Andrews road and unlike some of the residents on the southern side, we do not have access to any off-street parking. We (along with the many of our fellow residents) have two cars as we both work in different places which are not cost-effective or convenient to commute to by any other means. My partner has a demanding job at the hospital and she often does not finish work until later in the evening where, even with the current parking situation, it is difficult to find a space in the road. Currently, by about 5pm during the week, the majority of space in the road have already been filled such that by the time either of us get home we find we have to drive around the block a number of times on the off-chance that a space becomes available. This will become more of an issue when there are few spaces available to park and there is likely to be an increase in traffic flow as residents seek places to park. When there is no room to park safely in our road we typically have to stop in Church Lane or Lower Road but this will become more likely thus reducing the availability of spaces for the residents of those locations.</p> <p>Often my partner has to park in one of these neighbouring roads and walk back in the dark which is unnerving at the moment but with the significant reduction of spaces in Lower Road, she may be forced to park even further away with concerns not only for safety, but that of her car. There have been a number of incidents in Lower Road of vehicles being broken into or damaged late at night. It is not usual to see a broken window or a door mirror that has been kicked off.</p> <p>The plans show that large sections of Lower Road will have parking restrictions which will result in residents from that area being forced to park further away and one location they will use is St Andrews Road. Each location where the restrictions are applied will result in less space for the residents of that particular road which then puts pressure on the adjoining location. Where exactly do Wiltshire Council recommend that residents leave their vehicles who are not fortunate enough to have any off-street parking?</p>	<p>In general, the correspondent's comments focus on the fact that the provision of NWAAT restrictions would reduce the number of parking spaces in Lower Bemerton and may force him or his wife to have to park further away from their property than they currently do. It is important to consider these comments in the context of what both highway law and the Highway Code states on the provision of parking on the public highway.</p> <p>Highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods, and consequently any parking on the highway is an obstruction of that right of passage. There are no legal rights to park on the highway, or upon the Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking on the public highway, but parking is condoned where the right of passage along the highway is not impeded.</p> <p>The Highway Code (to which users of the public highway must adhere) states that motorists should not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction. This is specifically to protect visibility and turning manoeuvres at junctions. Any residents parking within 10 metres of a junction could be considered to be causing an obstruction of the public highway and liable to enforcement action by the Police. Therefore whilst it is proposed to introduce NWAAT at a number of junctions it should be remembered that motorists should not be parking at such locations anyway.</p> <p>The Council is acutely aware of the pressure on parking spaces in residential areas and has taken this into account in developing its proposals and used the minimum amount of NWAAT restrictions considered safe and practical in providing the best balance possible between retaining parking spaces and addressing the road safety concerns raised. One specific example of this approach is in St. Andrew's Road at its junction with Church Lane where the proposed NWAAT restrictions are less than 10 metres in length.</p> <p>The situation where a motorist has to drive around the block to find a parking space could be construed to already be occurring given the correspondent's comments about his wife having to park in nearby roads when finishing work late. Presumably, the correspondent's wife first checks to see if there is any parking spaces available in the road in which she lives before driving around adjacent roads until she finds a parking space. Motorists not able to find a parking space in the road they live in have the option of driving and finding a parking space in an adjacent road and clearly do not have to continually drive around the block waiting for a space to become free in the road in which they live. Therefore, the Council's proposals would seemingly not unduly alter the current situation in this particular respect.</p>

		<p>The correspondent's comment about street lighting has been noted. There are lighting columns present on A36(T) Wilton Road, Church Lane and St. Andrews Road so there should already be a reasonable level of lighting in the area. However, if the correspondent's concerns about the level of street lighting in the area persist they can be raised as an Area Board Issue for investigation through the Community Area Transport Group process.</p> <p>The correspondent's concerns about the personal safety of his wife in the event she has to park further away from their property than at present are understandable. However, the comments do appear to be based on the possibility problems might occur rather than problems that are actually occurring. This is an important point given, by the correspondent's own admission, his wife already has to park some distance away from their property on occasion. The correspondent (or his wife) could contact and work with the Council's Community Safety Team to address any existing or future personal safety concerns.</p> <p><u>Please note that the above response replicates the response provided to this correspondent in the report considered in 2014 as they have raised the same points in response to the current TRO consultation.</u></p>
15	<p>One of reasons cited for the proposed changes is that on one occasion in 2010 an ambulance was apparently prevented from accessing St Andrews Road. In the 18+ years I have lived in this road, I have seen a number of ambulances (and at least one fire appliance) that have successfully negotiated any apparent obstructions. In fact, the number of large vans, trucks and lorries delivering to the road has steadily increased of the last few years. There is hardly a day that goes by when we don't see a large refrigerated truck delivering shopping to one of our neighbours at all hours of day and night. If drivers of these trucks are able to access the road, then it is not unreasonable to expect a skilled professional driver of a similar size ambulance to be able to do the same. Whilst no-one would wish there to be any delay in an ambulance reaching its destination to respond to a call, this single incident has to be taken in context of the many thousands of movements of all types and sizes of vehicle that have taken place in the road without incident.</p>	<p>Irrespective of the number of vehicles that are successfully able to turn into St. Andrew's Road the impact of an ambulance or a fire engine being unable to access the road, or is delayed in doing so, is potentially life threatening. The ability to allow parking to continue to take place in St. Andrew's Road has to be considered in context of the Council's duty as the local highway authority to maintain safe access to the public highway and the legal obligation placed upon all motorists by the Highway Code that they should not be stopping or parking opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction.</p> <p>As is alluded to in the response to Comment 14 the Council is acutely aware of the pressure on parking spaces in St. Andrew's Road and has taken this into account in developing its proposals by proposing the use of the minimum amount of NWAAT restrictions possible to address the road safety concerns that have been raised.</p> <p>The proposed NWAAT restrictions at the junctions of Church Lane and Skew Bridge Road with St. Andrew's Road should ensure that vehicles are able to safely access to the road at any time of the day or night.</p>
16	<p>For those residents that do not have their regular grocery shopping delivered, it is often necessary to stop in the middle of the road and unload. This will become more prevalent with the introduction of the NWAAT restriction. My property is situated towards the middle of St Andrew Road, and while the yellow lines will not be directly outside our house, the residents at either end</p>	<p>This comment is noted.</p>

	who have lost spaces outside their houses will have to park further down which will reduce availability of spaces in areas where there are no restrictions.	
17	There are a number of older residents in Lower Bemerton with reduced mobility who I'm sure they rely on their cars to be able to retain a degree of independence. The reduction of availability of spaces will make it harder to find somewhere to park and there is an increased likelihood of it being further away from their house. In the last few months, one resident has thankfully been granted a disabled parking bay on the south side of St Andrews Road and by this act, Wiltshire Council are acknowledging the fact that parking in this road is difficult.	<p>The provision of a disabled parking bay by the Council is not necessarily an acknowledgment that parking within St. Andrew's Road is difficult but is an acknowledgement that a resident of the road has a mobility issue which requires specific parking provision outside of their property.</p> <p>More generally, any blue badge holder with reduced mobility can apply to Wiltshire Council for the introduction of a disabled parking bay. Each application for the introduction of a disabled parking bay will be considered on its own merits.</p>
18	<p>When the subject of NWAAT was raised a couple of years ago, the Officer Response to point 2 in Appendix 3 was as follows:</p> <p><i>"The highway code (to which users of the public highway must adhere) states that motorists should not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction. This is specifically to protect visibility and turning manoeuvres at junctions. Any residents parking within 10 metres of a junction could be considered to be causing an obstruction of the public highway and liable to enforcement action by the Police. Therefore, whilst it is proposed to introduce NWAAT at a number of junctions it should be remembered that motorists should not be parking at such locations anyway."</i></p> <p>That raises the question of how many times in the last 12 month period the Police have taken enforcement action? I have never seen any Police or Council officials taking such action which could be taken as sign that either there are not that many contraventions taking place, or that the current regulations are not being enforced correctly. My understanding of NWAAT enforcement is that this will be the responsibility of the local authority with the use of Civil Enforcement Officers who I believe operate from 8am to 8pm. As mentioned previously, the number of vehicles increases in the late afternoon and evening as people come home from work. After 8pm, does it mean that there will no longer be any enforcement or will it become the responsibility of the Police who are already quite busy dealing with more pressing matters?</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would take into account the above comments when reviewing the proposals and give due consideration to the day to day impact this will have on the residents who have no alternative option but to park their vehicles on the public highway.</p>	<p>As it stands there are not any NWAAT restrictions present within St. Andrew's Road (where the correspondent lives). Irrespective of the presence of NWAAT restrictions on the ground or not the Highway Code (to which users of the public highway must adhere) states that motorists should not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction. Enforcement of the Highway Code is the responsibility of the Police who are able to undertake enforcement activities at any time of the day or night. The level of enforcement this particular aspect of the Highway Code receives at the location in question will be dependent on a combination of Police resources and contraventions reported to them. Whatever level of enforcement of the Highway Code received within St. Andrew's Road it does not excuse any motorist from wilfully breaking the law by parking within 10 metres of a junction.</p> <p>The Council's parking enforcement officers typically undertake enforcement activities between the hours of 7.00am and 8.00pm Monday to Saturday and 7.00am and 4.00pm on Sundays. However, NWAAT restrictions can be enforced at any time of the day. Should the Council's proposals be introduced, and it is found that parking problems occur outside of the times that enforcement activities typically take place, then targeted enforcement action could be arranged to address them.</p>
19	I Kenneth Hand of (22 Skew Bridge Rd) am very much in objection to the proposal of a (No Waiting at Any Time) box right outside my house on the corner of Skew Bridge Rd & St Andrews Rd. As we all know these two roads are very narrow and parking is a complete struggle at times but we do	<p>It should be noted that the TRO does not propose the introduction of any additional NWAAT restriction directly outside of No. 22 Skew Bridge Road.</p> <p>As has been referenced elsewhere in this document the Council is acutely</p>

	<p>manage and so I don't want to loose any more space for parking our vehicles.</p> <p>My thoughts are that it would make more common sense to narrow the path on one side of St Andrews Rd making a more wider gap for traffic to pass by. This would also help emergency vehicles to pass with more ease.</p> <p>I do hope you can consider these facts when making the final decision.</p>	<p>aware of the pressure on parking spaces in the Lower Bemerton area and has taken this into account in developing its proposals by proposing the use of the minimum amount of NWAAT restrictions possible to address the road safety concerns that have been raised. An example of this approach is not joining up the proposed NWAAT restrictions outside of Nos. 20 and 24 Skew Bridge Road, and in doing so creating a potential parking space, even though the simplest option would have been to join the restrictions.</p> <p>Narrowing the footway on one side of St. Andrew's Road would require the removal or relocation of the existing trees and lighting columns. Doing so would restrict the width of the useable footway and may result in pedestrians being forced to walk in the live running carriageway. The Council would not potentially compromise pedestrian safety in this manner to protect parking which, as referenced elsewhere in this document, is taking place illegally under the terms of the Highway Code.</p>
20	<p>I wish to comment on the proposed parking restrictions on St Andrews Road, Church Lane and Skew Bridge Road in Salisbury.</p> <p>I am a resident of St Andrews Road and have two children at the local primary school, Bemerton St John.</p> <p>I believe that there is absolutely no benefit to be gained from pressing ahead with the parking restrictions which are being proposed by the Council. Parking can be a problem on St Andrews Road and restricting areas at either end of the road will only make the problem worse. Likewise, restricting parking on Church Lane will mean that residents from this road will attempt to park their cars on St Andrews Road, thus exacerbating the problem. If you remove parking spaces for residents, where then are we supposed to park?</p>	<p>In St. Andrew's Road it is only proposed to introduce NWAAT restrictions at its junctions with Church Lane and Skew Bridge Road respectively.</p> <p>In respect of St. Andrew's Road the Council's proposals are aimed at addressing safety concerns raised by local residents. The concerns raised focus on the lack of visibility and parked vehicles obstructing turning manoeuvres at the junction outlined above. The introduction of the proposed waiting restrictions is an appropriate measure to address these problems.</p> <p>The Highway Code (to which users of the public highway must adhere) states that motorists should not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction. This is specifically to protect visibility and turning manoeuvres at junctions. Any residents parking within 10 metres of a junction could be considered to be causing an obstruction of the public highway and liable to enforcement action by the Police. Therefore, whilst it is proposed to introduce NWAAT at a number of junctions it should be remembered that motorists should not be parking at such locations anyway.</p> <p>As is referenced elsewhere in this document the council is acutely aware of the pressure on parking spaces in residential areas and has taken this into account in developing its proposals by proposing the use of the minimum amount of NWAAT restrictions possible to address the road safety concerns that have been raised. One specific example of this approach is in St. Andrew's Road at its junction with Church Lane where the proposed NWAAT restrictions are less than 10 metres in length.</p>
21	<p>I regularly walk my two young children to school along Church Lane. The amount of commuter traffic which uses this narrow road as a "rat run" is really quite astounding and the speed of some of the cars is very concerning. Rather than restricting parking for residents (who incidentally will have nowhere else to park) perhaps it might be more sensible to restrict the</p>	<p>There are no speeding problems in Church Lane. The result of the most recent speed survey undertaken in Church Lane recorded the 85th percentile speed of traffic to be 21.9mph, significantly below the posted 30 mph speed limit. The results of the most recent traffic volume survey in Church Lane (undertaken at the same time as the speed survey) should the average daily</p>

	<p>access of "through traffic" along this route. This would be beneficial to everyone who lives in the area and make it a far safer option for walking our children to school. Indeed, there are several other routes that commuter traffic can take and a restriction on the routes that are regularly used as cut through routes for those in a rush to get to work would be beneficial to all.</p> <p>I very much hope that my comments will be taken into consideration before finalising any proposals</p>	<p>volume of traffic using Church Lane to be 539 vehicles. If you were to exclude school run and local residential vehicle movements from this figure the number of vehicles travelling along Church Lane is fairly low.</p> <p>Since the correspondent's comments were submitted, Wiltshire Council has undertaken works in both Church Lane and Lower Road to improve the pedestrian route to Bemerton St. John's School as part of its Taking Action On School Journey's programme.</p>
22	<p>While I wholeheartedly agree that people do park in ridiculous and sometimes dangerous places I feel in this location it is done out of desperation , the whole area seems to be a car park for the Audi / Volkswagen garage on the churchfields industrial estate who provide no parking for staff, also many people park for days on end and walk down to the railway station therefore residents are forced to park in any available spot, so the introduction of these new restrictions without attending to these issues will make it impossible to get anywhere near our homes , would it not be possible to introduce a residents parking scheme in what is a relatively small area before these restrictions are implemented</p>	<p>The introduction of a residents' parking scheme is outside the purview of this TRO.</p> <p>Should the correspondent wish to for a residents' parking scheme to be considered for the Lower Road area they would need to request the introduction of such by completing form WR1 and returning it to Salisbury City Council in the first instance in line with the Council's approved waiting restriction request policy. Form WR1 can be accessed via the link below.</p> <p>http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/pn-questionnaire-final-waiting-restrictions.xls</p>
23	<p>I am writing as a City Councillor for this ward, and these comments are based on views which have been expressed to me by local residents.</p> <p>In general the proposals being put forward seem to be sensible and I have received comments on only one aspect, which I think does need a slight modification.</p> <p>The area of concern is the yellow line extending around the bend in Lower Road opposite number 42 – I have pasted in below map of the area in question which has been annotated by one of the concerned residents who has been in touch with to me.</p> <p>The previously published TRO (ref decision HSB-06-14, see Appendix 1 for original proposals) had yellow lines extending around this corner from number 83 to the boundary between 65 and 71. Following representations received on the originally published TRO adjustments were made to both ends to the yellow line proposed around this corner, to allow for some parking at each end. This was to take account of the parking needs of the residents of, and visitors to, numbers 44-50 Lower Road. These houses are located on the bend and they have no off-street parking provision.</p> <p>The gap in the yellow lines now proposed at the northern end of this particular stretch (near the access to FP48) seem uncontroversial. However concerns have been raised with me about the potential hazard if parking is allowed on the bend opposite number 42 (shown in the diagram). If vehicles are parked here, and particularly if these are larger vehicles such as vans, it can be difficult for vehicles to get sight of the road ahead. There can be, and</p>	<p>Whilst the concerns that have been raised with Cllr Willmot (Salisbury City Council) are understandable the Council would not have proposed ending the NWWAT waiting restrictions on the 'S' bend at a point that it considered unsafe.</p> <p>If the Council's proposals are implemented their impact on road safety at this location will be monitored. If road safety problems arise as a result of the implementation of the Council's proposals the need for additional waiting restrictions to be provided at this location could be revisited.</p>

often are, cars parked all the way from number 65 to the Cecil Terrace junction allowing only one-way traffic through this stretch. It has been pointed out to me that cars (& larger vehicles such as buses) need to pull out when coming around the corner to see around parked cars/vans and get a view ahead to see if they can safely proceed. The road can become blocked if vehicles have pulled out to get a clear view around a parked car or van and another vehicle is approaching which does not then allow them to proceed.

I think an appropriate compromise would be to take the yellow lines around the bend to the electricity junction box which is just to the west of the 71/65 boundary fence. This will I believe give an appropriate balance between the wishes of the residents for on-street parking and the need to provide safety for two-way traffic. There is also a slight widening of the road at this point, where Broken Bridges footpath joins from the south, and I think parking should **not** be allowed to the west of this widened stretch in order to allow for east-bound vehicles to pull out to see towards Cecil Terrace and to provide a passing place if traffic is coming towards them.

I have pasted in underneath the sketch map below the view of this location from Google Street View (please refer to the images below) which I hope helps to clarify the points I am trying to make. I'd be very happy to take part in a site visit if that would be helpful to make sure we get the best possible outcome at this location

Images Accompanying Comment X

