

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS RECEIVED IN RELATION TO THE REVIEW OF
RESIDENTS PARKING ZONE A, SALISBURY AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	Officer Response
1	<p>Dear Wiltshire Council Traffic Order Team</p> <p>I am a resident of 55 Endless Street and I am writing to you to oppose Wiltshire Council's proposed introduction of "Parking Monday to Saturday 8am – 6pm Permit Holders Only Zone A" areas to Endless Street, Belle Vue Road, Albany Road, Wyndam Road and Swaynes Close.</p> <p>I have lived at 55 Endless Street for the last 3 years in a house with 3 other adults between the ages of 25-35 - three of us own cars. We are not family members and are financially independent from one another, and do not share our cars or insurance.</p> <p>This means that we have two cars with Residents' Parking badges and one car without a residents parking badge. All of us leave for work after 8am and arrive home before 6pm.</p> <p>Due to the existing parking regulations, I have to park my car on either Bell Vue Road, Albany Road or in some cases on Wyndam Road or Swaynes Close. This is already an inconvenience as every day involves a longer than desirable walk to the car, underlined by the fact that I never get to park my car on the street where I live. Whilst on days that I do not drive the car to work I am forced to use a visitors parking permit, to avoid receiving a ticket this adds up to 52 Saturdays a year or when added to the number of days' holiday (25) over 77 days a year.</p> <p>The existing restrictions in Zone A already force me to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If I want to avoid using my car for more than one day, it is common for me to have to drive over a mile away from my home to the nearest unrestricted parking area and then walk home (a 21 minute walk – Ref. Google Maps), to park my car. This occurs at least once a fortnight if not more often. • <u>The current parking regulations also force me to drive my car to work every day, rather than taking public transport, walk or cycle</u> (which I would prefer to do). • My car has previously been vandalized when parked away from 	<p>The problems that the correspondent has experienced in respect of parking within Residents' Parking Zone A (RPZA) could be considered to be largely of their own making. RPZA has been in existence since 1989 and the current terms and conditions in respect of issuing permits have been in place since 2005. As such, the correspondent could, and should, have considered the impact that the parking restrictions in place would have on their ability to park outside or near to the property at which they currently reside before deciding to move into it.</p> <p>The current terms and conditions concerning the issuing of permits do allow for more than two permits to be issued to a property within a residents' parking zone. The terms and conditions specifically state that:</p> <p><i>"If you feel that there are mitigating circumstances that need to be considered when determining your permit allocation you should make reference to these in writing when applying for your permits. Parking Services will consider requests for additional permits on a case by case basis."</i></p> <p>In respect of this correspondent, having checked with Parking Services, the Council holds no record that they have even asked for the allocation of additional permit to be considered. It is suggested that the correspondent contacts Parking Services, via parkingservices@wiltshire.gov.uk, making a case for an additional permit to be issued to them.</p> <p>Moving forward the Council's proposals through the removal of the ability for non-residents to park within Belle Vue Road, Albany Road and Wyndham Road (in particular) and the provision of additional parking spaces will result in more parking spaces being available for use by residents within RPZA. The extra spaces will provide the Council with greater scope to accept requests for additional permits to be issued. However, for the purpose of clarity, any requests for additional permits to be issued will still be considered on a case by case basis by Parking Services.</p>

	<p>my property – by the person whose house I parked outside; they left a note which told me it was because my car wasn't local to their road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have received parking tickets on several occasions for parking in parking bays within Zone A – despite living in Zone A. <p>Your proposed plans will force me to do one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every day park my car on Hamilton Road and have to walk at least 8 minutes to my house (Ref. Google Maps) • Be at increased risk of receiving parking tickets • Increased parking-related anxiety for me and my housemates • Put my car at risk of receiving tickets before and after I commute to work. • Make it highly unlikely that I will ever be able to park outside my house • Sell my car (I do not want to do this) • Move away from Salisbury to another city (I also do not want to do this) <p>Suggested amendments to the plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the proposed restricted time to 10am – 5pm or even 9am - 5pm (This would reduce the impact on people who live in zone A and commute to work, as they would not be at risk of receiving parking tickets between 8am-9am or 5pm-6pm.) • Leave things as they are • Allow residents of Zone A who live in properties where there are more than 2 car owners to receive a 3rd parking permit. <p>If you walk the streets in Zone A late in the evening or early morning (10pm-7am) it is very obvious that there are a large number of people who live in Zone A without residents' parking badges because there are large numbers of cars parked on the street that don't have residents' parking badges or visitors' parking tickets. Your proposals will not benefit any of these people; it will hinder and harass them.</p> <p>I sincerely hope you take my considerations on board and reject or amend these proposed changes so that they take into consideration the problems this will cause to the people who live in Zone A.</p>	
2	<p>We live at the Castle Street end of Wyndham Road and so the above parking alterations will potentially have a large effect on our ability to park and that of our visitors and other family members. We have both elderly people visiting, some with disabled badges and young families with babies and very small</p>	<p><u>Response to Question 1</u></p> <p>Residents will not be permitted to use their permits to park in the two time limited parking bays near the Southern Independent Medical Practice (SIMP).</p>

<p>children.</p> <p>Please would you answer our queries below, or let us know the relevant authority, so that we may completely understand the affect of the proposed changes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will we as residents be able to use our residents parking permit to park in the 2 proposed 'time-limited' bays (amounting to 5 of the spaces available near our house) at the Castle Street end of Wyndham Road (near the Independent Doctors Practice), and if so, will we also only be allowed the 1hr with no return within 2 hours (which we have already been told by the Council cannot actually be upheld in law!) or will we be allowed to park all day as we have a permit? 2. Will our blue badge holder visitors be able to use the same bays all day or only for 1hr time-limit or the 3hr time period as per their blue badge? 3. How do visitors ensure they can park, collect a visitors pass from us and return to their car without being 'caught' without a pass? Often visitors have to park either at the top of our road as the bottom end is busy with Doctors patients and those residents of Castle Street who are entitled to park in our road, or they have to park in one of the side roads off Wyndham Road and so they have no visibility of traffic enforcement officers. Our disabled visitors and those with babies and young children obviously take some time to reach our house and then return with a visitors pass and we are very concerned that in the meantime they could have been booked by a traffic enforcement officer. While hopefully this is unlikely it will mean stress for all concerned every time we have a visitor especially the old and our young families. 4. How much will visitors' passes cost and how many will we be allowed? 5. Will we be allowed to use our current visitors' passes? 	<p>The time limited bays are proposed primarily for patients visiting the doctor's surgery. However, you or somebody visiting you would be able to use the bays for up to one hour without displaying a permit.</p> <p>I am unaware who the correspondent has talked to within the Council but, regrettably, they have been misinformed. The proposed one hour no return within two hour restriction will be able to be upheld under highway law.</p> <p><u>Response to Question 2</u></p> <p>Blue Badge holders will be able to use the both the proposed residents' parking and time limited bays in Wyndham Road without time restriction by displaying their Blue Badge.</p> <p>I would also point out that Blue Badge holders are already permitted to park in any of the on-street residents' parking or time limited bays in Salisbury without time restriction by displaying their Blue Badge. Similarly, Blue Badge holders may also park in any of the charged for on-street Pay and Display parking bays without charge or time limit, again by displaying their Blue Badge.</p> <p><u>Response to Question 3</u></p> <p>In the case of all parking bays in Salisbury a Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO hereafter) has to observe a vehicle for a minimum period of five minutes before they can issue a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN). With regard to residents' parking bays this period is intended to allow a visitor to collect a visitor scratch card and return to put it in their vehicle. The correspondent also needs to keep in mind with regard to this specific situation that there will not be a CEO present every time a visitor to their property arrives so will often have a longer period in which a visitor scratch card can be collected.</p> <p><u>Response to Question 4</u></p> <p>Residents may purchase as many visitors scratch cards as they wish. Visitors scratch cards cost 40p each and are only available in books of 10, making it a cost of £4 per book of scratch cards. Residents in permit holders only zones are entitled to purchase 100 scratch cards per year at a cost of 40p per card. Additional permits purchased above this initial allocation of 100 would cost significantly more. The Council's full terms and conditions in respect of residents' parking schemes can be accessed via the following webpage - http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/salisbury-residents-parking-schemes-ts-and-cs.pdf.</p>
<p>I wish to object to the TRO for Albany Rd Salisbury, in particular the section at the corner outside number 49 on the following grounds:</p>	<p><u>Response to Comment 1</u></p>

<p>1. The current single yellow lines around the left hand corner of Albany Rd service a large number of delivery vans and also emergency vehicles, who can pull over momentarily while they make their call. Removing or severely restricting that facility will mean the road is temporarily blocked as delivery vehicles come and go. A significant number of grocery shopping and other delivery vehicles use the single yellow lines to service Albany Rd residents. Grocery shopping vehicles would otherwise be blocking the road for at least 5 minutes. Delivery vehicles are likely to increase, as shopping habits change. Local residents also use those areas to unload children and luggage.</p> <p>Please ensure you have also consulted the local supermarkets and post office, to obtain their views. Our Waitrose delivery driver was concerned about the removal of these lines, and will be bringing it to the attention of the depot manager, as they were unaware of this consultation. They are key stakeholders and you need to engage them.</p> <p>2. A number of very large lorries will follow their sat nav down Albany Rd and get stuck on the corner. With the current spacing and the help of residents and police they can nudge by. I would say this happens about once a month (this week it was a large coach). Removing the gaps, so there is more congested parking, means they would have to reverse back out of Albany Rd. If you go ahead, you will need to post very clear notice at the corner of Scot Lane and Endless St, or have a traffic calming scheme to divert them.</p> <p>3. Removing the 2 hour restriction will create more spaces for residents during the day, as Friends Life and day trippers will have to park elsewhere. After 6pm, the residents enjoy the flexibility of the single yellow lines. I suggest that the combination of removing the 2 hour and extra white box spaces, will make no difference overall. I appreciate that Albany Rd residents have complained about congestion, but the removal of the 2 hour restriction will be sufficient. Simply converting single yellow lines into white box spaces will make no difference in the evening, and in fact reduce the residents flexibility to use the single yellow lines as evening visitors tend to park elsewhere. It will simply add to the congestion. In fact, there are enough spaces in Zone A, you just need to be prepared to walk a couple of streets.</p> <p>4. It will detract from the sense of space outside my property and enjoyment of my garden to have cars there permanently. We bought no49 as it was not as claustrophobic as the other terraced properties,</p>	<p>The Council's proposals for Albany Road will remove the ability for non-residents to park within it during the hours of operation of the residents' parking scheme. This coupled with the provision of additional parking spaces in the road (including outside the correspondents property) will result in more parking spaces being available for use by residents and delivery vehicles. The effect of the combination of these two measures should be that day to day activities, such as receiving deliveries or unloading passengers, are able to continue without adverse impact.</p> <p>It should also be noted that if the Council's proposals are implemented there will remain a number of lengths of 'No Waiting At Any Time' (NWAAT hereafter) restrictions in the vicinity of the correspondents property (most notably directly opposite) which could be utilised for the purposes of loading/unloading by delivery vehicles or in the event by an emergency service vehicle.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 2</u></p> <p>If the Council's proposals are implemented, it is hoped that the proposed provision of additional parking spaces in Endless Street will serve to make it clear to large vehicles that they should not be proceeding along this route before they arrive at Albany Road. In addition to this, an improved sign informing drivers of large vehicles to avoid this route, replacing the existing sign in Endless Street, will be provided.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 3</u></p> <p>Residents' parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday. The 'No Waiting' restriction currently in situ outside of the correspondent's property operates between the hours of 9.00am and 5.00pm Monday to Saturday. Therefore, irrespective of whether or not it is through the use of a 'No Waiting' restriction or a parking bay parking outside of the correspondent's property is unrestricted after 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and all day on Sunday. However, replacing the 'No Waiting' restriction with a parking bay provides additional parking for residents and their visitors during the hours of operation of the residents' parking scheme and doing so is concordant with the main aim of the Council's proposals, which seek to maximise the number of parking spaces available within RPZA for local residents. Maximising the number of parking spaces available in RPZA will help to address current and future demands on parking within the zone.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 4</u></p> <p>The comment is noted.</p>
--	---

	<p>and there is light and quiet in the front rooms and garden. This would be disturbed and, as point 1, 2 and 3 above, with no real added benefits.</p> <p>I am concerned about the impact of flats at the current Friends Life grounds - this could make a big difference to Zone A, if they are permitted vehicles, and must be factored in.</p> <p>I would propose removing the 2 hour restriction and then seeing if this alone alleviates the residents parking issues. Removing yellow lines means that the increasing number of delivery vehicles and emergency vehicles have nowhere to pull over.</p>	
4	<p>It has come to my attention that you propose to restrict parking on Wyndham Road in Salisbury to residents only.</p> <p>Should you not already be aware I would like to bring your attention to the fact that there are business on this road that rely on their custom having the ability to park on this road.</p> <p>These are businesses that employ people in the area who in turn contribute to the local economy.</p> <p>I strongly advise against proceeding with your proposal to restrict parking on this road - it will lead directly to the foreclosure of these businesses, of this there is no doubt.</p> <p>This very important decision about peoples jobs and livelihoods rests in your hands.</p> <p>I trust you will come to the correct and sensible decision to reverse this proposal.</p>	<p>The Council's proposals include the retention of two time limited parking bays in Wyndham Road which could be utilised by customers of businesses in the road without needing to display a parking permit. Time limited parking bays will also be retained in the adjoining Kings Road and Marlborough Road which again could be used by customers of businesses in Wyndham Road without needing to display a parking permit.</p> <p>In addition to the above, owners of businesses within RPZA are entitled to apply for business permits. Business permits are designed to be handed in and out to customers visiting a business situated within a residents parking. In the case of Wyndham Road a customer displaying a valid business permit would be able to park in any of the permit holders only parking bays without time restriction.</p> <p>The Council's full terms and conditions in respect of residents parking schemes can be accessed via the following webpage - http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/salisbury-residents-parking-schemes-ts-and-cs.pdf.</p>
5	<p>On viewing the notices on various lamp posts ect in Endless St concerning the proposed scheme in connection with parking restrictions I note that you intend to put a zone A permit holders only restriction in front of my garage with the obvious consequences.</p>	<p>When undertaking the site work required to prepare the Council's proposals it was noted that the garage at the correspondents property was not being used to house a motor vehicle. Therefore, it was proposed to introduce a parking bay in front of the correspondents' garage. Doing so is concordant with the main aim of the Council's proposals, which seek to maximise the number of parking spaces available within RPZA for local residents.</p> <p>In preparing this report a further site visit has been undertaken and, as before, it was noted that the garage at the correspondents' property was not being used to house a motor vehicle. As such, it is believed that no changes are required to the Council's proposals in respect of this location.</p>
6	<p>Not only is the whole advertisement confusing to read (you have my sympathies) but in particular for example item (d) reading</p>	<p>The correspondent has misread the advertisement in respect of the proposed introduction of a disabled parking bay outside of the doctor's surgery in</p>

	<p>Disabled Badge Holders Only At All Times Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm</p> <p>is totally meaningless and unhelpful to the average motorist. I suggest you either remove “at all times” or remove “8am to 6pm” or stop trying to achieve the impossible with one notice meaning two different things.</p>	<p>Endless Street. The advertisement stated the restriction on the proposed disabled parking bay would be ‘Disabled Badge Holders Only At All Times Monday to Saturday 8.00am – 6.00pm 3 hours No Return within 3 hours’.</p> <p>What this restriction means is that the bay can only be used by Blue Badge holders Monday to Saturday between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Blue Badge holders can only park within the bay for a maximum period of three hours and are not permitted to return and use the bay again until a further period of three hours has elapsed. Outside of these times Blue Badge holders can use the bay without time restriction.</p> <p>It should be noted that this is standard restriction used in conjunction with all on-street disabled parking bays in Salisbury City Centre.</p>
7	<p>If the proposed changes to the parking in Kings Road, Salisbury (reference LJB/TRO/SALSA), were implemented I would no longer be able to park in my garage.</p> <p>I would like the parking areas opposite my garage (i.e. outside of numbers 20, 22 and 24 Kings Road) to either be left as they are (i.e. no parking before 6pm, Mon to Sat) or ideally to be changed to no waiting at any time.</p> <p>I live at 35 Wyndham Road and have a garage which backs onto Kings Road. If there were cars parked in the proposed spaces outside of 20, 22 and 24 Kings Road, I would not be able to get my car into or out of my garage. Kings Road is a narrow road so cars parked on one side would completely impede access to my garage, as it would (to a greater or lesser extent) to my neighbours at 33 and 37 Wyndham Road and their garage or driveway. I would have a particular problem as my garage is very narrow therefore I have to enter it pointing almost perpendicular to the opening.</p> <p>To summarise: I would like the parking areas opposite my garage (i.e. outside of numbers 20, 22 and 24) to either be left as they are (i.e. no parking before 6pm, Mon to Sat) or to be changed to no waiting at any time. If your proposed changes are implemented, I would not be able to park my car in my garage.</p> <p>Supplementary points: With the proposed scheme, the surrounding roads will have more limited parking for non-residents, this may have the effect of pushing more parked cars onto Kings Road. This could mean that I would rarely, if ever, be able to use my garage. With the current parking scheme there has not been a single occasion since I’ve lived here (since Nov 2011) that I’ve not been able to use my garage. On the occasions that my neighbours at 22 Kings Road park outside their house they usually park half on, half off the pavement which permits access to my garage.</p>	<p>Please refer to main report as this issue has been considered as a substantive issue.</p>

<p>8</p>	<p>It is with deep concerns that I am writing to you following the posting of the above notice on pavement posts in our area regarding your proposal to amend the current parking restrictions in “Zone A” in Salisbury. My wife & I have lived here since 1975 and have considerable experience of parking in our area and this proposal does not rest lightly upon us. The plan concerns the period from 0800 until 1800 Monday to Saturday inclusive and as set out in the document is completely unnecessary and absolutely unacceptable. Indeed in the past 40 years, on returning to “Zone A” during the day, we have <u>always</u> been able to find a parking space, albeit in an adjoining road. The <u>parking problems</u>, when the residents return in the evening, is another matter and is therefore not an issue to be addressed at this time.</p> <p>Like many residents in this area, we are both retired. We also own a car to keep us as independent as possible and we purchase visitor scratch cards for use by our visitors who will be spending more than 2 hours with us during the day. For us, the current combined cost of the parking permit and 50 scratch cards comes to £40 and I believe that if residents only parking is imposed, the price of the permit itself will double to £40, with the cost of scratch cards on top of that.</p> <p>However, the most important issue to us is the loss of access for visitors to our house. With a “residents only” scheme and the purchase of 5 books of scratch cards for £20, we will be restricted to only 1 visitor per week which in itself is totally unacceptable. Should we wish 2 visitors per week (at current prices) the annual cost for parking us goes up to an extortionate £202.50. <u>Bearing in mind that our 2 daughters like to call in to check on us regularly, I would be grateful if you could tell me where they fit in. Perhaps, with a “residents only” parking scheme implemented, Wiltshire Council would like our daughters to drop in once a fortnight each and for us to have no other visitors at all! Please note that we really do matter to some people.</u></p> <p>The reason behind this parking proposal is clearly part of a cunning plan for residents and casual parkers to our city to boost Wiltshire Council’s parking revenue without any thoughts as to the well being of its residents. Don’t give me problems, give me solutions I hear you say. Well, to get casual parkers into the car parks or on to the Park & Ride sites can easily be fulfilled by changing the current restrictions as follows (as mentioned in an earlier communication but of which no notice has been taken);</p> <p>That the 2 hour limit for non-permit holders in “Zone A” remains and that a change is made that there is no return to <u>anywhere</u> in “Zone A” that day. Certain individuals make a habit of returning to their vehicles every 2 hours and moving them to another parking space, sometimes moving as little as 15m.</p>	<p><u>Proposed Changes</u></p> <p>Despite the correspondents assertions to the contrary, it simply not true that the proposed changes to the parking restrictions in Wyndham Road (and more generally RPZA) are being proposed to generate revenue for the Council. The proposals have been brought forward following complaints from residents in the Belle Vue Road and Albany Road area of the zone about a shortage of daytime parking spaces and a more general need to review the appropriateness of the restrictions in situ given that they have not been reviewed since RPZA was first introduced in 1989.</p> <p>The correspondents’ suggestion about making the restrictions ‘Waiting Limited to 2 Hours, No Return to Zone A That Day’ are feasible and indeed have been considered. However, such a restriction would not be concordant with the main aim of the Council’s proposals, which seek to maximise the number of parking spaces available within RPZA for local residents. The proposed use of permit holders only bays removes the ability for anybody but residents, or their visitors, to use the bays during their hours of operation and thereby maximising the number of parking spaces within RPZA.</p> <p>Obviously, the Council wants to see more people using the Park and Ride services and its car parks if this is a by-product of introducing the residents parking scheme then clearly this would be of benefit to the Council but it is certainly not something the Council is expecting.</p> <p><u>Visitor Parking</u></p> <p>Visitor scratch cards costs the same in permit holders only residents’ parking schemes as they do in limited waiting residents’ parking schemes. Residents may purchase as many visitors scratch cards as they wish. Visitors scratch cards cost 40p each and are only available in books of 10, making it a cost of £4 per book of scratch cards. Residents in permit holders only zones (as is proposed for the road where the correspondent lives) are entitled to purchase 100 scratch cards per year at a cost of 40p per card. As is alluded to by the correspondent additional permits purchased above this initial allocation of 100 cost significantly more. The Council’s full terms and conditions in respect of residents’ parking schemes can be accessed via the following webpage - http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/salisbury-residents-parking-schemes-ts-and-cs.pdf.</p> <p>It is worth noting that visitor scratch cards are not vehicle specific so can be passed between visitors. Using the example quoted by the correspondent the visits by their son-in-law and daughter on the Monday would seemingly only require one permit at a cost of 40p. Without knowing the specifics of arrival and departure times but looking at the week as a whole (as outlined by the</p>
----------	---	--

Back to your consultation document, the only entry in your “Statement of Reasons” states the following;

RTRA 1984 Section 1 (1)

(f) For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.

We believe that this proposal will neither preserve nor improve the area. We certainly would not move to an area where residents are restricted to the numbers of visitors that they are allowed. Take this week as an example;

Monday a.m.	Son-in-Law called in with ill granddaughter.
Monday p.m.	Daughter called in for drink and to collect ill granddaughter.
Tuesday a.m.	Daughter called in with granddaughter.
Tuesday a.m.	Visitors called for 2 hours.
Tuesday p.m.	Daughter called in to see how we are and to collect granddaughter.
Wednesday p.m.	Daughter called to collect grandchildren after school.
Thursday p.m.	Tradesman to call and fit carpet.

This clearly shows that under the proposed scheme we would use up 7 permits in just 4 days at a cost of over £14, never mind the fact that we could not have any more visitors for a few weeks. This scheme also affects people who don't live in “Zone A”. Our daughter who collects her children from us after school on Wednesdays and stays for an hour before taking them for swimming lessons is now, following hearing of the proposed changes to residents only parking, requesting to change the lessons to Saturdays. This will now impact on her family's life as well.

If you find that not many residents have commented on the proposed scheme, may I relay to you that I have spoken to a couple of friends regarding the proposals and their replies were “why bother to comment when Wiltshire Council will not take any notice and will impose it anyway”. Therefore please rethink your plans for the good of my wife, myself, our family and all the other “Zone A” residents who are in a similar position. We feel that we are being victimised and if you are desperate to spend some of our Council Tax in this area, please prioritise by repairing the broken paving stones, resurfacing the pot-holed road and clearing the drains which haven't been done for many years.

I would finally request that Wiltshire Council replies to the following by return;

1. Would Wiltshire Council compensate us for any loss of value of our property as a result of the implementation of the Residents Only

correspondent) potentially as few as three visitor scratch cards could have been required at a of £1.20.

The Council's proposals also include the retention of time limited parking bays in Wyndham Road, Kings Road and Marlborough Road which could be used by visitors without needing to display a parking permit.

Response to Question 1

No. More generally though residents' parking schemes typically add value to properties as they provide protected parking for residents.

Response to Question 2

The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 governs the procedure that the Council must follow in making a TRO. This document only requires that the Council publishes a notice of its proposals in a local newspaper. Specifically it states:

“PART II PROCEDURE BEFORE MAKING AN ORDER

Publication of proposals:-

7.—(1) An order making authority shall, before making an order,—
(a)publish at least once a notice (in these Regulations called a “notice of proposals”) containing the particulars specified in Parts I and II of Schedule 1 in a newspaper circulating in the area in which any road or other place to which the order relates is situated”

Over and above this the council erected notices in each street to which its proposals related, made the consultation material available online and in public buildings such as Salisbury Library and its Customer Services Office in Milford Street in Salisbury.

Response to Question 3

A problem with the wording within the legal TRO allows motorists to move their vehicles between spaces within the zone. This problem is being addressed as part of the Council's proposals.

	<p>Parking Scheme as we certainly would not buy a house in an area where this operates?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Why are residents not being informed of the proposals by letter? It is an insult to find out about an important issue like this by a notice stuck to a post. Along with many others, I do not purchase the Salisbury Journal so would not see it in there. 3. Why are drivers allowed to park in "Zone A" for more than 2 hours by simply moving their cars to an adjacent space every 2 hours? 4. In this, the anniversary year of the Magna Carta, what has happened to our "Liberty & Freedom"? <p>I eagerly await your comments to this letter and trust for a quick reply to the above 3 questions.</p>	
9	<p>The proposal to replace the double yellow lines outside of my property is unacceptable as this will prevent me from accessing my off road parking space. I am not in possession of a residents parking permit and do not wish to buy one under any circumstances. The proposal to replace the line with an advisory white bar marking will enable cars to park in front of the access unrestricted. There is no justification to replace the double yellow lines with a white bar. I wish to object to this decision on grounds of removal of the right to access my property and loss of amenity - without any prior consultation.</p> <p>Secondly the overall scheme to make the whole area is detrimental to the livelihood of Salisbury City Centre; the ability to short term park for free within easy walking distance increases the likelihood that visitors will spend time in the shops in Salisbury. This is a gross waste of public monies as the cost of signage and road marking is excessive and unacceptable.</p>	<p>The provision of driveway protection (white bar) markings in front of dropped kerb accesses is a standard measure used by the Council in residents' parking zones as a way of increasing the number of parking spaces available. The use of such markings allows the owner of the property to which the dropped kerb access relates, or a visitor to that property (with the owner's permission), to park in front of the dropped kerb access without needing to display a permit and thereby potentially create additional parking spaces elsewhere within RPZA.</p> <p>Should a motorist park in front of the dropped kerb access who the owner has not given permission to do so then this is considered to an offence of obstructing the public highway. Such offences can be reported the Police who would be able to undertake enforcement action. Therefore, the provision of driveway protection marking will not enable unrestricted parking in front of the correspondents dropped kerb access.</p> <p>Although the Council's advertised proposals did not actually propose converting the whole of RPZA to permit holders only parking, even if the whole zone were to become such there would remain a number of free parking options available to visitors to the city centre. There are free parking spaces in, amongst others, Rolleston Street, Brown Street, Exeter Street, Fisherton Street and South Western Road. Parking is also free in Culver Street Car Park after 3.00pm Monday to Saturday and all day on Sunday. Free parking is also available within Residents' Parking Zone C. All of the options outlined above are either within the city centre or easy walking distance of it.</p> <p>Whilst there will be costs associated with the introduction of the Council's proposal they will not be excessive, particularly bearing in mind that the</p>

		<p>whole of RPZA is already covered by both signs and road markings, which the Council is legally obliged to maintain, that relate to the existing residents' parking scheme.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>I do not want full residents parking in Belle Vue Road. I have written to the council twice and was advised I would be sent a form in October which never arrived. My neighbour, who is keen for the full permits to occur, said not only had she received paperwork but she was visited in October by someone to discuss the plans. I wrote to John Glenn MP regarding my concerns. Interestingly it appears that a friend and neighbour across the road, who doesn't want it either, has not received the paperwork or had a visit.</p> <p>Having lived in London and more recently Bristol, I know first hand the nightmare that permit parking restrictions can bring</p> <p>My issues are:</p> <p>Visitors won't be able to come even for a coffee or lunch without a permit.</p> <p>Workpeople giving quotes or working on/in the houses will require permits (which could become extremely costly). In my experience they often no longer want to come to do the work either because of the additional hassle</p> <p>Local small businesses (including my own, I work from home as a physiotherapist) will be hit.</p> <p>The market traders, shops, cafes and the arts centre etc are all likely to suffer from loss of trade as the ease of parking in a street without the hassle of a car park and finding money/ making calls etc is taken away.</p> <p>I come and go from my house at different times of the day each day and in my opinion the problems are not during the day as much as at night when parking after about 9 is not as easy. Bringing permits during the day will not ease this problem.</p> <p>If change is to happen I wholeheartedly do not want residents parking only. My suggestion would be:</p> <p>Two hour parking but no same day return or moving to another nearby street. I know there are strong views on this issue both ways, however this suggestion seems simple enough that both parties would be happy.</p>	<p>It is unclear who exactly at the Council the correspondent has written to. However, the Traffic Engineering Team (as the developer of the proposals for RPZA) has, other than these comments, not received any correspondence from them.</p> <p>I believe that the forms that the correspondent is referring to are something that was distributed by a local resident who opposed a possible option of putting some streets from RPZA, including Belle Vue Road, into Residents' Parking Zone E. This being the case then the forms were not prepared or distributed by Wiltshire Council.</p> <p>The Council's proposals include the introduction of time limited parking spaces into Belle Vue Road (the road where the correspondent lives) which can be used by visitors popping in for a coffee or tradesmen when providing quotes without needing to display a permit. Similarly these spaces could be utilised by customers of businesses in the road without needed to display a parking permit.</p> <p>In addition to the above owners of businesses within RPZA are entitled to apply for business permits. Business permits are designed to be handed in and out to customers visiting a business situated within a residents parking. In the case of Belle Vue Road a customer displaying a valid business permit would be able to park in any of the permit holders only parking bays without time restriction.</p> <p>Even with the Council's proposals to convert Belle Vue Road to permits holders only parking there would remain a number of free parking options available to visitors to the city centre. There are free parking spaces in, amongst others, Rolleston Street, Brown Street, Exeter Street, Fisherton Street and South Western Road. Parking is also free in Culver Street Car Park after 3.00pm Monday to Saturday and all day on Sunday. Free parking is also available within Residents' Parking Zone C. All of the options outlined above are either within the city centre or easy walking distance of it.</p> <p>The correspondents' suggestion about making the restrictions 'Waiting Limited to 2 Hours, No Return to Zone A That Day' are feasible and indeed have been considered. However, such a restriction would not be concordant with the main aim of the Council's proposals, which seek to maximise the number of parking spaces available within RPZA for local residents. The proposed use of permit holders' only bays removes the ability for anybody but residents, or their visitors, to use the bays during their hours of operation and thereby maximising the number of parking spaces within RPZA.</p>

11	<p>In your consultation and planning application for a change in the parking bays and marked zones in Kings Road, Salisbury (restricted parking Zone A), you identify houses with and without garages, and have not placed any marked bays opposite your marked garages. Unfortunately, your plan doesn't take into account the garage on the back of my property, 25 Wyndham Road, and you have indicated a marked bay will be placed opposite it. This would mean I would be unable to use the garage.</p> <p>The garage has been there for as long as I've lived at the property, since I moved in with my late husband in 1997, and I have always indicated on any parking permit applications that there is a garage on the property.</p> <p>Obviously, there has been some kind of mistake here, and although I have no objection to changes to marked bays in general, I would like the plans to be changed to recognise my garage and acknowledge the access it requires.</p>	Please refer to main report as this issue has been considered as a substantive issue.
12	<p>I only very recently discovered, almost by accident, that Wiltshire Council proposes to change the whole of Zone A - Salisbury, to Permit Holders Only.</p> <p>One can only assume that the intention of such a proposed change, would be to put (an unfair) pressure on ordinary citizens who might wish (or actually have the need) to park in one of these roads - and quite possibly for only a reasonably limited amount of time (in order to visit or collect a friend, or to "drop something off" or to collect something) - to compel these people to use a "Pay and Display" space elsewhere, or to park in one of the "main" Car Parks (< minimum charge of £1.40). It would seem therefore that the ultimate aim of the proposed change is simply to provide the Council with an <u>easy source of extra revenue</u>.</p> <p>I should be pleased to know how in the eyes of the Council, such a proposed change might be thought to square with Wiltshire Council's proud logo: "Where everybody matters".</p>	<p>Despite the correspondents assertions to the contrary, it simply not true that the proposed changes to the parking restrictions in RPZA are being proposed to generate revenue for the Council. The proposals have been brought forward following complaints from residents in the Belle Vue Road and Albany Road area of the zone about a shortage of daytime parking spaces and a more general need to review the appropriateness of the restrictions in situ given that they have not been reviewed since RPZA was first introduced in 1989.</p> <p>The Council's advertised proposals did not actually propose converting the whole of RPZA to permit holders only parking. In areas of the zone where it is proposed to introduce permit holders only parking the Council's proposals include the provision of a small number of time limited parking bays to help support businesses within the zone and the servicing of residents' properties. Also it is permissible to stop for a short period of time on a double or single yellow line restriction to load and unload a vehicle. In addition to this residents are able to purchase visitors scratch cards and businesses can purchase business permits, the effect of which will be to allow visitors or customers to use the permit holders only parking spaces.</p>
13	<p>I am Cllr Michael Pope and I am responding to the consultation as a City Councillor for this ward. I also live in zone a at 62 Hamilton Road.</p> <p>My views are -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make Endless Street, Belle Vue Road and Albany Road residents only. 2. Remainder of roads keep as existing but change to no return to zone a after the two hours. 	The comments are noted.
14	I write with regard to the proposed changes to the parking arrangements in	Response to Comments 1 and 2

<p>Zone A.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Surely the whole point of having zones is that the parking restrictions should be similar all over the zone. These proposals will totally wreck that continuity. 2. Having so many different rules, varying from street to street, will lead to people making mistakes unwittingly. Having the same restriction all over the Zone makes it much less likely that people will be caught out and incur a fine. Or is this a money making exercise? 3. The streets which do not have residents only parking will be overloaded with people trying to park to visit residents. 4. Wyndham Road is being proposed as residents only parking. This is an absurd suggestion as there is a doctors practice in this road. How will ill, frail or disabled patients access their GP surgery? 5. None of the proposed changes will solve the main problem in this zone. It is not during the day that there is a shortage of spaces, it is at night. <p>Please consider the proposals very carefully. They may appear to solve some of the problems, but they will have detrimental impact on some of our most vulnerable residents.</p>	<p>Ideally, restrictions in residents' parking zones should be the same across the whole of the zone. As the correspondent alludes to having differing restrictions in adjacent streets may lead to confusion for motorists and result in them unwittingly parking illegally. The decision to proceed on the basis of having differing restrictions from street to street in RPZA was at the behest of the elected member for the ward who was seeking to give local residents the type of parking scheme that they wanted based on the results of the consultation undertaken by the Council in 2013.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 3</u></p> <p>If permit holders only parking is introduced into (amongst others) Belle Vue Road, Albany Road and Wyndham Road then there is a significant possibility that parking from these roads will be displaced into the roads within RPZA that are to remain subject to a limited waiting residents' parking scheme. Should parking be displaced into these roads and it create problems for local residents the need for permit holders only parking to introduced in them could be revisited.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 4</u></p> <p>The Council's proposals include the retention of two time limited parking bays, outside of the doctors surgery in Wyndham Road which could be utilised by visiting patients without needing to display a parking permit. Time limited parking bays will also be retained in the adjoining Kings Road and Marlborough Road which again could be used by customers of businesses in Wyndham Road without needing to display a parking permit.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 5</u></p> <p>Residents' parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are aimed at tackling problems caused by commuter and shopper parking and are not intended to solve parking problems outside of these times.</p> <p>In general, overnight parking problems in the area are caused by high levels of car ownership by residents within the zone and the only realistic solution is for residents to own fewer vehicles. Whilst residents' parking schemes could operate at night in general they would only serve to make parking more restrictive for local residents. All council owned car parks, on-street pay and display parking bays and loading bays within the city centre are free of charge and unrestricted after 6.00pm (until 8.00am the following day) so there is little reason for commuters or shoppers to park in RPZA after this time. Additionally, operating residents' parking schemes at night would make</p>
--	---

		<p>the costs of parking permits higher to cover the additional enforcement costs.</p> <p>The Council's proposals include, where practical, the replacement of lengths of NWAAT restrictions with additional parking spaces. Doing so not only creates additional daytime parking spaces for residents but overnight parking spaces as well. Whilst this may not solve all the overnight parking problems within RPZA it will help to alleviate them.</p>
15	<p>With regard to the proposed changes to parking in Kings Road I am very concerned that the allocation and siting of parking bays on the north side, will not allow me to drive in and out of my parking space/garage safely and easily.</p> <p>I live at 33 Wyndham Road and already find it difficult to reverse my estate car out of my parking space due to cars parked opposite, half on the pavement and half on the road (Kings Road). I fear that it will be impossible should your new parking arrangements be implemented.</p> <p>This situation does not only apply to myself but to all my neighbours who have parking places or garages at the rear of their properties.</p> <p>Please can you revisit your plans and confirm that access will be possible and maintained. I fear of course that with the changes to waiting, Kings Road will in fact become more busy as day parkers seek fewer parking spaces. It is a constricted single width road and without pulling onto the pavement two cars cannot pass safely.</p> <p>Children also play in the road due to the limited parking and I fear that it will change safety and the character of the neighbourhood and make a quiet safe road into a rat run.</p> <p>In view of this I would request that any changes to this road include designated for residents parking only during the day.</p>	<p>Please refer to main report as this issue has been considered as a substantive issue.</p>
16	<p>I wish to raise a concern about the proposed revisions to parking on Kings Road. On the plan, new parking spaces will be created outside no20, 22, 24, 26 and 28 Kings Road</p> <p>Many residents of Wyndham road have garages or drive ways at the rear of their properties, backing onto Kings Road, these are accessed from Kings Road. If the changes to the parking are made, the residents of Wyndham road will have great difficulty getting cars into and out of their garages and drive ways as Kings road is too narrow. This may result in damage to cars parked on Kings Road and potential obstruction of Kings Road as residents of Wyndham Road try to get their cars in and out of their drives / garages.</p>	<p>Please refer to main report as this issue has been considered as a substantive issue.</p>

	<p>I am also concerned that Kings road will be significantly restricted in width in certain places, this may prevent larger vehicles and refuse lorries being able to use the road</p> <p>Parking is currently permitted in certain places on Kings road between 5pm and 9am and on Sundays, however, cars in these spots are often parked on the pavement due to the narrow width. If the parking restrictions are changed, cars will be parked on the pavement at all times, which will impede pedestrians</p>	
17	<p>I am writing to comment on the proposed changes to the Salisbury Zone A parking regulations.</p> <p>First I would like to say that it is almost impossible to find the information on the WC website and also no indication as to where the public should write. I therefore have no idea if this is going to the correct place. I hope that you will not assume agreement when no-one comments, it might be that the information cannot be found!</p> <p>I have had a long look at the proposed changes to Zone A parking and I cannot see any logical reason why Wyndham Road is to be changed to Residents Only. It is totally unnecessary.</p> <p>Capita and Friends Life are more or less disappearing and this will lift the pressure on our street. Residents Only will push our short stay parkers into other hard-pressed streets. What we have been asking for all along, is to keep the 2 hour short stay parking and the 2 hour traffic order to be changed to “No return to <u>zone A</u>”. Without this change, “no return” is at present, effectively unenforceable . This change would stop people moving their cars across the road after two hours and encourage them to move to the car parks. This change could be implemented as a trial rather than going straight to Residents Only, which would never be reversed.</p> <p>And I also feel that the number of small businesses in the street will be badly served by this change. These include at least two B & Bs, four homes for people with special needs, a private medical practice, two dentists that I know of. All these organisations have visitors coming and going all the time. The only time we have serious problems with parking is after 6.00 pm when the parking restrictions do not apply. Therefore, as far as I can see, the only reason to make Wyndham Road Residents only is to increase revenue.</p> <p>Unfortunately I suspect that you are using the figures from Paul Shaddock’s spurious “unofficial” questionnaire which does cloud the issue and give a false impression.</p>	<p>When developing residents’ parking schemes the Councils undertake two different consultation processes. The first process is the informal consultation and the second process is the formal consultation. The informal consultation process is termed as such because the Council is not legally required to undertake it. During this process all residents within the zone are written to and their views are sought on whether or not they consider parking problems to exist and any potential changes the Council is looking to make. The results of this consultation help the Council in drawing up any proposed changes to the parking restrictions.</p> <p>The formal consultation process is termed as such because the Council is legally required to undertake it. During this process a copy of the proposed TRO and detailed plans showing the Councils proposals are made available for comment by members of the public. All comments received at this stage are considered in a report and the final decision on whether or not to proceed rests, in the case of Wiltshire Council, with the Cabinet Member for Highways.</p> <p>The consultation process outlined above is exactly what has been followed in respect of the councils proposed changes in RPZA, which are this subject of this report.</p> <p>The correspondents comment that the informal consultation undertaken by the Council was spurious seems little more than a churlish rebuke stemming from the fact that Council did not propose a solution that they personally favour. When undertaking the informal consultation process in relation to these proposals the options available to residents was to retain the existing limited waiting type of residents’ parking scheme in RPZA or convert to a permit holders only type of scheme (which would maximise the number of parking spaces available within RPZA for local residents). This approach to the informal consultation was agreed with the then Wiltshire Council Member, Mr. Paul Sample.</p> <p>The correspondents’ suggestion about making the restrictions ‘Waiting Limited to 2 Hours, No Return to Zone A That Day’ are feasible and indeed have been considered. However, such a restriction would not be concordant</p>

	<p>I am registering my objections with Wiltshire Council as this is supposed to be a consultation but, depressing though it is, the suspicion is that Mr Shaddock and WC will do exactly what they decided to do years ago.</p>	<p>with the main aim of the Council's proposals, which seek to maximise the number of parking spaces available within RPZA for local residents. The proposed use of permit holders only bays removes the ability for anybody but residents, or their visitors, to use the bays during their hours of operation and thereby maximising the number of parking spaces within RPZA. Ultimately this is why such an option has not been taken forward.</p> <p>In response to the informal consultation, albeit by a small margin, residents of Wyndham Road voted in favour of converting to a permit holders only type of residents' parking scheme. As such the Council's proposals have been taken forward on this basis.</p> <p>The Council's proposals include the retention of two time limited parking bays in Wyndham Road which could be utilised by customers of businesses in the road without needing to display a parking permit. Time limited parking bays will also be retained in the adjoining Kings Road and Marlborough Road which again could be used by customers of businesses in Wyndham Road without needing to display a parking permit.</p> <p>In addition to the above owners of businesses within RPZA are entitled to apply for business permits. Business permits are designed to be handed in and out to customers visiting a business situated within a residents parking. In the case of Wyndham Road a customer displaying a valid business permit would be able to park in any of the permit holders only parking bays without time restriction.</p>
18	<p>The proposed road markings for Nelson Road will in one hand help my customers i.e. The white bar marking, but making the no waiting at anytime in yellow and in red on the plan is not acceptable. The reason being some of our customers are severely disabled people need to park very close to the shop door. These red and yellow zones are used constantly between 8am-6pm , these cannot be restricted.</p> <p>You are proposing one white bay outside the shop ,this is not adequate. One parking bay is not enough. Secondly we offer a taxi service throughout the day to customers where, we collect them and bring them to the shop. We need to park outside the shop in these zones also.</p> <p>Lastly, we delivery on an hourly basis to care, nursing and residential homes. We have no parking permits for any vans or our community transport cars; we need these zones for our own parking also.</p> <p>If my objection is not accepted then your changes will have a detrimental effect on the service I am supplying to the elderly and disabled people of Wiltshire.</p>	<p>The proposed changes to the parking restrictions in Nelson Road are entirely for and to the benefit of the Lifestyle & Mobility shop operating in the road.</p> <p>Somewhat surprisingly given that the correspondent runs a shop that is specifically aimed at servicing disabled people they appear to be ill informed about parking restrictions and what Blue Badge holders are permitted to do in respect of them. The Council's proposals include the provision of a 'No Waiting' Monday to Saturday 8.00am to 6.00pm restriction directly outside of the correspondents shop. Blue Badge holders are permitted to park for up to three hours on 'No Waiting' restrictions by displaying their Blue Badge. It is also permissible to stop for a short period of time on a 'No Waiting' restriction to load and unload a vehicle. The same also applies to NWAAT restrictions. Therefore the proposed provision of the 'No Waiting' restriction will improve both access to the shop for disabled motorists and the ability for the staff of the shop to load and unload their vehicles. The 'No Waiting' restriction also allows residents of Nelson Road to park on it overnight when the Lifestyle & Mobility shop is closed and there is the greatest demand from residents for parking spaces within the road. There are NWAAT restrictions present within 10 metres of the entrance to the correspondents' shop which again could be used by Blue Badge Holders visiting the premises or by staff of the shop to</p>

	<p>I require you to not issue a No waiting zone in red and a no waiting zone in yellow, and instead make these disabled parking zones or leave them as they are as 2 hour No return zones.</p>	<p>load or unload a vehicle.</p> <p>Blue Badge holders are permitted to park in any of the on-street residents parking bays in Salisbury without time restriction by displaying their Blue Badge. Meaning that a customer to the correspondents shop can use any of the existing or proposed parking bays in Nelson Road.</p> <p>In view of the above it is considered that customers of the Lifestyle & Mobility shop are well served by the Council's proposals for Nelson Road.</p> <p>The proposed new length of NWAAT restriction in Nelson Road is in the middle of the road between an existing parking bay and the proposed 'No Waiting' restriction. The provision of this restriction will mean that parking cannot take place in the middle of the road. Allowing parking in the middle of the road at the location in question risks vehicles using the 'No Waiting' restriction or the parking bay becoming blocked in.</p>
<p>19</p>	<p>I have studied your plan of proposed changes for parking in Zone A, Salisbury. Please could I point out a SERIOUS ISSUE with the plan as it stands.</p> <p>Currently there is a single yellow line across the junction of Albany Road and Belle Vue Road (the junction near to Endless Street).</p> <p>This gives just enough room during the daytime for those large lorries and coaches that regularly "stray" from Endless St into the one-way system of narrow streets with right-angled bends (ie Belle Vue and Albany Roads), to do a complex manoeuvre, turn round within the space provided by the junction, and exit back down Endless Street.</p> <p>In the evening, when there are usually vehicles parked on the single yellow line, any "straying" lorry drivers have an almost impossible task to turn their vehicle round in the very restricted space.</p> <p>I have seen a lorry take 45 minutes and dozens of manoeuvres to turn round in the evening. My neighbour's car was seriously damaged by a lorry on one such occasion. Meanwhile any other driver trying to get through the one-way system (and this now includes police cars from the nearby police station) is stuck for the duration. I live at this junction and witness these snarl-ups several times every week.</p> <p>If the single yellow line at the junction is replaced by permanent parking bays, the problem with manoeuvring lorries will be much, much worse.</p> <p>Large heavy vehicles are supposedly informed that it is unwise to drive down these streets. There is a blue advisory sign on Endless Street stating that the</p>	<p>If the Council's proposals are implemented it is hoped that the proposed provision of additional parking spaces in Endless Street will serve to make it clear to large vehicles that they should not be proceeding along this route before they arrive at Belle Vue Road or Albany Road. In addition to this an improved sign informing drivers of large vehicles to avoid this route, replacing the existing sign in Endless Street, will be provided.</p> <p>The Council will also provide an additional sign at the junction of Endless Street and Belle Vue Road informing drivers of large vehicles to avoid this route.</p>

	<p>way ahead is "unsuitable for HV's". Clearly this sign is either not seen, or is ignored, by many HV drivers.</p> <p>In your proposed plan, the single yellow line at this junction appears to have been replaced by permanent parking bays. In order to prevent an already difficult situation being made worse, one of the following is necessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the single yellow line should be retained at the junction • OR a sign on Endless Street that lights up at the approach of an HV should replace the existing blue sign • OR "no entry for lorries and buses" signs or at least "unsuitable for HVs" signs should be installed where Endless St turns and becomes Belle Vue Road. <p>I appreciate that the Council is trying to provide more parking spaces. However, there is already a real problem with HVs, which needs some measure put in place to try and solve it. Residents of this area would of course prefer to see a measure which stopped HVs straying into these streets in the first place.</p> <p>I did write to you last year explaining this problem when there was an initial consultation, but my point seems to have been ignored. Please could you take it into account now. I would be happy to discuss this with an officer should you wish to contact me. Better still, perhaps one of your team should come out from Trowbridge to look at the junction and see for yourself.</p>	
20	<p>Whilst very much in favour of the move to residents only for much of this part of Zone A, couple of smaller points as they affect our property. At present we can park our Mini outside after 5 and Sundays (single yellow line) - but it is moving to No Waiting at all? Adjacent will become one of the small 1 hour only waiting areas - why can that not become part of the residents parking zone as no non-residents will risk going into town and back in that time. There are still not enough resident parking areas, and visitors to local properties can as now use the visitor parking vouchers.</p>	<p>The length of NWAAT restriction proposed outside of the correspondent's property is to keep the access to College Street Car Park clear of parked vehicles.</p> <p>The proposed introduction of the time limited parking bay into Belle Vue Road is to provide parking for customers of businesses operating in the road.</p>
21	<p>While I welcome the proposed parking (Mon-Sat 8am-6pm) for Zone A permit holders only, I feel the need to express my concerns about the proposal to remove the current single yellow line restriction on the left hand comer between numbers 41 and 45 Albany Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With daytime parking on this stretch, there will not be enough room for large vehicles to safely negotiate the bend. I refer here not to the heavy goods vehicles that are warned not to attempt this, but everyday traffic which includes refuse collection, removal vans and furniture delivery vans. I understand from a resident of more than 30 year that the yellow line restriction was originally introduced because 	<p><u>Response to Comment 1</u></p> <p>Council officers use a piece of software called AutoTRACK which allows the space required for a turning manoeuvre of any size and type of vehicle to be tracked. Using this software has shown that a fire engine and a refuse collection vehicle can still negotiate the bend in question should the Council's proposals be implemented.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 2</u></p> <p>If the Council's proposals are implemented it is hoped that the proposed</p>

<p>parked cars were regularly being damaged on this bend.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. In 7 years of living at the above address, the problem of very large vehicles becoming stuck on this bend has been a regular occurrence. While the situation has recently improved with the signing in Endless Street, the problem has not been eliminated and errors will continue to be made by drivers of coaches and lorries, often foreign and unfamiliar with the city. Removing the yellow line will make it impossible for these drivers to get out of the situation they find themselves in. 3. The single yellow line allows essential stopping space for day time deliveries and other services to residents along the whole of Albany Road. These include parcel and supermarket deliveries as well as ambulances and other emergency services, which are currently able pull up there without blocking the road. <p>I hope you will take these points into consideration.</p>	<p>provision of additional parking spaces in Endless Street will serve to make it clear to large vehicles that they should not be proceeding along this route before they arrive at Albany Road. In addition to this an improved sign informing drivers of large vehicles to avoid this route, replacing the existing sign in Endless Street, will be provided.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 3</u></p> <p>The Council's proposals for Albany Road will remove the ability for non-residents to park within it during the hours of operation of the residents' parking scheme. This coupled with the provision of additional parking spaces in the road will result in more parking spaces being available for use by residents and delivery vehicles. The effect of the combination of these two measures should be that day to day activities, such as receiving deliveries are able to continue without adverse impact.</p> <p>It should also be noted that if the Council's proposals are implemented there will remain a number of lengths of 'No Waiting At Any Time' (NWAAT hereafter) restrictions in the vicinity of the correspondents property (most notably directly opposite) which could be utilised for the purposes of loading/unloading by delivery vehicles or in the event by an emergency service vehicle.</p>
--	--