

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE COUNCIL'S PROPOSALS FOR WYNDHAM ROAD  
AS PART OF THE REVIEW OF RESIDENTS PARKING ZONE A, SALISBURY (2016) AND OFFICER RESPONSE**

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	Officer Response
1	<p>Given the aim of the Zone A Review is not just to increase the number of parking space available to residents in Zone A but is to 'maximise' the number available, we the undersigned believe that too many time limited spaces have been allocated at the Castle Street end of Wyndham Road.</p> <p>We believe a fairer solution for the proposed 12 time limited bays would be to: either allow Zone A residents to park in the time limited bays as per the Council's proposal for Castle Street, or revert to the original proposed 2 time limited bays which should become resident's only outside of the hours the restrictions apply i.e. evenings, Saturdays and Sundays which are recognized by the Council as the most problematic times for parking.</p>	Please refer to main report as this issue has been considered as a substantive issue.
2	<p>In brief the main aim of the parking review in the Council's words is to maximise the parking for residents, in practice we are going to asked to pay double the current amount in order to give up spaces near our houses in favour of clients of the Independent Medical Practice!</p> <p>I have attached a letter we have sent to the Independent Medical Practice (SIMP) at the Castle Street end of Wyndham Road which contains many of the salient points. Our objection is that the change to the proposed number of time limited spaces came as a direct result of the SIMPs appeal to the Council on the grounds of their ill and infirm patients. However, not all of the Doctors practice at the surgery every day, two of the doctors offer botox and liposuction so presumably their patients are fit enough to walk, their website states they are not far from car parks, they do not open on Saturdays, thus prohibiting residents from 52 days of parking and their needs are being put before those of the resident for whom the new restrictions (in the Council's own words) are to maximise the number of spaces available to residents. This is a 250% increase on the appeal of non-residents and their relatives! They had been given 4/5 spaces by the Council do they really need 11/13?</p> <p>I hope you will agree with us that this is very unfair and that the SIMP have acted in a rather underhand manner. We are seeking support from our local MP and local City and Wiltshire Councillor.</p> <p>Text of Letter Sent to Dr. Willis:</p>	In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.

*Review of Residents' Parking Zone A*

*Many thanks for taking the time last evening to talk through the latest proposals for the changes to be made to the Residents' Parking Zone A scheme specifically affecting Wyndham Road.*

*During our discussions outside your surgery you witnessed that 12 cars plus one unoccupied space would be available for 1 hour time limited parking in the new proposals, a total of 13 spaces which will no longer be available to residents, not the 10 spaces as stated in the Council's proposals.*

*Paragraph 12 of Council document Ref 12 HT-02-16 Review of Residents' Parking Zone A Salisbury says 'such a change would maximise the number of parking spaces available within RPZA for local residents in line with the principal aim of the review'. Losing 13 spaces will be in direct contravention of the review's principal aim.*

*You advertise your practice on the web as **'The Practice is conveniently situated within comfortable walking distance of Salisbury city centre with some on-street car parking at the Practice and a public car park nearby'** and therefore it does appear disingenuous to approach the Council with a petition to try and gain more than the original two parking bays sufficient for 4-5 cars. According to the Council's review ref 12 HT-02-16 paragraph 26 which states **'It is apparent that Dr Willis has misinterpreted the Council's proposals and believed that they showed the complete removal of the ability for patients visiting the SIMP surgery to park in Wyndham Road. Put simply, that is not the case. It is unfortunate that Dr Willis chose not to discuss his concerns about the proposals for Wyndham Road, and how they would affect the day to day operation of the SIMP surgery, with officers before launching his campaign seeking objections to them, as he will have undoubtedly caused undue worry and stress for patients of the surgery through the dissemination of his view of the Council's proposals, even the Council was disappointed that there was no consultation prior to your petition.***

*They also note ref 12 HT-02-16 paragraph 28 that Blue Badge holders would not be restricted under the new proposals (**'Blue Badge holders are already permitted to park of the on-street residents' parking bays in Salisbury, irrespective of the type of residents' parking scheme in operation, without time restriction by displaying their Blue Badge. The ability for Blue Badge holders to use the residents' parking bays in Wyndham Road will not be altered as a result of the Council's proposals. This means that Blue Badge holders will continue to be able to park close to the SIMP surgery.'**) The Council's review also states*

12 HT-02-16 paragraph 27 **'The Council's advertised proposals for Wyndham Road included converting the two limited waiting residents' parking bays closest to the SIMP surgery to time limited parking bays rather than permit holders only residents' parking bays. This was specifically so that patients visiting the surgery had the opportunity to park close to it. The two bays proposed to be converted would be restricted to 'Parking Limited to 1 Hour, No Return Within 2 Hours Monday to Saturday 8.00am to 6.00pm' and could accommodate a maximum of four vehicles depending on their size and efficacious parking.**

*It is clear from documents ref 12 HT-02-16 paragraph 24 'All of the items of correspondence relating to the proposals for Wyndham Road, and how they would impact on the day to day operation of the SIMP, essentially raise the same issue. That issue being the removal of the limited waiting residents' parking bays from Wyndham Road would prevent patients from being able to park within a reasonable distance of the surgery and consequently stop them from being able to visit their General Practitioner. The items of correspondence highlighted that not being able to park within a reasonable distance of the surgery would be particularly problematic for sick, elderly, disabled and infirm patients wishing to visit SIMP.'* and document reference 12 HT-02-16 paragraph 21 which says **'Of the 85 items of correspondence objecting to or offering comments on the Council's proposals, 64 related solely to the proposals for Wyndham Road and how they would impact on the day to day operation of the Southern Independent Medical Practice (SIMP) which is based within the road. The 64 items of correspondence comprise 63 emails from patients (or family members of patients) of SIMP and a petition with 117 signatories. The signatories of the petition comprise a mix of staff and patients (or family members of patients) of SIMP. The correspondence received appears to be part of a campaign organised by Dr Richard Willis (the owner and founder of SIMP) to propagate objections to the Council's proposals'** that a campaign was launched by your surgery as 63 of the 64 complaints were in support of your request. *Is it fair and reasonable that even the opinions of relatives of your clients should come above the interests of us residents?*

*As residents our yearly charge will double from £20 to £40 for the new Residents' Only Scheme and we will still be required to purchase daily virtual tickets for our visitors. We also pay a higher council rate for living in the city. Under the new proposals your clients will be able to enjoy free convenient parking, at the expense of us residents who are funding the service.*

*With the original allocation of 5 time limited spaces for 1 hour parking*

	<p><i>'specifically' to address SIMP, you were already in a privileged position with your clients having access to free convenient parking when the clients of most other city doctors and dentists have to park, pay and walk to their practices, and, as already mentioned, your website advertises your proximity to car parks and therefore parking presumably does not present you with a major problem. Several of the doctors at your practice also have practices elsewhere and therefore cannot be in two places at once and the patients visiting the two of your doctors who offer botox and liposuction do not fit with your argument to the Council of patients being sick and infirm.</i></p> <p><i>To be honest we were not happy with the original allocation of 5 time limited spaces but with a mind to compromise decided not to appeal. Had we known your plans we would, of course, made a counter appeal at that time. However, following our conversation last evening we are glad that you agree that the increase in spaces is unfair to residents, that you have no wish to upset residents and that a compromise is required. You also said you strongly agreed that applying restrictions on a Saturday (one of the 3 periods identified by the Council as being the most difficult for residents) was totally unreasonable. As you are aware, time is of the essence, and we would be very grateful if, as you intimated, you will contact the Council with a view to being just and fair to us paying residents of Wyndham Road and withdrawing your request which was solely responsible for the increase in the allocation of time limited spaces.</i></p> <p><i>We wondered if a possible solution for you would be to convert your back garden for the parking of you most needy cases? We obviously want a friendly solution to this matter and would very much appreciate you talking to us and keeping us informed of your consultations with the Council and their response.</i></p>	
3	<p>Further to my email please would you also add that the SIMP currently has 4 spaces to the side of their property before exploring the possibility of making use of their garden for further parking. If they perceive they are short of space then they could allocate them for clients. This would be no different to most city centre workers have no allocated car parking.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>
4	<p>With reference to Council document HT-02-16, paragraphs 29 &amp; 30 on pages 5 &amp; 6. It does not seem fair or reasonable to calculate and then allocate sufficient spaces for the SIMP practice customers (8 spaces) when the review has not given the same consideration to paying residents. There are more Zone A residents with permits than there are available parking spaces so any perceived requirement for SIMP should be reduced by the same ratio to reflect the shortfall.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>
5	<p>We object strongly to the amendments made to the planned introduction of residents only parking in Wyndham Road Zone A Salisbury. The 5 bays originally earmarked for 1hr parking were ample. There is no need for an additional 8. (The planning numbers suggest these are 4 and 6 bays but</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>

	<p>there are 13 vehicles, including 1 van, parked there while I am typing this). This end of Wyndham Road is very close to the Central Car Park. Indeed, the medical practice's own website says that the practice is conveniently situated within comfortable walking distance of Salisbury City Centre and that there is a public car park nearby. Any patients who are disabled will obviously still be able to park anywhere under the blue badge scheme. Surely thirteen parking spaces for one business, in an area with insufficient residential parking, is excessive given most City centre businesses of all descriptions have to rely on their customers using public car parks? Salisbury Parking say that the changes mean many spaces will be free in the street during the day but observations suggest otherwise; we recognize most of the cars parked here as residents. Have you any data to back this claim up? Please may we see the objections received which resulted in the changes to the original proposal?</p> <p>From our perspective we are being asked to pay double for a greatly reduced service. The situation will be exacerbated by the new residential buildings currently under construction at the end of the road.</p>	
6	<p>I wish to add the following observations to my previous objections. All points should be considered against the stated principal aim of the review of parking in Zone A Salisbury which is that of maximising the number of parking spaces available to residents living within the zone. The latest version of the TRO has been greatly skewed towards providing benefits to one business to the detriment of residents. References are to document ref 12 HT-02-16.</p> <p>Para 26. Includes the statement that SIMP campaign will have undoubtedly caused undue worry and stress for patients of the surgery through the dissemination of his view. The ensuing large increase in places not available to residents has certainly caused worry and stress for those residents whose properties will undoubtedly be reduced in value and made more difficult to sell as a result of having no parking outside of their actual property.</p> <p>Para 27. States that 2 bays were made available and could accommodate a maximum of four vehicles depending on their size and efficacious parking. These bays certainly can accommodate five vehicles. Photographic evidence is available if required.</p> <p>Para 28. Clearly blue badge holders (i.e. the disabled mentioned in the SIMP objections) can already park anywhere so are not a valid part of any argument for increasing the number of bays.</p> <p>Para 29. This includes the statement that the level of response to the TRO has led officers to reconsider. All this response was from a mixture of staff, patients or family members of patients of SIMP. Why should their interests override those of actual residents? All this is against a background of the SIMP website saying that The Practice is conveniently situated within comfortable walking distance of Salisbury city centre with some on-street car</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>

	<p>parking at the Practice and a public car park nearby. This para 29 also states that the original provision of the two proposed time limited parking bays is likely to be insufficient as there are four GPs practicing at the surgery. The reality is that these GPs have other medical businesses and are not always at Wyndham Road premises. For example, Dr Willis has a surgery in Southampton on Wednesdays and Dr Morley has a business providing plastic surgery, botox etc services at four other venues around Dorset as well as from SIMP. Dr Lovatt has a company providing 3D liposuction and skin-tightening amongst other things. Thus, many of the customers for SIMP are not actually ill at all and do not require special consideration for parking. (One can only assume that a patient who is having a consultation on lip enhancement is capable of walking from the Central car park).</p> <p>Para 30. Again, the number of car spaces available is understated. The proposal states up to 6 but is actually 8 (photo evidence is available if required). As stated earlier, any customers for SIMP can already park in Mill Stream Approach, Castle Street pay and display, the Central Car park or use the park and ride. It is proposed to provide these extra time limited bays whilst retaining some parking close to the residential properties opposite the surgery. In practice this parking may well not be very close at all.</p> <p>Given that the arguments for increasing the number of time limited bays do not stand much scrutiny it would seem a reasonable compromise to go with the 2 bays in the council's original proposals. There is no case for any increase and certainly not that of around 250% which is included in the new proposals.</p> <p>Also, as SIMP doesn't open on Saturdays surely any time limited bays should be Monday-Friday only as the ref document states they were introduced specifically for patients visiting SIMP? Failure to amend this results in another 52 days per year when residents will not be able to leave their cars in the road by their houses. As the additional time limited places were only introduced to satisfy the complaints by SIMP it is totally unfair that we are being asked to pay double our annual fee for a service which patently does not maximise the number of parking spaces available to residents.</p>	
7	<p>Apologies for a further submission but as we have looked further into this matter and had many discussions different issues and possible solutions have arisen. The following contains most of the points we have made plus a couple of different equitable solutions. As you will know, the original consultation on whether to introduce Residents Only parking into Zone A produced a small majority in favour of the introduction of such a scheme. When the actual proposals were first issued for consultation they included 2 bays (either 4 or 5 vehicles) designated as time limited (1 hour no return within 2 hours) on the north side of the Castle Street end of Wyndham Road. The councils report and justifications are contained in the document HT-02-</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>

16.  
The private medical practice (SIMP) subsequently organised a campaign to say this would greatly affect their business and patients. In response to this, the council have increased the number of places to at least 10 covering both sides of the road.

However, as per para 26 of the above report, it is apparent that Dr Willis had misinterpreted the Council's proposals and believed that they showed the complete removal of the ability for patients visiting the SIMP surgery to park in Wyndham Road. This was not the case and so all those objections received from the SIMP orchestrated campaign are not valid as they were in response to a false position, not the actual proposals.

The problem with paragraphs 29 and 30, which detail the council's response to the concerns of SIMP, is that the justification for increasing the number of bays is based on false assumptions regarding the number of spaces required. The original plans for the 2 bays providing 4 or 5 spaces seemed a fair compromise. They were then increased by 250% in response to the SIMP input. However, in arriving at this conclusion the council based the requirement on 4 doctors as listed on their website. There are 4 doctors but the premises can only accommodate 3 at maximum and they have interests/clinics elsewhere so there are often only 2 doctors there and never more than 3. So, using the council's own calculations of one space for each patient being seen by a doctor and one space for a patient waiting to be seen by one of the doctors, the 4 or 5 spaces originally proposed would be adequate, especially as not all the customers arrive by car. We conducted a short survey of visitors to SIMP for four hours on the morning of 29th July. During this period 30 visits were made to the practice 9 of which were on foot or bicycle. Thus an average of 5 parking spaces per hour were required to meet their needs.

There are 4 spaces on the driveway but the doctors usually park in the road so they appear to have permits. Additionally, they do have the option of converting their driveway and rear garden to provide parking for customers if they wished.

I can see no justification for an increase in time limited bays as the arguments put forward for them do not stand scrutiny. The council were obviously satisfied with the original proposals and only modified them in response to the request from SIMP but there is no case to support that increase.

More broadly, it is believed that the revised proposals go against Wiltshire Council's ethical code which does not allow for preferential treatment to be given to private companies when such treatment is not provided to public

service companies. Thus, providing SIMP with such parking for their customers whilst not doing the same for patients visiting the NHS practices in Salisbury is breaking their own code.

Although the time restricted places are at the Castle Street end of Wyndham Road their introduction will affect the whole road as residents will have to find parking places outside other people's homes. Parking in Wyndham Road is difficult at the best of times, there are insufficient spaces at present, to reduce this by at least 12 will have repercussions for all residents.

It is also absurd that the current proposals will mean that every Saturday, when the SIMP is closed, residents will still only be able to park for 1hr. The argument from the Council is that I am aware of the opening hours of the medical practice. Whilst the spaces are primarily intended to be used by patients visiting the medical practice it is important to remember they can actually be used by any motorist for up to 1 hour and therefore also be of some benefit in servicing the road more generally. For example on a Saturday this means that they could be used by visitors to road who might be popping into a residents house for a coffee and would thereby avoid having to use a visitors parking permit. The reality is that at least 12 spaces will be available for anyone to use and that given it is very unlikely that there will be an hourly turnover of 12 visitors to residents of Wyndham Road who could or might wish to stay for only 1 hour, these spaces will either remain empty or will be used by shoppers etc thus denying paying residents unrestricted spaces. This contravenes the main aim of the Review; Wiltshire Council Business Plan which identifies 8 principles, number 3 of which states that We are an organisation which places its residents first; and local transport policy which aims to encourage the use of park and ride, public transport and reduce shoppers parking in residential areas. Further to our email below. Whilst we understand that no solution will be perfect for all, and compromise is needed, there must be a will to be as fair as possible to all parties.

It is obviously possible to have a combination of resident parking and other systems such as pay and display or time limited, as is being done in Castle Street (south).

Thus one possible compromise under the new proposals for the Castle Street end of Wyndham Road would be to implement either time limited along with residents permit or pay and display along with residents permits. Alternatively, revert to the original proposed 2 bays as time limited and any such bays become resident's only outside of the hours the restrictions apply i.e. evenings, Saturdays and Sundays which are recognized by the Council as the most problematic times for parking.



<p>8</p>	<p>Preventing residents from parking Mon - Sat 8 - 6 in so many bays on the west end of Wyndham Road does not make sense, is wholly unnecessary and might create a problem with daytime parking for residents . I believe these restricted bays are intended for visitors to the doctor's practice, but they don't need that many and they don't need them on Saturdays.</p> <p>I also feel that these changes as a whole aren't necessary. Parking on Wyndham Road isn't normally a problem during the day (although it might become one if so many bays are allocated to a small private doctors practice) - it is however a real issue at night time and don't seem to be any plans to deal with this eg encouraging residents with off street parking facilities to use them and not use the limited on street spaces; encouraging better use of bays and more considerate parking. There is often NO WHERE TO PARK in the evening and it will get worse with substantial new residential development at the west end of Wyndham Road, removal of weekend facilities at the old planning office. It's a shame that so much effort has been put into a problem that doesn't exist while the real problem goes unaddressed.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>I wish to register my objection to the parking zone proposal for Wyndham Road Salisbury, a retrograde step, on the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Many of the residents of this road are pensioners and a number require care in their home. To place a number of spaces free to the public limited to one hour duration restricts the number of spaces available to the residents a number of whom have two or more cars per household.</li> <li>2.As the objection from the surgery appears to have led to an increase in the number of 1 hour parking spaces how is it proposed to police this freedom, to prevent misuse by people hoping to carry out a quick free shop, or visit their solicitor or estate agent in nearby Castle Street.</li> <li>3.Will the Council be increasing the number of public parking spaces outside the Three Swans Surgery in Rolleston Street. As an 86 year old requiring care, not having car but a visitors pass, I need a carer, relative, friend or Taxi to drive me to the surgery when necessary.</li> <li>4 Parking and offloading will become more difficult with the greater number of parcel ,grocery and other commercial deliveries involved in on line ordering. To say nothing of the confusion caused by Ambulances and Police vehicles using the street.</li> <li>5. The present system whilst not ideal does allow more flexibility for A Zone residents if that is what the proposal is meant to serve.</li> </ol>	<p><u>Response to Point 1</u></p> <p>Please refer to main report as this issue has been considered as a substantive issue.</p> <p><u>Response to Point 2</u></p> <p>The proposed one hour bays are not specifically allocated to the medical practice and can be used by any motorist. If a motorist wishes to use one of the bays for a quick free shop, or to visit their solicitor or estate agent then they would be permitted to do so.</p> <p><u>Response to Point 3</u></p> <p>It is unlikely that additional parking could be provided at this location because of the need to maintain the ability for vehicles to access the parking area and goods yard at the rear of the Three Swans Surgery, notably the HGVs that service the McDonalds restaurant based in Winchester Street. In addition to this there is a need to keep the accesses to the private off-street parking spaces in Rolleston Street clear of parked vehicles. Once the works to build the retirement apartments on the former bus station have been completed it might be possible to provide some additional parking spaces in Rolleston Street. However, any amendments to the layout of the parking bays Rolleston Street will only be taken forward as part of a future review of Residents Parking Zone E.</p>

		<p><u>Response to Point 4</u></p> <p>Should the council's proposals be introduced there would be no significant impact on the ability to receive deliveries in Wyndham Road (or more generally within RPZA). Vehicles would be able to park into the one hour bays to deliver goods. Such vehicles would also be able to park in the residents parking bays to deliver goods. In line with national guidelines on the enforcement of parking restrictions a short period of grace is offered to allow a visitor to collect a visitor scratch card and return to put it in their vehicle or to activate a virtual permit. This period of grace would allow for goods to be loaded and unloaded.</p> <p><u>Response to Point 5</u></p> <p>The comment is noted.</p>
10	<p>I am writing to protest about the plan to allocate 13 parking spaces to the independent medical practise at the bottom of Wyndham Road. This practice apparently only has three doctors so they don't need anywhere near this number of spaces. In fact they shouldn't have any, I attend St. Ann's St surgery and there is no parking for patients there. People have to park in town centre car parks. Same with Millstream surgery, people who need to drive their park in central car park. They have disabled spaces in their car park. The independent medical practice has two off road packing spaces which seem to be currently used by staff. These could used to accommodate disabled patients and the staff could park in central car park, just like other medical and dental practices in the city and most office workers.</p> <p>This organisation is a commercial enterprise, not an NHS funded medical centre, so does not deserve this significant parking allocation because the same is not granted to other organisations in Salisbury City centre.</p> <p>Residents parking in Zone A is over subscribed as it is, i.e. there are more residents permits than parking spaces and the new flats at the bottom of Wyndham Road will only make this worse. This is not the time to be giving away 13 spaces to a local business! It stinks of favourism toward this organisation and its wealth customers.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p>Both the St. Ann's Street and Millstream surgeries referenced by the correspondent have their own off-street car parks which have spaces for Blue Badge and non Blue Badge holders alike.</p>
11	<p>I am writing to you to ask you to reconsider your proposed changes to the parking in Wyndham road.</p> <p>Notices have been put up this week, advising that the road will become residents only parking very soon. There is indeed a serious constraint on parking availability for residents - but this is primarily at night and during weekends when we are all home from work.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p>The St. Ann's Street surgery referenced by the correspondent have their own off-street car park which has spaces for Blue Badge and non Blue Badge holders alike. More generally the St. Ann's Street surgery is situated within</p>

<p>The principle aim of your changes is stated as 'to maximise the number of parking spaces available to residents.' This it would seem is a most laudable aim. Particularly as it is extremely difficult to park in zone A after 6pm. However, on closer inspection, the proposed solution does not in any form meet the stated objective.</p> <p>As part of the solution the independent GP surgery at no 1 has been allocated thirteen designated spaces for its patients. They currently have none. All of the current resident spaces from no1 to no 11 will be now reserved for patients. All at the expense of resident spaces even when the surgery is closed.</p> <p>There are several objections to this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- this move contradicts the primary aim of the changes.</li> <li>- there are never more than three doctors holding surgery at any one time so thirteen spaces seems excessive.</li> <li>- two of the doctors are cosmetic practitioners specialising in Botox - surely these patients should not be granted free parking over residents?</li> </ul> <p>I and many of my neighbours attend NHS surgeries within the city centre if we were to drive to our GP we would be expected to pay for parking - and rightly so.</p> <p>This leads me to question how ethical it is for Wiltshire Council to make special provision for a Private medical practice and not address Provision for NHS practices in the same area. For example I attend St Ann St surgery. It is a residents only road with no allocation for parking for the large NHS practice - why is a private practice being given preferential treatment - this is not ethical and I would expect Wiltshire council to apply equitable provision.</p> <p>I would argue that the allocation of fixed thirteen spaces are excessive - what study has been done to show how many patients are use the practice at any one time? As this directly effects me living at no 11 I would like to see the evidence of need - particularly in relation to how the number of spaces allocated has been derived. I have lived here for over twenty years and have never seen any more than two patients at any onetime. The practice itself has told a neighbour that they only have three doctors are on duty at any one time two of which are cosmetic consultations. The practice does not consult patients all day so most of the spaces would be empty and yet still not accessible to residents - the very people whom you say these changes are intended to support.</p> <p>I would also like to point out the folly of granting planning permission for new flats and houses directly next to the surgery - these new residents will have</p>	<p>Residents Parking Zone E and any amendments to the operation of the parking bays in St. Ann Street would only be considered as part of a future review of Residents Parking Zone E.</p>
---	--

no option but to compete with existing residents in a congested zone. Particularly as their nearest parking will be allocated to the practice. Surely you should review the impact from the increase in residents before you consider reducing the spaces available.

I would also like to point out that in the medical practice has a drive where two cars can park. These spaces are currently used by their staff. Surely these should be made available to patients and the staff park elsewhere - even at Salisbury district hospital staff pay to park.

In other areas visitors permits are used. A potential solution could be that the surgery could be given a fixed number (max five) visitor passes which patients could then temporarily display in the window of their car. This would mean that the number of spaces available to residents would be optimal and patients could park as they do now in an available space. I would like an explanation as to why this has not been considered?

A further issue with the proposal and one which is even more fundamental, is that the zone will be residents only from 8 - 6 each day. Yet the problem with parking is after 6 when returning from work the zone is completely full. To overcome this I have been advised by the parking team to use the central car park at night. As a teacher I bring boxes of books home to mark each night usually about 7pm - this results in several trips to my car at the end of a long day. I don't believe that residents should have the right to park outside their house it is a public highway - but the thirteen spaces which are to be allocated to the surgery will be no longer be available to residents-compounding the current problem further.

I believe these spaces are then to be used for shoppers for an hour at a time at the weekend. This means that when most residents are at home there will be thirteen less places to park in an already congested zone.

I would suggest that the current proposal does not meet the objective of the changes and so should not proceed. Implementation will make the situation worse and apply unethical privilege. These changes do not consider residents or propose to meet our needs. This implementation will also add insult to injury and result in an increased parking permit fee - for less parking!

I was surprised not to be directly consulted on these fundamental changes but to read them on a lamppost with reference to visiting Salisbury library for further information. For changes of such significance I would expect that residents directly affected would be notified or at least given the same opportunity as I believe the patients of the medical practice have been

	<p>given. There is parking available in Central Car Park for surgery visitors - if it is ok for me to park there after a long day at work carrying several boxes of books - then Surely it is ok for patients choosing that practice - as the practice has a large drive it can reasonably make provision for disabled visitors.</p> <p>These changes do not meet the intended aims and will clearly cause further problems for the residents. I urge you to reconsider taking into account what it might be like to live here already.</p>	
12	<p>I have some questions / concerns re. the proposed parking charges for Wyndham Road</p> <p>Is the allocation of so much parking spaces to the medical practice excessive? It is going to cause problems for the residents concerned, with a knock-on parking problem right up the road.</p> <p>What is it going to do to the value of the properties concerned?</p> <p>Is this fair to other medical practices in the town? (I understand, though, that, the S.I.M.P does have a particular difficulty - a long way from a car park for elderly, sick patients)</p> <p>How is the one hour limit going to impact on visitors and tradesmen coming to resident's houses? One hour is not enough.</p> <p>Can we still give the above a ticket in order that a visit is long enough?</p> <p>Why can the medical practice not give patients a parking ticket like the rest of us? Free perhaps?</p> <p>Is any other method of payment for visitors going to cause confusion for elderly visitors? Not all have or understand smart phones.</p> <p>My concerns above do not mean that I think the medical practice should not have consideration. I <u>do</u> feel the proposed solution is out of balance.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p>The impact of the council's proposals on property values is not a material consideration for the council. In general terms permit holder only parking schemes are typically considered to add value to residents' properties as they restrict parking to local residents and their visitors. However, should the council's proposals be implemented and the correspondent believe that their property value has been decreased as a direct result of them, they would be entitled to ask for a review of their council tax banding.</p> <p>Visitors and trades persons to residents of Wyndham Road would be able to make use of the proposed one hour bays proposed within the road without needing to display a visitor's scratch card or activating a virtual permit. If visitors park in the residents parking bays in Park Street then displaying a visitor's scratch card or activating a virtual permit would be necessary. If more than an hour is needed then they would be able to park in any of the permit holders' only bays by displaying a visitor's scratch card or activating a virtual permit without time restriction.</p> <p>The council fully understands that the change to virtual permits (via the MiPermit system) is a significant alteration to how residents parking schemes work and that, as with any change, it will take people a period of time to fully adjust to the new system. Residents do not have to have access to a computer (or smartphone) to make use of virtual permits. Whilst undoubtedly using the MiPermit system online is the way to make best use of the virtual permit system, all of the associated activities can be undertaken over the phone. If the correspondent needs any help with the MiPermit system they can contact the council's Parking Services Team directly by phoning 01249 706131.</p>
13	<p>We write in response to the Review of Residents Parking Zone A in Salisbury, with specific reference to Wyndham Road.</p> <p>We strongly oppose any plan to lose the two hour free and no return within</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>

	<p>four hours current model. Since Capita closed down and Friends Provident reduced staff there are no parking problems within this area during the daytime any more.</p> <p>Many elderly people rely upon regular visits throughout the day, and it will make their lives difficult to complicate the current provision.</p> <p>If local officials had been enforcing the current existing restriction there would be no need for change now.</p> <p>The proposed plan for the western end of Wyndham Road next to Salisbury Independent Medical Practice, which we understand incorporates thirteen parking spaces to be made available under a one hour free parking arrangement, would be unnecessary if you preserved the status quo and made provision to enforce the regulation on a daily basis.</p> <p>We would all be happy to accept no change at all, with the proviso that a meter man visited twice daily. This would I am sure be acceptable to all local businesses such as S.I.M.P.</p> <p>We have five family members, all drivers, and two cars, but only one car is here during the week and we share this one car within the family.</p> <p>Please count this letter as five objections.</p>	<p>The closing of the Capita office and the reduction of staff at Aviva (Friends Provident) has reduced the pressure on parking demand within RPZA. However, it is inaccurate to say that there are no daytime parking problems in the area. There are still problems with commuters and shoppers reducing the number of spaces available to residents and their visitors. The streets closest to the city centre, like Albany Road and Belle Vue Road, are most affected by such problems. Addressing affected streets in isolation would most likely result in parking problems being displaced to streets further away from the city centre where fewer daytime parking problems currently exist. As such the council is seeking to address the zone as a whole.</p>
14	<p>Thank you for the notifications about the parking proposals which I'm delighted to see favour the residents of Wyndham Road with proper residents parking!</p> <p>There are three concerns:</p> <p>1. Where will the parking boundary outside No 17 Wyndham Road end, it states in the statement between Nos 15 and 17 but shows on the plan as outside nos 17 and 19 as it has always been. I've emailed about this online</p> <p>(Ref Wyndham Road north west side from a point 15 metres north east of a point in line with the boundary between property Nos 7 &amp; 9 Wyndham Road to a point 7 metres north east of a point in line with the boundary between property Nos 15 &amp; 17 Wyndham Road. The existing parking outside Nos 11, 13, 15, 17 and 19, now runs from mid No 11 to just a bit beyond the party boundary between Nos 17 and 19. Yet your proposals plan to end the parking on the boundary between Nos 15 &amp; 17.why? This may be a mistake as it shows on plan the new boundary in the original position, which I hope is the case as I object to losing yet another residents parking space.)</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p><u>Response to Point 1</u></p> <p>The parking bay referred to by the correspondent will end outside of No. 19 Wyndham Road, as it currently does. The correspondent has misinterpreted the paperwork published as part of the TRO consultation. None of the paperwork proposes or shows that the length of the bay in question will be altered in any way.</p> <p><u>Response to Point 2</u></p> <p>Enforcement of speed limits is the responsibility of Wiltshire Police rather than Wiltshire Council. A recent survey of the speed of traffic using Wyndham Road revealed that it was eligible for Community Speedwatch (CSW).</p> <p>CSW is a locally driven initiative where members of the community join</p>

	<p>2. Are there plans to enforce the 20 mph speed limit as the road is a speed track at present making the road dangerous at times.</p> <p>3. Why are there so many 1hr spaces at the Castle Road end of Wyndham Road? I read that the surgery required some parking spaces but surely not as many as have been allocated, they are after all a commercial business operating in a residential area. Residents unable to park because of the proposed short term parking will simply park further up the road taking up valuable spaces. Surely the number of short term spaces could be reduced to the original allocation of 5 spaces.</p>	<p>together with the support of the Police to monitor speeds of vehicles using speed detection devices. Vehicles exceeding the speed limit are referred to the Police with the aim of educating drivers to reduce their speeds.</p> <p>If the correspondent is interested in setting up a CSW scheme covering Wyndham Road then they should contact Leanne Homewood at Wiltshire Police by emailing <a href="mailto:leanne.homewood@wiltshire.pnn.police.uk">leanne.homewood@wiltshire.pnn.police.uk</a>. Ms. Homewood is responsible for setting up CSW schemes.</p>
15	<p>Regarding above TRO – just to inform you that I am very much in favour of the proposal – it will immensely improve my parking issues.</p> <p>Further to earlier e-mail, I have just read in the details for Wyndham Road that between 11 and 13 parking slots are being allocated for 1hr free parking at the lower end of Wyndham Road. This appears to be to appease SIMP a Private Medical Practice. The knock on impact will affect residents throughout Wyndham Road and also Albany road. SIMP is a private medical practice and consequently its owners and customers are not likely to be strapped for cash and it is located in a primarily residential area; consequently, the increase from the original 5 spaces to the now 11/13 spaces appears to be excessive to say the least and would appear to some to be potentially cow-towing to those that have wealth over the needs of the local residents. Moreover, the increase from 5 to 11/13 spaces appears to be at odds with the principle aim of ‘maximising the number of parking spaces available to residents’. Notwithstanding, the remainder of the proposal looks positive.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>
16	<p>I am writing regarding the proposed changes to the parking on Wyndham Road.</p> <p>The number of spaces marked as ‘1 hour, no return within 2 hours’ at the western end of Wyndham Road seems excessive. If the principle aim of the parking review is to ‘maximise the number of parking spaces available to residents’ why are residents of Wyndham Road being deprived of so many? Other roads, such as Albany Road, do not have any 1 hour spaces and the eastern end of Wyndham Road has only one. I understand that the medical practice needs some spaces but surely not as many as you’re proposing.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>
17	<p>I would like to add my objection to the amount of parking spaces that the doctor’s surgery has requested at the bottom of the road, the amount they have asked for seems very excessive &amp; it will cause problems for the residents.</p> <p>The idea of residents only parking will hopefully help the parking situation but not if this amount are issued to one place.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>

<p>18</p>	<p>I would like to raise an objection with the proposed No Waiting at any time in regards to the 2 following places:</p> <p>Wyndham Road north west side from a point 2 metres south west of its junction with Queens Road to a point 10 metres south west of that junction.</p> <p>And:</p> <p>Wyndham Road north west side from a point 6 metres south west of a point in line with the boundary between property known as Wyndham Park and property Nos. 101 to 123 Wyndham Road to a point 1 metre south west of a point in line with the boundary between property Nos. 98 and 100 Wyndham Road</p> <p>Living at no.76 for the past year we have found parking can be very difficult especially after 5pm on a weekday, this problem has been exacerbated since we are no longer allowed to use the car park connected to the old disability centre.</p> <p>The suggested no waiting zones, which are currently single yellow lines are used every day by residents. Therefore if these were to become no waiting zones it would mean several of us who do not get home from work before 5pm would have to park an unreasonable distance from home.</p> <p>I am aware as well that there are houses and flats being built at the end of Wyndham road and if they have on street parking this will push even more cars up our end of the street meaning we could be pushed even further away.</p> <p>If we could keep the single yellow lines it would ensure that at least 7 cars could still park near home after 6pm. Several of whom would not be able to park nearby otherwise.</p>	<p>The restrictions quoted by the correspondent relates to proposed introduction of NWAAT restrictions in front of the two accesses to the car parking areas to the rear of the Wyndham Park school (now flats) and in front of the car parking spaces outside of Nos. 101-123 Wyndham Road (the two blocks of flats at the top end of the road). All other lengths of the single yellow line referred to by the correspondent are proposed to become residents parking bays, meaning that be used for parking day or night.</p>
<p>19</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed alterations to parking in Wyndham Road, Salisbury. The amendments change from 5 spaces to a total of 13 is excessive to service one business, the Medical practice. The practice already has 4 parking spaces to the side of their building for doctors and associates. This means 13 for clients. Anyone registered with a National Health practice in town has to pay to park. Why should those who can afford to register with a private practice be allowed PRIVILEGED free parking provisions of 13 spaces when they could park in the central car park as advised on their Web site.</p> <p>The Private Practice does not open on Saturday so these 13 spaces of 1 hour parking, will be used by shoppers which will make it impossible for</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>



	<p>residents to park at all. Residents pay for their permits so shoppers should pay to park in a car park.</p> <p>Parking spaces are always at a premium in Wyndham Road whichever day of the week and the proposals will exacerbate the current problems.</p>	
20	<p>I am writing about the proposed new parking arrangements in Wyndham Road which is within your ward. The review by Paul Shaddock states the initial proposal allowed 2 bays for parking by SIMP (Private Health Practice) at the lower end of Wyndham Road. Quite adequate for their needs. This was subsequently changed to accommodate Dr Willis's organised petition to 13, one hour free spaces. Dr Willis already has 4 parking spaces aside his building, which totals 17 spaces. Dr Willis parks his car in the street so I assume he has a Business parking permit as well. Wilts Council website states "that Business Parking permits are designed to be registered to customers who need to park in a residential zone while visiting a business located there. A maximum of 2 permits are issued to businesses with no off street parking" Why does Dr Willis have a permit??</p> <p>SIMP is a private Health Clinic serving privileged patients in a residential area. Two of the four Doctors who work at SIMP are registered for performing Botox and Liposuction, hardly life threatening, nor deserving of free parking provision to the detriment of Residents parking facilities. Does Wiltshire Council favour private clinics over National Health practices or dentists in Salisbury town who have been awarded no such advantage or consideration? Dr Willis could well make alterations to his rear garden to accommodate parking for 8-10 of his patients. My Doctors surgery in town has done exactly that, there are no free parking spaces on the streets for their patient list. If SIMP deserves parking provision then so do all the other practices and clinics in Salisbury. The same consideration is being given to a private Dentist in Hamilton Road, whereas my NHS dentist in Scots Lane had been given no so such consideration.</p> <p>SIMP does not open at the weekends, so 'Residents Zone Only' should apply on Saturday and Sunday, otherwise these 13 spaces will be used by shoppers depriving the Council of much needed revenue from the town car parks.</p> <p>If this is Wiltshire's code of practice and ethical approach, is it unacceptable, unjust and unfair.</p> <p>This proposal was aimed at maximising Residents Parking but appears to be nurturing the requests of the private sector completely.</p> <p>As our representative your consideration and support is essential.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p>With regards to the issue of the medical practice having been issued with business permits – thank you for bring this matter to the council's attention. As the correspondent states under the council's terms and conditions for issuing business permits the medical practice wasn't eligible to receive any. Having investigated this matter following receipt of these comments the business permits issued to the medical practice have been withdrawn by the council as of October 2016.</p>

21	<p>I would like to object to the proposal for changing 2 hour parking in Wyndham Road to Residents only especially as providing one hour slots at the end of Wyndham Road to service the private practice there will only result in everyone living in the road having to find parking higher up the road. My mother has a walking frame and very little mobility and this would make visits to me from her care home very difficult. I have up until now never had a problem parking outside my house - 26A Wyndham Road. I have visitor tickets for my friends and I would like things to remain as they are.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>
22	<p>It has come to our notice that '13' one hour parking spaces have been allocated to a private business namely SIMP at the bottom of the road near Castle Street only a stone's throw from the Main Car park. If their request was for four or five spaces, I don't think there would be such an uproar. Also, this business has a rear garden and a driveway which could hold at least 6 cars if sorted. This road has many residents that live in Wyndham Road and the parking should be for these people. Business customers should park in the main car parks like others in the city have to, unless they can park off road in their own boundary.</p> <p>I suffer from COPD and need to park within a short distance from the house, as opposed to parking on double yellows with my blue badge, and also my partners mother is 93 has a Blue Badge and again cannot walk far. By losing that number of spaces to the Doctors Practice everyone will naturally look for spaces further up the road with the possibility of me not finding one.</p> <p>We have lived at 51, Wyndham Road since 1985 and under the present system of 2 hours &amp; by issuing permits to visitors. This always seemed to work well.</p> <p>Therefore, why change this? ' If it aint broke don't fix it'.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p>Whilst the correspondents' need to park close to their property is understood it must be borne in mind that technically any motorist is currently able to park in the parking bays in Wyndham Road, meaning that there is currently no guarantee that they would be able to park near their property. This situation wouldn't change as a result of the council's proposals, albeit that more residents of RPZA might be seeking to make use of the parking spaces closest to the correspondents' property than currently do.</p>
23	<p>As a resident of Wyndham Road, already experiencing parking difficulties, in particular overnight, I am very concerned at the suggestion of 13 parking spaces being turned into one hour slots, apparently mainly for the benefit of the doctors' surgery at the bottom of the road, which already has four parking spaces on their property.</p> <p>Mill Stream Approach car park is very close to the surgery, and for patients to use this car park would be in line with other surgeries whose patients have to pay to use nearby car-parks when visiting their doctors, eg Mill Stream Medical Centre, Harcourt Medical Centre, etc.</p> <p>I do not feel that one hour's parking will benefit "casual shoppers", as it is a 10 minute walk to the town centre, 20 minutes there and back, leaving a shopping time of 40 minutes - insufficient time for little but the most basic</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p>With specific regard to the proposed one hour parking bays in Wyndham Road, the correspondent would not have to go out before 8.00am to move their vehicle. A resident of Wyndham Road could park in any of the one hour bays from 5.00pm in the afternoon until 9.00am the following morning or from 5.00pm on a Saturday afternoon until 9.00am on a Monday morning.</p>

	<p>errands. I do not therefore think that shoppers will use these spaces.</p> <p>From the Castle Street end of Wyndham Road to Swaynes Close/Marlborough Road crossroads the house numbers go up to fifty. Please bear in mind that many of the larger houses are divided into several flats. Taking only the absolute basic of 50 households, blocking 13 spaces is the equivalent of withdrawing slightly more than a quarter of the spaces available for residents who already pay an annual parking charge. As I have said, this calculation takes no account of the large number of flats in the road.</p> <p>Finally, if I am obliged to park overnight in one of these allocated spaces it very much rankles that as a resident of Wyndham Road I have to go out before 8 o'clock to try to find somewhere else to park my car.</p>	
24	<p>Sir, I am frankly appalled and confused regarding your proposal to reserve THIRTEEN parking spaces to 1 hour free spaces for clients of SIMP and casual shoppers at the bottom of Wyndham Road.</p> <p>I was led to believe that the principal aim of this Parking Review in Zone A was to MAXIMISE the number of spaces available to residents??? Not to REDUCE it?</p> <p>Why are patients of a private medical practice allowed to take priority over residents? Where will the residents be expected to park? Will you therefore also be providing free parking spaces to users of all the NHS GP surgeries around the city? Perhaps we should also have free parking at the hospital? Or is free parking only for the already privileged?</p> <p>How will you justify Residents Permit costs ( when residents will not be able to park anywhere near their homes)? Will you reduce council tax to compensate residents?</p> <p>The petition organised by Dr Richard Willis of SIMP is purely designed to protect this man's profit and impressive livelihood, and shows no respect for residents who live on Wyndham Road.</p> <p>The petition has, by your own admission, been signed not solely by patients of SIMP, but by staff members and family members of those patients. These people are not affected, and their opinion is not relevant or valid. If they are that concerned about their relatives visiting SIMP, then they can surely drop them off and park in the nearby car park and pay to park there. Like everybody else who visits the city centre has to.</p> <p>All this proposal will do is to make an already difficult parking situation</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>

	<p>worse. The residents at the bottom of the road will be forced to try to park further up the road and every homeowner will be affected.</p> <p>I am lucky enough to have a carport behind the house on Kings Road and rarely park on Wyndham Road. I do this because parking on the road is already so difficult.</p> <p>However, even this is becoming increasingly difficult because other residents of Kings Road, which is a narrow road, regularly park opposite the carport and block my ability to get in and out of my parking space. We need a double yellow line to stop this from happening. I know that a number of my neighbours also struggle and can literally get trapped in their parking space.</p> <p>This problem is only going to worsen if your, frankly, absurd proposal goes ahead.</p> <p>Please please listen to reason and support and protect the residents of Wyndham Road. The proposal is nether fair nor reasonable, and contradicts the principle aim of of the Parking Review.</p>	
25	<p>A fairer solution to the proposed 12 time limited bays would be either allow zone A residents to park in the time limited bays as per the council's proposal for Castle St, or revert to the original proposed 2 time limited bays which should become residents' s only outside of the hours the restrictions applying is evenings, Saturdays and Sunday's which are recognised by the Council as the most problematic times for parking.</p> <p>I do not think it's fair that a private Medical Practice should be given preferential treatment regarding parking.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>
26	<p>In response to your 'New Traffic Order Zone A. Parking Restrictions,' I am a 73 year old lady with no car so I have a residents parking permit. As you are not allowing a supply of scratch cards and I do not have any 'online' equipment' if I have more than one visitor with a car I will be unable to give them free parking. This makes me very isolated and concerned.</p> <p>I am very worried that any helpers, relatives and friends may be given a parking fine which would mean that as most of them are elderly with limited incomes they would stop visiting. I also have various helpers who come here at the same times and the lack of parking will apply to them also.</p> <p>I am also concerned that you will stop me having a parking permit after this one expires. I would be pleased if I can have response to my letter.</p>	<p>Based on the correspondent comments they currently have an annual visitor's parking permit. This type of permit is designed to be handed in and out to visitors of a resident living within a residents parking zone. This type of permit is issued free of charge to eligible residents. The correspondent will continue to be able to receive this type of permit after their current one expires.</p> <p>The majority of the other comments submitted by the correspondent appear to relate to the use of virtual permits. The decision made by the council to move from physical daily visitors scratch cards to virtual permits sits outside of the scope of this review process.</p> <p>The council fully understands that the change to virtual permits (via the MiPermit system) is a significant alteration to how residents parking schemes work and that, as with any change, it will take people a period of time to fully adjust to the new system. Residents do not have to have access to a computer to make use of virtual permits. Whilst undoubtedly using the</p>

		<p>MiPermit system online is the way to make best use of the virtual permit system, all of the associated activities can be undertaken over the phone. If the correspondent needs any help with the MiPermit system they can contact the council's Parking Services Team directly by phoning 01249 706131.</p> <p>In addition to the correspondents' annual visitor's permits and the daily visitors permits other options are available to the them would be for visitors to make use of any the proposed time limited parking bays within RPZA without needing to display a visitor's scratch card or activating a virtual permit.</p> <p>The council issue medical permits to organisations that offer medical care services to residents that live within a residents parking zone, irrespective of the age of the resident. It is up to the service provider, rather than the resident, to apply for this type of permit.</p>
27	<p>I am contacting you in relation to the new parking restrictions in Wyndham Road at a time when residents parking permits are doubling in price our ability to park near our homes is being seriously compromised . I understand that 12 spaces ,are in effect being withdrawn from residents for the majority of the week but will be made available to a private medical practise operating in the street. This business has a good sized underused garden with side access that could be park 4/5 cars .Surely it cannot be right for a Nationwide business to have priority to local residents many of whom work from home or are retired and use their cars at varying times of the day .</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>
28	<p>I live at 19 Wyndham Road SP1 3AA and broadly support the Council's proposals. I understand the principle aim of the review is to maximise the number of parking spaces available to residents. I am 72 years of age and have undergone a heart operation. It is important for me to be able to park close to home. Too often I have to carry heavy shopping further than I would want to.</p> <p>I am concerned that too much consideration is being given to the needs of patients of SIMP. How many of those patients live in Wyndham Road or zone A? Please ask the practice to provide that information and share it with me before concluding your review.</p> <p>I suggest that the needs of patients may be of some relevance, but I struggle with the idea that the views of their family members should outweigh the aim of maximising the spaces available for residents. If a petition with 117 signatories is to be taken into account please advise me, send me a copy of the petition, and grant me the time to produce an opposing petition bearing 118 signatures. I understand the petition may have been sent out with the false information that the SIMP was to have no</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>

street parking available.

I am a patient registered with the Endless Street Surgery, an NHS surgery which is considerably busier than SIMP. Will you be considering providing 13 free 1 hour spaces for that surgery? Is any other Salisbury surgery receiving such provision?

SIMP does have some off road parking. That could be extended to the rear of their premises for the use of staff.

I regularly pass SIMP and have always regarded it as a haven of tranquillity rather than a hive of industry. I understand from their website that 4 medically qualified personnel practice from there. I suspect some may be part time at SIMP and that the average number present at any time during the working day is low, my guess would be fewer than 2. Please ask the Practice to provide information on the intensity of use of the premises and to share it with me. I consider that your original proposal to provide 5 spaces was over generous when balanced against your principle aim of maximising the spaces available to residents.

Although the new houses and apartments currently being built adjacent to, and across the road from SIMP, will be provided with parking places, they may require additional places in Wyndham Road and/or visitor permits, which will considerably increase the parking pressures currently faced by residents.

If a majority of SIMP patients do not live locally I would regard it as a bizarre contradiction of your principle aim to favour them with free parking, and deny that to immediate residents, who would have to compete with me for a parking space.

Having looked at the SIMP website, and noted the services provided, I suspect that many of the private patients of SIMP drive at least several miles to the surgery, and are quite capable of walking from paid parking, or taking a taxi, to Wyndham Road.

Shoppers love the free parking at the lower end of Wyndham Road. They should be accommodated in the Central car park and not Wyndham Road.

I suggest that the appropriate number of 1 hour free spaces in front of SIMP is 2 and that the remainder of that 1 hour parking area should have the same residents only provision as most of Wyndham Road. Authorising that would not completely achieve your principle aim, but with my personal concerns as a resident of Wyndham Road, and with empathy for

	residents across the road from SIMP, I would be able to understand your decision.	
29	The intention to reserve 13 parking spaces to 1 hour free spaces at the lower end of Wyndham Road for the Private Medical Centre and casual shoppers. This proposal is not fair or reasonable or in line with the principle aim. NHS patients have to pay to park when visiting the doctors and people who go shopping could use the car parks which would generate income for the council. The original decision to allow 5 spaces still seems excessive. They already have a driveway which 4 cars could park on. Could the current proposal for 5 spaces be reduced as a council car park is situated very close by which again as stated before would generate additional income for the council.	In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.
30	<p>I would like to register my strong objections to the above advertised Traffic Order.</p> <p>It is not necessary to impose a <b>blanket</b> Residents Only on the whole of Zone A. While I appreciate that our streets are overcrowded, a <b>blanket</b> Residents Only is a lazy way to attempt to solve an unsolvable problem. And it will disadvantage the elderly and the infirm, and will just be increased income for the Council.</p> <p>It is not needed in Wyndham Road, Hamilton Road or St Marks Road, College Street and Park Street. As we all know, the biggest problem is at night when all the residents come home and there aren't enough spaces. Now that Capita has gone and Friends Life building is being converted into housing, hopefully with their own parking spaces, the pressure is less in this area.</p> <p>Belle Vue Road and Albany Road are a special case and I can see that they have a strong argument for Residents Only, but I still suspect that most of the cars in these roads are Residents.</p> <p>The provision for thirteen spaces at the bottom of Wyndham Road exclusively for one hour visitors but not for residents is ridiculous. Visitors to the Doctors Surgery find a space somewhere in the road and are gone after a short time, but with this new plan there will be thirteen empty spaces that only a few people will be entitled to use but not residents. It is not necessary, what we have works well.</p> <p>I would like to add that the parking in Zone A has never been policed properly and with the financial constraints that haunt Wiltshire Council at the moment I doubt that it will be in the future. So I suggest you save the money that you are planning to spend on changing the regulations and use it to get the wardens to do their jobs efficiently.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p><u>Enforcement</u></p> <p>The removal of the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays in RPZA will, from the council's perspective, make the scheme easier to enforce. Instead of having to walk around the zone and log the details of all cars not displaying a permit and then walk around the zone again two hours later to check if vehicles had overstayed the two hour limit placed on the bays, the Civil Enforcement Officers will be able to issue Penalty Charge Notices during their first visit if a car is not displaying a permit or activated a virtual permit. This will result in a far more efficient enforcement regime within RPZA.</p>

<p>31</p>	<p>I object to proposal reference LJB/TRO/SALSA.</p> <p>Please give priority to residents and their visitors, and not to providing parking for the visiting customers of a private medical centre.</p> <p>There is often insufficient residents parking all ready for the people living in Wyndham road, and with a further new housing development nearing complete at the junction of Wyndham road and Castle street this will surely get worse.</p> <p>I can see no justification for providing special parking provision for a private business that has been set up in a residential road. Please keep the residents permit parking throughout the road, as this still allows for short term parking for casual visitors.</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>
<p>32</p>	<p>We OBJECT to the latest proposed revision to residents' parking zone A for lower (western) Wyndham Road. Such a change would effectively ban us and other residents of the affected area from parking near our homes for most of the week and half the weekend.</p> <p>We have read the officer report by Paul Shaddock reference HT-02-16. The currently proposed amendment is inconsistent with the stated aim of the parking zone review: "the principal aim being that of maximising the number of parking spaces available to residents living within the zone" (report para 11).</p> <p>We agree that the current parking situation for residents needs to be improved. We agree that the existing 2-hour unrestricted casual parking (8am-6pm Mon-Sat) causes over-congestion at times in the parts of zone A closest to shopping and places of employment/leisure, including at evening and weekends, as the officer report notes.</p> <p>Presumably the main purpose of the proposed one-hour visitor bays is to provide some parking for visitors to businesses located within the controlled parking zone. Provided that the number of one-hour bays is proportionate this is reasonable and consistent with the principal aim to maximise the number of parking spaces available to residents. The previous iteration of the amended TRO with two, one-hour visitor bays on the north side of Wyndham Road seems to us a fair compromise in that the bays are nearest the main point of local demand and also in front of homes with off-street parking. The current iteration seems to us to weight business interests above residents and to allocate more one-hour bays that is reasonable or likely to be needed for businesses in the zone.</p> <p>We infer that the latest proposed amendment is a response to the case made by Southern Independent Medical Practice (SIMP). As residents of</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p>



	<p>five years we have never observed any apparent access problem for the practice or its patients under current arrangements. The analysis in the above officer report, that their case is based on a misinterpretation of the parking changes previously proposed, makes the latest proposal to change lower Wyndham Road to 1-hour no return only for the benefit of their private-practice and patients, all the more perplexing and contradictory. This benefit is not afforded to any other private business in the area that we are aware of, such as the private dental practice in lower Hamilton Road.</p> <p>In considering what level of short term parking provision is reasonable for businesses within the zone the following points should also be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Extensive public pay parking is available within a five-minute walk</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Residents of Castle Street where there is limited parking also park on surrounding streets under zone A permits</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> A new housing development of about 15 homes under construction at the junction of Castle Street and Wyndham Road is likely to increase demand for zone A permits in the immediate vicinity of the proposed one-hour bays</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Local businesses have the option to purchase business parking and visitor permits on what appears to be the same terms as residents, should they need them.</li> </ul> <p>However, if the committee is minded to make the latest or some further change in favour of short term parking within the zone we suggest that residents should be given an exemption within the area affected, and that the one-hour no-return only apply 8am-6pm Monday to Friday only.</p> <p>A simpler compromise and one fairer to any businesses with zone A not located near the currently proposed one-hour bays might be to allow one-hour casual visitor parking throughout zone A in normal working hours, with residents'-only parking at evenings and weekends</p>	
33	<p>I live at 19 Wyndham Road and, having looked at the proposal for the part of Wyndham Road where I live, I do not agree with and strongly object to the amount of space that has been allocated for parking Monday to Saturday, 8.00am to 6.00pm for one hour, no return within two hours. I would like to make the following points:</p> <p>1 I understand the Council originally proposed that there should be provision for a five car parking space to facilitate the small private GP surgery, SIMP at 5 Wyndham Road. The surgery and its patients and, I understand, their families and friends have petitioned to increase the amount of parking. This is grossly unfair as I understand that this small private GP practice does not have a high number of patients coming and going and therefore does not actually need so much</p>	<p>In the main the comments raised have been considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 3</u></p> <p>When the proposals contained within a TRO are advertised for public comment any member of the public is entitled to comment on them. It is up to both officers and the relevant Cabinet Member to determine the credence that should be given to any comments received.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 10</u></p>

	<p>parking to be set aside for their use. I have lived here for over 20 years and I have never been aware that this is a heavily used business.</p> <p>2 As the proposal is to provide additional parking spaces in Residents Parking Zone A, I wonder how many patients using the small private GP surgery, SIMP, and their relatives and friends, are Wyndham Road residents?</p> <p>3 I object to the relatives and friends attempting to have a 'right' to have a say in this proposal - I assume they are not residents and they are not patients attending the small private GP surgery, SIMP. However, if this is acceptable, please let me know by return so that I can ask my relatives and friends to support my objection to the proposed large parking provision for the small private GP surgery, SIMP.</p> <p>4 I believe that a fairer provision for the small private GP surgery, SIMP, would be to allocate the car parking space directly outside the surgery itself, 5 Wyndham Road, for their use only. This space accommodates two vehicles and would be in addition to the area they currently use on the site itself.</p> <p>5 Also, these two spaces could be made available to residents on Saturdays as the private GP surgery only operates Monday to Friday.</p> <p>6 The site that the private GP surgery occupies is quite a large one and they could investigate maximising parking on their own site.</p> <p>7 It is unacceptable that the seven properties on the other side of the road would not be able to park outside their houses as they currently can; this proposal would be removing currently available parking spaces rather than providing the intended additional parking spaces in Residents Parking Zone A.</p> <p>8 Additionally, if this was to happen, the residents of these seven properties would have to park outside other residents' properties, again, defeating the objective of this proposal to provide additional parking spaces in Residents Parking Zone A, Salisbury.</p> <p>9 I would also add that the construction of the two developments at the beginning of Wyndham Road is likely to increase the pressure of parking on this part of Wyndham Road when their visitors start looking for somewhere to park.</p> <p>10 I use the NHS GP surgery in Endless Street and there does not appear</p>	<p>The parking bay outside of the GP surgery in Endless Street is a shared Pay and Display and Zone A permit holders parking bay. Therefore the correspondent as a Zone A permit holder would be able to park in this bay free of charge when visiting the surgery.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 11</u></p> <p>Technically, a Pay and Display parking space could be introduced outside of the medical practice in Wyndham Road. However, the introduction of this type of space cannot be considered at this location. Such a space would require the installation of a parking meter. Given the narrowness of the footways in Wyndham Road a footway buildout to house the meter would be required. Providing a footway buildout would result in a reduction in the amount of space available for parking within the road. However, and more fundamentally there is no funding available within the council that would allow for the provision of a footway buildout and parking meter in Wyndham Road to be taken forward.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 13</u></p> <p>The number of time limited spaces provided is considered on a street by street basis with regard to the overall needs of the street. For example fewer one hour spaces were provided in Nelson Road on the basis that the majority of customers to the Living and Mobility Shop would be Blue Badge holders. Blue Badge holders are already permitted to park in any of the on-street residents parking bays in Salisbury without time restriction by displaying just their Blue Badge. Therefore, fewer one hour bays are needed in the road.</p> <p><u>Terms and Conditions</u></p> <p>Residents can park in the one hour bays but are not exempt from the one hour time limit placed upon them. In consideration of the hours of operation of the one hour bays in Wyndham Road a resident of the road could park in the bays from 5.00pm in the afternoon until 9.00am the following morning or from 5.00pm on a Saturday afternoon until 9.00am on a Monday morning.</p> <p>The council's full terms and conditions in respect of residents parking schemes can be accessed via the following link, the correspondent will need to refer to the information concerning Residents' Only parking schemes - <a href="http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/salisbury-residents-schemes-ts-and-cs-2016-feb.pdf">http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/salisbury-residents-schemes-ts-and-cs-2016-feb.pdf</a>.</p>
--	---	---

to be any similar such proposal for parking at that surgery thereby making this a grossly unfair proposal, favouring the private GP surgery. I struggle to believe that this is an acceptable, democratic position for the Council to take.

11 I also notice that in Castle Street, there are parking meters for the use of people who want to access the businesses there, as the private GP surgery, SIMP, is a business, perhaps this could be considered for the small parking space I have suggested (outside 5 Wyndham Road), and the revenue could go towards Salisbury's parking needs.

12 I would also like to draw attention to the bus stop in Castle Street which is very close to this private GP surgery and that taxis are readily available in Salisbury and that patients could very easily be dropped off (and collected) by one of their supportive relatives or friends who could then park either in Castle Street using the parking meters or the large central car park not too far away. These are simply alternative suggestions for the private GP surgery to address their needs without encroaching on the residents who struggle to park in their own road which is why this proposal is being made.

13 Finally, I also notice that other businesses/business areas have much less parking provision, eg the mobility shop in Nelson Street (only one or two spaces for people with disabilities) and the businesses along Escort Road (one small provision for one hour parking and another small provision for 30 minutes parking).

Although I can see the proposed new layout, I haven't seen any other details of the proposal such as parking arrangements for visitors such as family, friends or people doing work on properties, or anything about the cost of the proposed arrangements.

Would residents with parking permits be able to park in the one hour waiting bays if there were no available parking in the residents only bays?

Although I have had an acknowledgement of this email, I have not yet had answers to my queries against which I may wish to object.