

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

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	Officer Response
1	I see no reason to change the current arrangements which appear to be working well for all including commercial premises.	The comments are noted.
2	<p>I have been living at 54 Hamilton Road for exactly five years and I never had a parking problem. During the day there are always parking spaces available which suits me very well because from time to time people come to my house for herbal consultations and for herbal courses. If they stay for longer than 2 hours I usually give them a visitors parking card. The two-hour free parking has been ideal for me and for the people who come to my house, and I very much hope that it can stay that way. I don't see any reason to change it into a residents only parking area. There has never been any problem for residents to park during the day, in fact half of the road is usually empty until about 6pm when people come home from work. I also feel that it will have a very unsocial effect and put off friends from visiting when you change it to residents only parking which can have a detrimental effect on people's health and lead to isolation.</p> <p>Please reconsider your plans to change parking regulations in Hamilton Road.</p>	<p>The council's advertised proposals include the provision of eight one hour parking bays in Hamilton Road which could be used by visitors to residents or customers of businesses in the road, without needing to display a parking permit. Time limited parking bays will also be retained in the nearby Marlborough Road and Wyndham Road.</p> <p>It is unclear whether or not the herbal consultations/courses mentioned by the correspondent are part of a business they are running. If they do form part of a business then owners of businesses operating within Residents Parking Zone A (RPZA hereafter) are, subject to terms and conditions, 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 zone. Motorists displaying a valid business permit would be able to park in any of the permit holders only parking bays in RPZA without time restriction.</p> <p>The council's full terms and conditions in respect of residents parking schemes can be accessed via the following link - http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/salisbury-residents-schemes-ts-and-cs-2016-feb.pdf.</p>
3	<p>While happy with the decision to implement Residents Only parking in the Zone A Area, I must question the wisdom and rationale for removing the single yellow line on the left hand side of Albany Road (from numbers 41 - 49) as the road bends at a near right angle. The decision to allow all day parking along this stretch of road will inevitably result in access problems for permitted vehicles such as refuse collectors, removal vans, scaffolding lorries and fire engines. It will also further exacerbate the problems already experienced on a regular basis by other large vehicles mistakenly coming up Albany Road and becoming stuck at this point. The Traffic Police are already frequently called out to deal with this problem, and once all day parking is allowed in this area, all manoeuvrability will be removed.</p> <p>I understand that the current single lines were originally placed on this sharp</p>	<p>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. This software has shown that a fire engine and a refuse collection vehicle would still be able to negotiate the bend in question should the council's proposals be implemented. Given that vehicles as big as a fire engine or a refuse collection vehicle would still be able to negotiate the bend there, should be no reason for parked vehicles to be damaged as long as they are correctly parked within the parking bays and vehicles are being driven in accordance with Highway Code.</p> <p>If the council's proposals are implemented it is hoped that the proposed 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</p>

	<p>bend several years ago, as residents' cars were being damaged by traffic coming up Albany Road. I now question the justification for changing an arrangement that was considered necessary at that time.</p>	<p>they arrive at Albany Road. Irrespective of the council's proposed amendments to RPZA the Salisbury Area Board (via its Community Area Transport Group) has agreed to fund the provision of improved signage in Endless Street informing drivers of large vehicles that this route is unsuitable for their vehicles.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>Before you amend regulations I would like you to publish recent supporting evidence that there is a problem with the parking in Albany Rd area of zone A, that you are clear exactly what problem you are trying to solve, and current evidence that your proposals will solve this problem. Otherwise, I am not sure you are right to amend the regulations arbitrarily.</p> <p>I repeat my objections below, and add (since Feb 2015):</p> <p>to point 1 - shopping habits continue to change and the single yellow lines enable delivery and trade vans to pull over during the day and off load. These areas are in constant use in Albany Rd. Removing them will force vans to stop in the road, which will prevent police getting round from the station and other emergency vehicles, and block flow of traffic. Vans are simply not going to parallel park into a white bay or double yellow - they don't have time.</p> <p>to point 2 - large lorries continue to navigate Albany Rd, and would be completely stuck if the corner bays were extended during the day. At night, residents are on hand to move their cars. This problem continues.</p> <p>to point 3 - during weekdays there is not a problem with parking in Albany Rd. Extending the white bays is not necessary and would block parking for delivery vans. In the evening the residents have the flexibility of the yellow lines. I have not seen a recent problem, which is why I am questioning the currency of your evidence. On Saturdays there is more of an issue with shoppers walking into town, however, this is only for very short period of time during the day. Can you impose 10 minute parking at weekends only? Anecdotally, I understand that extending the bays to create more weekday parking and allowing more residents permit, creates non-compliance as residents cards can be sold on. Please confirm how you will tackle this compliance risk?</p> <p>Removing the 2 hour restriction - parking in the road has now eased, and this flexibility is extremely convenient during the week, as it allows most tradesmen and visitors to complete their business. I would not want this changed now, as I do not see that there is a problem that needs resolving. I do not want to lose this flexibility, only to find that the parking situation stays exactly the same. There needs to be a marked improvement in exchange. Can you guarantee this, based on current evidence?</p>	<p>The main aim of the review of RPZA is to provide as many parking spaces as possible for residents. This is achieved in two ways, firstly by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking spaces and secondly by providing additional parking spaces through the conversion of single or double yellow lines into parking bays or driveway protection (white bar) markings. This approach will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p> <p>As the correspondent has chosen to repeat the comments they submitted in response to the proposals consulted upon in 2015 both the comments submitted and the officer response can be found at Comment Reference No. 3 in Appendix 7 of the report that dealt with the response to the 2015 proposals. Appendix 7 can be accessed via the following link https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?Id=1086.</p> <p>Responses to the additional comments submitted are set out below:</p> <p><u>Response to Point 1</u></p> <p>If drivers of delivery or trade vans chose to block the road in preference to making use of the parking bays or double yellow lines in Albany Road then they would be committing an offence of obstruction of the public highway and liable to enforcement action by the Police as the authority responsible for dealing with such offences.</p> <p><u>Response to Point 2</u></p> <p>If the council's proposals are implemented it is hoped that the proposed 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. Irrespective of the council's proposed amendments to RPZA the Salisbury Area Board (via its Community Area Transport Group) has agreed to fund the provision of improved signage in Endless Street informing drivers of large vehicles that this route is unsuitable for their vehicles.</p> <p><u>Response to Point 3</u></p> <p>Whilst legally a 10 minute restriction on the use of the parking bays in Albany Road by non permit holders could be introduced the removal of the ability for</p>

	<p>Again, your decision needs to be evidence based to avoid amending regulations only to find that the parking situation stays either exactly the same, but less convenient, or that it simply creates a different problem</p>	<p>non permit holders to use the bays at all, as has been proposed, would address the problem highlighted.</p> <p>Extending the parking bays does not create a non-compliance risk. Whether or not the bays in Albany Road are extended a resident could choose to sell on a visitors scratch card (or virtual permit). The councils' terms and condition includes an incremental pricing structure applied to the purchasing of visitor parking permits. This structure is intended to make sure that residents do not sell their visitor parking permits on. If a resident is caught selling on their visitors parking permits then the council reserves the right to cancel all parking permits issued to said resident, including their residents parking permits.</p> <p>The council's full terms and conditions in respect of residents parking schemes can be accessed via the following link – http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/salisbury-residents-schemes-ts-and-cs-2016-feb.pdf.</p>
5	<p>I am writing to object to the proposals, which will directly affect the ability of my family and my neighbour to park outside our homes.</p> <p>81, and we at 79, are the only two houses in St. Mark's Road directly affected by the proposals, which should they come into force, would mean any vehicle visitors to our street will use these new one hour spaces, resulting in the spaces becoming unlikely to be free for us during the day.</p> <p>This is of great concern to my husband and I, as with a six week old baby, easy access to our front door is key and not something we would be happy about losing. Currently we park right outside without any issues at all.</p> <p>Your proposals are discriminatory against us as owners of these two houses - we pay just the same for a residents permit as the rest of the street.</p> <p>I do not believe a change to parking restrictions is needed, but at the very least suggest that you consider moving the proposed one hour spaces west, towards the junction with Queen's Road - as these are not outside any St. Mark's Road residents' houses, let alone their front doors!</p>	<p>The main aim of the review of RPZA is to provide as many parking spaces as possible for residents. However, meeting this aim has to be achieved whilst supporting businesses and organisations operating within the zone in accordance with the priorities set out within the council's business plan.</p> <p>A one hour space was proposed outside of Nos. 79 and 81 St. Mark's Road to aid the operation of the Jehovah's Witness Assembly Hall located next to No. 79. As with all the time limited proposed by the council in RPZA they are not specifically allocated to a specific business or organisation and can be used by any motorist so long as they adhere to the restrictions on their use.</p> <p>The proposals are not discriminatory. Highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods, and consequently any parking on the highway is an obstruction of that rite of passage. There are no legal rights to park on the highway, or upon the council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking on the public highway, but parking is condoned where the rite of passage along the highway is not impeded. In addition to which the terms and conditions of the council's residents parking schemes clearly state that "having a parking permit does not give you any "right" to park outside your property."</p> <p>However, with the above said the suggestion of essentially swapping the restriction of the bay outside of Nos. 79 and 81 St. Mark's Road with that of the bay opposite No. 108 St. Mark's Road would not be detrimental to the overall aim of the review.</p>
6	<p>We act for Mr D Small in connection with his property at 1 Belle Vue Road, Salisbury SP1 3YF and concerns have been raised regarding the Notices that have been erected in the area regarding revisions to road markings that</p>	<p>The use 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</p>

<p>are of particular interest to his vehicular access from Albany Road.</p> <p>There is a dropped kerb situation that serves the access into 1 Belle Vue Road and his neighbouring property to the north presenting no issues at all. However, after considering the Guidelines relating to parking across a dropped kerb, concern has been raised in relation to the exemptions to parking alongside a dropped kerb and of the six criteria, one can foresee a problem with regard to the fourth criteria, stating –</p> <p><i>'Vehicles parked on the carriageway across a dropped kerb that have the occupier's consent is exempt'</i></p> <p>This would be satisfactory with a single access position, but with a joint access position the situation can be envisaged where the neighbour or visitors to that property can park across their section of the dropped kerb, which will cause immense difficulty to our Client when entering or exiting his access, not only with the car parked across the adjacent dropped kerb, but also with vehicles parked legally opposite and as demonstrated by the attached photographs, such difficulty can be appreciated.</p> <p>Likewise our Client's neighbour will have the same difficulty should our Client park a vehicle or visitors park vehicles across our Client's kerb.</p> <p>At present the layout works satisfactorily as both occupiers respect one's difficulty in accessing and we see no reason why this situation needs to be changed.</p> <p>Our Client prefers to reverse into the site as this prevents the least confrontational issue with pedestrians and as it will be appreciated, the distance to the junction with Belle Vue Road is short.</p> <p>The road markings if necessary would not appear to be the issue, but the criteria under which parking on those markings can be exercised.</p> <p>The condition at present is perfectly satisfactory, with both occupiers respecting one's difficulties. However, if those circumstances change from either party, there is no recourse allowed in the criteria.</p> <p>We would ask that this situation is taken into consideration with any change in road markings or colour or notification that would allow the existing situation to remain.</p> <p>It would also be of use to understand why it is necessary to change a situation that works satisfactorily.</p>	<p>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 creates additional parking spaces elsewhere within RPZA.</p> <p>There are numerous locations within RPZA where driveway protection markings have been provided across shared driveways, such as Park Street. Where the marking is used across a shared driveway the onus is on the owners of the dropped kerb to work together to make best use of the marking. The use of the marking across a shared driveway does not give any party carte blanche to block another party's right of access to their property. Should that situation arise then the Police would be able to undertake enforcement action against the offending party for causing an obstruction of the public highway.</p> <p>The use of a driveway protection marking in front of the shared driveway of No. 1 Belle Vue Road and No. 3 Albany Road was proposed after survey work indicated that cars were occasionally parking on the double yellow lines currently in situ. However, if the resident does not believe that the provision of a driveway protection marking at this location will be of benefit then one doesn't need to be provided.</p> <p>Therefore, the council will not proceed with the provision of a driveway protection marking in front of the shared driveway of No. 1 Belle Vue Road and No. 3 Albany Road and shall instead retain the existing double yellow lines.</p>	<p>The report published in January 2016 that considered the comments</p>
7	As a resident in Albany Road I have long been a sufferer of the people who	

	<p>use our road as a handy place to avoid parking charges on a quick trip into town, apart from the fact that too many permits have been issued for the road.....so there are still not enough spaces.</p> <p>It has been my understanding that it is a particular problem for us and Bellevue Road being the nearest to town.</p> <p>I believed, erroneously it appears, that it was just these two roads that were proposed for residents only and I think there is general support for that. I can understand that those further away may not be so keen as the two hour parking limit is useful for tradesmen, short visits from friends etc. and they do not get the town visitors as the time taken to get into town takes up more of the 2 hours.</p> <p>Surely it is not 'beyond the wit of man' to have Albany and Bellevue as Zone A1 which is residents only (and not available to the rest of zone A), therefore reducing the number of signs that need changing, which allows us to park in our road (if there is space!) but does also allows us to park in the rest of zone A (which happens already) since if you arrive back late at night there are no spaces in the road (first para. refers) so I have been in St Mark's Avenue, upper end of Wyndham Road etc and if you are late back getting up very early to move the car from the car park is not a pleasant option.</p> <p>So whilst I am very much in favour of residents only parking for my road, I believe there is a way forward to keep all parties happy should you get many negative responses from those further afield.</p>	<p>submitted in response to the council's first RPZA TRO consultation contemplated the possibility of operating Zone A on a split zone basis. Whilst it would technically be possible to operate RPZA in such a way it was ultimately felt that such an approach would be confusing and unjust to residents and it was decided to proceed on the basis of making all residents parking bays in the zone permit holders only.</p> <p>For more information on this matter I would direct the correspondent to the aforementioned report. The report can be accessed via the following link - https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?Id=1086. Specifically, I would direct the correspondent to Paragraphs 38-42 and 54-57 of the report.</p>
8	<p>I object strongly to the new residents only parking arrangement in St. Mark's Rd and Wyndham Road in Salisbury,</p> <p>I am 78 years of age and I live alone as my husband died recently. I do not drive and although I have a parking space, it is very awkward to get in and out of due to difficult access.</p> <p>Visitors are very important to me plus the people who help me. A lot of my friends are elderly and will only come if they can park in the road.</p> <p>In the day time these roads are half empty and I object to the fact that visitors cannot use these spaces at this time. It would be nice if common sense could prevail.</p>	<p>In addition to the correspondents driveway there will be a number of other parking options available to visitors to her property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitors would be able to park, without the need for a permit, for up to an hour in the proposed one hour bay in St. Mark's Road. • Visitors 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. • It is proposed to replace the existing double yellow lines in front of the correspondents' driveway with a driveway protection (white bar) marking. <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. The use of such markings potentially creates additional parking spaces elsewhere within RPZA.</p>

		Should a motorist park in front of a 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 to the Police who would be able to undertake enforcement action.
9	<p>Parking in zone A is difficult enough without putting further restrictions, by placing more unusable areas.</p> <p>Collecting more fines is the most lightly reason.</p> <p>No one listens or even acknowledges, suggestions from residents. I have on several occasions suggested more spaces at the end of St Marks road. The triangular area, were it joins Escort road.</p> <p>The last thing we need is less resident spaces, more restrictions, more regulations.</p>	<p>The main aim of the review of RPZA is to provide as many parking spaces as possible for residents. This is achieved in two ways, firstly by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking spaces and secondly by providing additional parking spaces through the conversion of single or double yellow lines into parking bays or driveway protection (white bar) markings. This approach will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p> <p>However, meeting this aim outlined above has to be achieved whilst supporting businesses and organisations operating within the zone in accordance with the priorities set out within the council's business plan. Therefore it is necessary to provide some time limited parking bays which could be used by customers of the businesses and organisations operating within the zone.</p> <p>It is unclear to whom this correspondent has made their suggestions for additional parking spaces to. However, the Traffic Engineering Team (as the developer of the proposals for RPZA) have, other than these comments, not received any correspondence from them. It is unclear from the comments exactly where the correspondent believes that extra parking spaces can be provided. It is assumed that they are referring to the large area of hatch markings present at the junction of St. Mark's Road and Estcourt Road. That being the case then the council's advertised proposals included the removal of some of this area of hatching to allow additional residents parking spaces to be provided.</p>
10	<p>Visitors Parking, St Marks Road</p> <p>Most Visitors to St Marks road, are in the daytime. When large numbers of Residents are at work. So plenty of parking spaces. At night there will be empty Visitors spaces that Residents will not be allowed to use, or get fined. Sounds like another Council money making scene to us.</p>	<p>All of the time limited bays proposed within RPZA will only operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday. Outside of the aforementioned hours of operation the bays are unrestricted so could be by any motorist.</p> <p>With specific regard to the proposed one hour parking bay in St. Mark's Road this would mean that a resident of the road could park in the bay 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>
11	<p>I do not agree with the proposal to make Hamilton Road mainly Residents Only. My reasons are:</p> <p>a) There is currently not a shortage of parking in Hamilton Road during the daytime (8am to 6pm - the time at which the proposed change will take</p>	<p><u>Response to Point A</u></p> <p>It is accepted that Hamilton Road currently experiences fewer daytime parking problems than the roads within RPZA that are located closer to the city centre, where there are greater problems with commuter and shopper</p>

	<p>effect). There is however, a shortage of parking during evenings, at which time the proposed change will be of no benefit at all.</p> <p>b) The proposed change will inconvenience residents using trades persons and short duration visitors, who will then require visitors permits.</p> <p>c) I can see no benefit whatsoever with regard to the one stated aim in: http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/tro-salisbury-zone-a-itm-statement-of-reasons.pdf</p> <p>d) In view that the effects will be mainly negative, I feel it is highly likely that the real reason for the proposal is to increase revenue from residents permit fees.</p>	<p>parking reducing the number of spaces available to residents and their visitors. 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 the streets in RPZA located further away from the city centre. As such the council is seeking to address the zone as a whole by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays, doing so will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p> <p><u>Response to Point B</u></p> <p>The council's proposals include the provision of eight one hour parking bays in Hamilton Road which could be used by visitors to residents of the road (including trades persons) without needing to display a parking permit. Time limited parking bays will also be retained in the nearby Marlborough Road and Wyndham Road.</p> <p><u>Response to Point C</u></p> <p>When advertising TROs for comment the council in its role as the local highway authority is legally required by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to publish its reasons for proposing the introduction of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>The reasons for which waiting restrictions can be introduced are defined by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. There are seven defined reasons why a highway authority may introduce waiting restrictions and in the case of this TRO the reason used by the council is:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.”</i> (Defined as reason ‘F’ by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984).</p> <p>Reason ‘F’ is typically used in situations where waiting restrictions are being introduced to make sure that an existing service or action can continue to take place. In the case of RPZA it is use relates to the provision of additional parking spaces. The provision of additional parking spaces in RPZA is considered an improvement to the amenities of the area. It is therefore considered appropriate for the council to have used reason ‘F’ when publishing this TRO.</p>
12	<p>I am writing regarding the proposed changes to the parking on Kings Road.</p> <p>I live on at 35 Wyndham Road and have a garage backing onto Kings Road as do a number of other houses. I submitted a comment on the original proposal for changes to the parking and appreciate that the proposed plans</p>	<p>Please refer to main report as this issue has been considered as a substantive issue.</p>

	<p>were modified as a result of mine and my neighbours' comments.</p> <p>The current proposal is a significant improvement from the previous proposal but I am still concerned that some of my neighbours' access/egress (and mine to a lesser extent) could be restricted if people are permitted to park on the northern side of Kings Road at all. People parking on the northern side of Kings Road usually park half on the pavement, which I appreciate, as it allows me to access/egress my garage. However, if two cars were parked fully on the road in the two spaces closest to my garage this would restrict my access/egress and would also affect my neighbours.</p>	
13	<p>I am a resident of salisbury, living in St Marks Rd, and I find the proposed changes mystifying. I cannot see that there will be any benefit to anyone, as the root of this insoluble problem is that there are too many vehicles trying to park in these streets. The situation is especially difficult in the evenings and no amount of tinkering with the system for daytime parking is going to rectify this. Making the area the area residents only during the day will simply add to residents problems, as the current 2 hour grace period for short visits seems likely to be halved. It looks as if we will all need to buy extra visitors parking tickets, for even short visits by tradesmen etc.</p> <p>On a personal note, my husband is a blue badge holder, having lost a leg a year ago. We have frequent short visits from various health care professionals, and having to watch the clock all the time during their visit will be a distraction from their main purpose. This kind of unsympathetic approach is typical of Wiltshire council, we have found. The best example of its uncaring attitude was the patronising and inflexible response we met with last year, when enquiring about having a disabled parking space designated outside our house. These, apparently, are not permitted in residents only parking zones. Will the proposed changes to parking in zone A affect this policy, I wonder?</p> <p>Present parking arrangements in zone A seem to work as well as possible, in current conditions.</p> <p>My response to the proposed changes can be summed up in the old saying "If it ain't broke, don't fix it".</p>	<p>It is accepted that St. Mark's Road currently experiences fewer daytime parking problems than the roads within RPZA that are located closer to the city centre, where there are greater problems with commuter and shopper parking reducing the number of spaces available to residents and their visitors. 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 the streets in RPZA located further away from the city centre. As such the council is seeking to address the zone as a whole by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays, doing so will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p> <p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. As the correspondent alludes to the only way to realistically address such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</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> <p>The council's proposals for RPZA will not result in a change of policy in</p>

		respect of the provision of disabled parking bays in areas where there are existing waiting restrictions in place.
14	<p>I oppose this proposal, as it restricts parking in the street upon which I live.</p> <p>If the proposal to have the areas marked for no waiting mon-sat 8am-6pm and Parking mon-sat 8am-6pm 1hr non return within 2 hours is enforced, then if I park over night but do not plan to go out the next day, I must move my car to another place on the street in the morning which is inconvenient.</p> <p>There are plenty of empty spaces during the day for visitors, and having lived here for six years I have never failed to park during the day. The problem occurs in the evening when people return from work, where there are simply less spaces than people wanting to park. The area highlighted as newly planned residents parking is much smaller than the areas marked as proposed for no waiting mon-sat 8am-6pm and Parking mon-sat 8am-6pm 1hr non return within 2 hours and no waiting at any time and Advisory white bar marking.</p> <p>This proposal reduces parking for the residents of Nelson Road and Zone A permit holders.</p> <p>As there has been space identified at the Scamells road end of Nelson road that could be used for parking without infringing the turning area, why not simply leave the parking arrangement as it is, but add these spaces as available to residents?</p> <p>I am more than happy to discuss alternatives to this proposal and give a residents insight into parking on Nelson Road.</p>	<p>The main aim of the review of RPZA is to provide as many parking spaces as possible for residents. However, meeting this aim has to be achieved whilst supporting businesses and organisations operating within the zone in accordance with the priorities set out within the council's business plan.</p> <p>The proposed introduction of a length of single yellow line and a one hour parking bay in Nelson Road are intended to support the Lifestyle and Mobility shop operating within the road. The single yellow line is intended to keep the area in front of the store clear to assist with loading and unloading activities. Currently vehicles parking in front of the store can make loading and unloading activities, which includes large items of furniture and mobility scooters, extremely difficult to undertake. As the council's proposals will remove the ability for non permit holders to park in the residents parking bays in the road, the proposed one hour parking bay is intended to be used by customers of the Lifestyle and Mobility shop. However, it should be noted that this bay could also be used by visitors to residents in the road without needing to display a visitors parking permit or activating a virtual permit.</p> <p>Whilst technically there is a reduction in the number of daytime parking spaces available to residents (of approximately two spaces) this can be accommodated within Nelson Road because, as the correspondent acknowledges in their comments, there are sufficient spaces available in the road during the day to accommodate resident's parking requirements. However, overnight, when as the correspondent also acknowledges, there is greater demand from residents for parking spaces within the road the proposed changes will result in there being an additional two spaces in the road by virtue of the removal of a length of double yellow line from the turning head and its replacement with a parking bay.</p>
15	<p>With ref to the proposed changes to parking regulations, in principle I am not against residents only parking but to insert extra parking bays outside my house and round the corner will be a disaster.</p> <p>30 years ago my wife had her brand new mini hit by 3 coaches the first week she had it whilst parked outside our house. After her story appeared on the front page of the Salisbury journal the council decided to put single yellow lines outside our house and double yellow opposite and round the corner.</p> <p>Now you are proposing to take away the single yellow line and insert parking bays there, heavy vehicles will still have to come up the road, whether it is vehicles that have come up by mistake or removal, scaffolding or bin lorries. My wall was knocked down by a lorry trying to reverse back and forward to try and get round the corner when there were no cars parked in front of my house. It is not so long ago that cars parked in bays were given tickets for</p>	<p>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. This software has shown that a fire engine and a refuse collection vehicle would still be able to negotiate the bend in question should the council's proposals be implemented. Given that vehicles as big as a fire engine or a refuse collection vehicle would still be able to negotiate the bend there, should be no reason for parked vehicles to be damaged as long as they are correctly parked within the parking bays and vehicles are being driven in accordance with Highway Code.</p>

	<p>causing an obstruction when the fire service did their safety checks to ensure they could get round in an emergency. Is this what we will get in Albany Road??.</p>	
<p>16</p>	<p>In St. Marks Rd we do not have an issue with the 2 hour parking restrictions at the moment. There is no need for resident only except in your opinion. It will be more costly to the householder as the price for residential cost more and I think we, as householders pay enough. The only real beneficiaries will be the council and one hour sections! Really? Majorly unfair to have to pay for a visitors ticket for friends to come and visit if they stay for more than 1 hour, that is also if they will be able to find a space as these will obviously be limited. Also the nearest car park is often over run by police cars. Perhaps I should suggest to my friends that they park in town and walk or catch a bus? But wait there's only a couple of buses a day and they are in the morning! If the likes of Bellevue and Albany Road have the issues as they are closer to town then may I suggest that you REZONE them! I also aired my views to Atiqul Hoque, for all the good that did! The only time there are issues in my road are at evenings and weekends when the restrictions are not in place as is the nature of today... there are too many cars per household. Nothing more. I also failed to receive any questionnaire on this matter over the last couple of months or was that intentional?. Maybe if you issued one annual visitor permit per household unrelated to a specific vehicle at a reasonable charge would help but those ridiculous visitors permits now are a money making exercise. Surely I should be entitled for people to come and visit me and be able to park anywhere in my road for at least the two hours set currently or am I going to have to charge my friends a fee for coming to visit?</p>	<p>It is accepted that St. Mark's Road currently experiences fewer daytime parking problems than the roads within RPZA that are located closer to the city centre, where there are greater problems with commuter and shopper parking reducing the number of spaces available to residents and their visitors. 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 the streets in RPZA located further away from the city centre. As such the council is seeking to address the zone as a whole by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays, doing so will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p> <p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. As the correspondent alludes to the only way to realistically address such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</p> <p>The correspondent mentions having not received a questionnaire, it is unclear to what questionnaire they refer. The council has not distributed a questionnaire on its proposals for RPZA since 2013.</p> <p>Subject to a policy change the terms and conditions relating to the issuing of visitor permits or the types of visitor permits issued could be altered. However, any such policy change sits outside of the scope of this review process. If the correspondent wishes to take this matter up they will need to contact the council's Parking Services Team directly. They can do so via parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p> <p>There are no legal rights to park on the highway, or upon the council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking on the public highway, but parking</p>

		is condoned where the rite of passage along the highway is not impeded. It is up to the correspondent if they wish to pass on the charge for visitors parking permits to people visiting them.
17	<p>I live in Park Street in zone A and am interested in the new proposals for the area.</p> <p>The most difficult time to park here is from about 5pm on weekdays and any time Saturday and Sunday but particularly in the evening on those days. As I understand it, a Residents Only scheme will stop at 6 in the evening on weekdays and not apply on Sunday.</p> <p>I am therefore unsure of the benefits to residents in zone A as the restrictions will have most effect during the day when it isn't so difficult to park in the area. I also wonder how visitors will be dealt with and assume that a permit will be required for even a short visit which is a distinct disadvantage to residents.</p> <p>I am unable to decipher the implications of the siting of parking bays in my street but wonder if there will be a reduction in available slots. And this in a street which already has a significant number of parking bays on former front gardens and the attendant dropped kerbs.</p> <p>I think this change is a mistake and will not make parking easier at the busiest times of the week.</p>	<p>It is accepted that Park Street currently experiences fewer daytime parking problems than the roads within RPZA that are located closer to the city centre, where there are greater problems with commuter and shopper parking reducing the number of spaces available to residents and their visitors. 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 the streets in RPZA located further away from the city centre. As such the council is seeking to address the zone as a whole by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays, doing so will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p> <p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. As the correspondent alludes to the only way to realistically address such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed physical layout of waiting restrictions on the ground in Park Street then there will be no changes to what is currently in situ.</p> <p>Visitors to residents of Park Street would be able to make use of the 30 minute bay proposed in the road or the 30 minute or one hour bays proposed in Estcourt 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.</p>
18	I have seen the notices in my street regarding the proposed changes in Belle Vue Road and the surrounding streets to the parking arrangements from 2 hours to residents parking and once again raise my wholehearted	The council's proposals include the provision of a one hour bay in Belle Vue Road (the road in which the correspondent lives) which could be used by visitors, trades persons or customers of businesses in the road without

	<p>objection to them.</p> <p>This is taking a sledge hammer to crack a nut! I am aware that a year ago a small minority of homes mentioned they would like this but many people have sold up and moved over the last year and I strongly suspect that those that have gone were keen advocates of full residents parking.</p> <p>If indeed there is still a majority, which I doubt, can this not just be changed to a 2 hour parking and no return to the zone A for 4 hours?</p> <p>I work from home and have a social life so have several people coming to my home almost daily. I also use local people for services to my home as I'm sure many others do. Understandably it doesn't encourage people to come to me if they have to pay every time they do and I will very quickly run out of parking cards and end up having to pay the £2.80 daily rate several times a day with this new arrangement. Others who are older and/or less able to get out enjoy being visited by others but don't want to have to pay every time someone comes to see them, they too will lose out.</p> <p>If this decision goes ahead it will be more of a hinderance than a help and make no difference whatsoever to the only problem with parking that we do have which is after 6!!</p> <p>Please do not go ahead with this plan it doesn't work and is unlikely to really benefit anyone.</p>	<p>needing to display a parking permit.</p> <p>In addition to the above, owners of businesses operating within RPZA are, subject to terms and conditions, 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 zone. Motorists displaying a valid business permit would be able to park in any of the permit holders only parking bays in RPZA without time restriction.</p>
19	<p>I object to the proposed change in Zone A to 'residents only' parking on the basis that the lack of parking spaces for residents occur after 5pm not during the hours of 9am until 5pm. I have lived in Zone A for 5 years and have never found a problem parking somewhere near to my house during the daytime but have often had to park further away during the evening.</p> <p>It also seems a shame that the proposed parking restrictions will exclude shoppers who have come into the city centre to support our local businesses. This cannot be a positive step in encouraging life into the area.</p> <p>I object to the two additional spaces outside nos 42 and 40 as I do not think it is necessary because the issue of residents being unable to park occurs after 5pm. After this time residents are allowed to park in this area anyway due to a single yellow line.</p> <p>I would like to suggest retaining the current parking restrictions with the addition of 'no return to zone within 24 hours' after the two parking hours allowed. This would stop any cars moving from bay to bay during the day so releasing spaces for others.</p>	<p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times.</p> <p>The main aim of the review of RPZA is to provide as many parking spaces as possible for residents. This is achieved in two ways, firstly by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking spaces and secondly by providing additional parking spaces through the conversion of single or double yellow lines into parking bays or driveway protection (white bar) markings. This approach will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone. However, meeting this aim has to be achieved whilst supporting businesses and organisations operating within the zone in accordance with the priorities set out within the council's business plan.</p> <p>As the council's proposals will remove the ability for non permit holders to park in the residents parking bays in the road, the proposed one hour parking bay outside of No. 40 and 42 Belle Vue Road is intended to be used by customers of businesses operating in the road. However, it should be noted that this bay could be also used by visitors to residents in the road</p>

		<p>without needing to display a visitors parking permit or activating a virtual permit.</p> <p>Shoppers visiting Salisbury are well catered for in terms of parking provision. In addition to the Park and Ride sites, city centre car parks and on-street Pay & Display parking bays 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 on the residents parking bays 'Waiting Limited to 2 Hours, No Return to Zone A That Day' are technically feasible. However, the use of such a restriction would not be concordant with the main aim of the council's proposals, which seeks to maximise the number of parking spaces available within RPZA for residents and their visitors. The removal of the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays within RPZA during their hours of operation, as per the council's proposals, helps to maximise the number of parking spaces available within the zone to residents and their visitors.</p>
20	<p>I have completed your online form re the 1 hour spaces at the bottom of Wyndham road. However I would like to add that my property (25, Wyndham road) has a garage which is accessed via KINGS ROAD. The current proposal suggests no change to the single yellow line opposite my garage. This causes problems as I cannot access my garage when vehicles are parked opposite it. I would like to have double yellow lines opposite garage so I could always use it. No parking at any time would be ideal for the section of Kings road which is currently shown as a single yellow line.</p>	<p>Please refer to main report as this issue has been considered as a substantive issue.</p>
21	<p>1. I am a senior citizen living in St. Mark's Road. I regularly employ a cleaner and a gardener who enable me to live independently. There may come a time when I will need regular carers. Am I to use Visitor permits for their visits, which would mean that my quota would soon be used up? At the moment, they use the 2 hour allowance.</p> <p>2. I am concerned about the effect of these proposed changes on local small business, like Harrison's the Butchers in College Street, who will suffer as a result. Is this your intention?</p> <p>3. What is the position over those who visit to do maintenance work some of whom are only here briefly and now use the 2 hour allowance?</p> <p>4. As far as St. Mark's Road is concerned you have completely failed to address any problem here. It is not crowded during the day, only between 7.0 pm and the morning, when people leave for work. So you are proposing</p>	<p><u>Response to Comments 1 and 3</u></p> <p>Visitors or trades persons visiting residents of St. Mark's Road would be able to make use of the one hour bay proposed in the road or the 30 minute or one hour bays proposed in Estcourt Road without needing to display a visitor's scratch card or activating a virtual permit. If visitors park in the residents parking bays in St. Mark's Road then displaying a visitor's scratch card or activating a virtual permit would be necessary.</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> <p><u>Response to Comment 2</u></p>

<p>to change the daytime routine unnecessarily and causing us as residents a great deal of inconvenience.</p> <p>5. Please let me know the costs of all this - I think this should have been publicised when this was first proposed.</p>	<p>The council's advertised proposals contain a number of 30 minute or one hour parking bays within RPZA to support the businesses and organisations operating within the zone. With specific regard to Harrison's The Butchers it is proposed to introduce a 30 minute parking bay outside of their property which could be used by customers visiting their premises.</p> <p>In addition to the above, owners of businesses operating within RPZA are, subject to terms and conditions, 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 zone. Motorists displaying a valid business permit would be able to park in any of the permit holders only parking bays in RPZA without time restriction.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 4</u></p> <p>It is accepted that St. Mark's Road currently experiences fewer daytime parking problems than the roads within RPZA that are located closer to the city centre, where there are greater problems with commuter and shopper parking reducing the number of spaces available to residents and their visitors. 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 the streets in RPZA located further away from the city centre. As such, the council is seeking to address the zone as a whole by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays, doing so will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p> <p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. As the correspondent alludes to the only way to realistically address such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 5</u></p>
---	---

		<p>It is not possible to provide accurate cost information until a final decision has been made on the proposals that will be introduced. The decision made will have an impact on the number of alterations that need to be made to the signs and lines on the ground in RPZA and therefore the cost of the works to be undertaken. However, to date the council has spent approximately £2,000 on the review, with the majority of this money having been spent on the cost of the two TRO consultation processes undertaken.</p>
22	<p>Please would you tell me why there is a special 1 hour only stretch on the Hamilton Road proposal when we are so close to the biggest car park in Salisbury, which is usually half empty because of the parking prices. Why not put in a 1 hour section in that car park, which is so much closer to city centre amenities anyway?</p>	<p>As the council's proposals will remove the ability for non permit holders to park in the residents parking bays in the road, the proposed one hour parking bay is intended to be used by customers of businesses operating in Hamilton Road. However, it should be noted that this bay could also be used by visitors or trades persons visiting residents of Hamilton Road without needing to display a visitors parking permit or activating a virtual permit.</p>
23	<p>Parking should be restricted to permit holders only from 4pm onwards. This would mean that visitors during the day would still be able to park for up to 2 hours anywhere in the affected streets as there are many parking spaces empty during the day time (say 8am-4pm). The main difficulty for residents is parking when they get home from work. If the restriction for permit holders was from 4pm then there would be 2 hours from 4-6pm when the parking wardens would be patrolling and checking. This would mean that residents would have a greater chance of parking during the evening and overnight and visitors would still be able to use the empty spaces during the daytime.</p>	<p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. The only way to realistically address such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</p> <p>Salisbury District Council (when responsible for the residents parking schemes in Salisbury) undertook some limited consultation work in respect of possibly extending the hours of operation of residents parking schemes into the evening. The results of the consultation indicated that residents didn't favour such an option because any extension of the hours of operation would require the cost of permits to be significantly increased to cover the cost of undertaking enforcement later into the evenings and the availability of free parking in the city centre meant that extending the enforcement of residents parking schemes later into the evening would likely only impact upon themselves rather than commuters and shoppers.</p> <p>Subject to a policy change the hours of operation of residents parking schemes in Salisbury could be altered so that they operated later into the evening. However, any such policy change sits outside of the scope of this review process. If the correspondent wishes to take this matter up they will need to contact the council's Parking Services Team directly. They can do so</p>

<p>24</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the main proposal in this order which is to remove the two hour parking facility in this zone for non residents and to make the majority of the area residents only parking. I make this objection as a resident of the area. I am also objecting to the detailed proposals in Albany Road as they affect the part of that road running west-east including the removal of the single yellow line and its reduction to a small length around the tight right hand bend at the beginning of that west-east section and its replacement in part by additional resident only parking bays. I also contend that the proposals generally and in respect of Albany Road in particular do not meet the statement of reasons which merely recites one of the grounds in section 1(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (the 1984 Act)but does not provide any form of detailed or substantiated reasons for the making of the proposed order which fundamentally changes the nature of the parking regime in Zone A of Salisbury. There is no supporting information or "reasons" for the proposal as anticipated under the 1984 Act. The mere recitation of one of the grounds for making TROs under s.1 of the 1984 Act does not amount to a discharge of the Council's requirement to give reasons for the making of the order. how, for example, does the proposal contribute to "preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs"? There appears to be no supporting analysis of parking problems in the particular zone or in particular parts of it. Certainly as regards those of us in Albany Road and particularly the west-east part (Nos 43-57)this proposal considerably reduces the amenity of the area. it will remove the ability of visitors to park for up to 2 hours during the regulated period without costly visitor parking permits. there is no evidence from observation during the regulated period of any particular parking issues - the only times at which there appears to be an excess of residents cars looking for parking is outside the current regulated periods other than possibly on a Saturday morning.</p> <p>Furthermore, the reduction of the single yellow line at the corner of the northern end of Albany Road outside no.43 will significantly worsen the amenities of this road as it will inevitably mean that large vehicles (delivery trucks, removal lorries etc. will face increasing difficulty in navigating that right angle bend. We have direct and recent evidence of the need for the current longer single yellow line restriction with the arrival of a shipping container lorry to deliver goods. Similarly the Council's contractors Hills use a large scale vehicle for recycling and waste collection and regularly require that longer yellow line for loading purposes. Similarly with the same single yellow line outside the garage on the south side of the road opposite nos.55-57 and the junction with Belle Vue Road.</p> <p>In the absence of any stated "reasons" for the making of this proposal let alone detailed analysis underlying the proposal it is therefore difficult to</p>	<p>via parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p> <p>In submitting their comments on the council's proposals the correspondent also formally submitted the majority of these comments as a Request For Information under the regulations relating to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and The Environmental Information Regulations 2004. In accordance with aforementioned regulations a response was sent direct to the correspondent in September 2016 and will not be published as part of this document.</p> <p>Turing to the correspondents comments regarding the council's statement of reasons. When advertising TROs for comment the council in its role as the local highway authority is legally required by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to publish its reasons for proposing the introduction of waiting restrictions.</p> <p>The reasons for which waiting restrictions can be introduced are defined by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. There are seven defined reasons why a highway authority may introduce waiting restrictions and in the case of this TRO the reason used by the council is:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs."</i> (Defined as reason 'F' by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984).</p> <p>Reason 'F' is typically used in situations where waiting restrictions are being introduced to make sure that an existing service or action can continue to take place. In the case of RPZA it is use relates to the provision of additional parking spaces. The provision of additional parking spaces in RPZA is considered an improvement to the amenities of the area. It is therefore considered appropriate for the council to have used reason 'F' when publishing this TRO.</p> <p>The Equality Act 2010 introduced the Equality Duty which requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimization and any other conduct prohibited by the Act, advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. There is no express provision within the Act dealing with the provision of parking spaces on the public highway or the restrictions placed upon the use of those spaces.</p> <p>The provision of parking spaces must be considered within the context of highway law. Highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods, and consequently any parking on the</p>
-----------	---	--

<p>comment properly on the policy and evidence which the Council has developed and used in making this proposal. Accordingly please also treat this response as a request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and The Environmental Information Regulations 2004 for information used by the Council in:</p> <p>(1) formulating the proposals for Zone A in Salisbury including the expected revenue to be raised from the proposed changes, and</p> <p>(2) in particular those proposals as they relate specifically to Albany Road, and again</p> <p>(3) in particular, to that stretch of Albany Road between nos 41 and 57 concerning the reduction in single yellow line and the removal of it and its replacement by advisory white lines in front of the garages on the south side</p> <p>(4) any assessment made in respect of the Council's public sector equality duty under the Equality Act 2010 of these proposals in particular dealing with the impact on the elderly of the change from free visitor parking for up to 2 hours.</p> <p>Finally, in the absence of detailed reasoning and analysis for this I consider any proposal to confirm the draft orders will be premature and subject to challenge.</p>	<p>highway is an obstruction of that rite of passage. There are no legal rights to park on the highway, or upon the council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking on the public highway, but parking is condoned where the rite of passage along the highway is not impeded. Therefore, the provision of any parking bays whose use is restricted to local residents and their visitors is considered to of significant benefit to all residents, and not just the elderly.</p> <p>The proposed change does not limit in any way the number of visitors a resident of the zone can receive. Currently RPZA operates as a limited waiting residents' parking scheme. Under this type of scheme residents are entitled to purchase 50 daily visitor permits per household per year at a cost of 40p per permit and an additional 50 daily visitor permits at a cost of £2.85 per permit. Any additional daily visitor permits required by residents can then be purchased at a cost equivalent to that of the all day parking charge in the city centre. There is no limit on how many additional daily visitor permits residents may purchase. If RPZA is converted to a permit holders only type of scheme (as is proposed) then the number of daily visitors permits residents are able to purchase at the cheap rate of 40p increases from 50 to 100 (all other costs / allocations are as stated above). This increase is in recognition of the fact that there is no ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays in this type of scheme.</p> <p>A number of time limited parking bays which can be used free of charge by visitors to residents of RPZA are included within the council's proposals. These bays will be located within Belle Vue Road, Estcourt Road, Hamilton Road, Marlborough Road, Nelson Road, Park Street, St. Mark's Road and Wyndham Road.</p> <p>All residents parking bays within RPZA currently (and will continue to) operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday. Outside of the aforementioned hours of operation the bays are unrestricted so could be by any motorist, including visitors to residents of the zone. This means that a visitor could park in any of the bays from 6.00pm in the evening until 8.00am the following morning or from 6.00pm on a Saturday evening until 8.00am on a Monday morning free of charge and without needing to display a visitors parking permit or activating a virtual permit.</p> <p>Similarly, all of the time limited bays proposed within RPZA will only operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday. This means that a visitor could park in any of these bays from 5.00pm / 5.30pm (depending on the type of time limited parking bay) in the evening until 8.30am / 9.00am the following morning or from 5.00pm / 5.30pm on a Saturday evening until 8.30am / 9.00am on a Monday morning free of charge and without needing to display a visitors parking permit or activating a virtual permit.</p>
--	---

		<p>Irrespective of the type of residents parking scheme operated by the council, residents over the age of 60 who do not own a car and who live in a household to which no residents parking permit has been issued, may apply for 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.</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> <p>It is difficult to say what impact the removal of the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays in RPZA free of charge for up to two hours will have. It will vary considerably dependent on an individual resident's specific circumstances. However, any impact of this change would be the same on all residents of the zone, irrespective of their age. However, with specific regard to the elderly, there remains a number of free parking options available to visitors to them.</p>
25	<p>1. I have no compass but wish to check that residents parking will still be allowed in front of 18 Park Street where there is no dropped kerb.</p> <p>2. If this scheme is for the benefit of residents there should be a minimum of 30 minutes waiting allowed for all to cover doctors and carers visits which would prevent outsiders getting free parking for shopping in the city centre. I have lived in Park Street for 40 years but did not get any info about the original consultation through my door. I would have voted for the retention of two hour parking as there is little problem with daytime parking in Park Street. Stopping parking for all but residents will create problems for the garage, ballet school and butchers business and elderly residents will have difficulty in coping with doctors visits and especially with regular calls made by carers. I hope you will consider 30 minute parking for the area or several bays in each street to cover this important need.</p>	<p><u>Response to Comment 1</u></p> <p>There will still be a residents parking bay located outside of No. 18 Park Street.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 2</u></p> <p>In respect of the comments about the consultation material then the correspondent is mistaken. The original consultation material distributed to residents included a questionnaire. The council holds a copy of the questionnaire the correspondent completed and returned. Therefore it is justifiable to assume they received the information.</p> <p>The council's advertised proposals contain a number of 30 minute or one hour parking bays within RPZA to support the businesses and organisations operating within the zone. Visitors to residents or customers of businesses in Park Street would be able to make use of the 30 minute bay proposed in the road or the 30 minute or one hour bays proposed in Estcourt Road without needing to display a visitor's scratch card or activating a virtual permit.</p> <p>In addition to the above, owners of businesses operating within RPZA are, subject to terms and conditions, 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 zone. Motorists displaying a valid business permit would be able to park in any of the permit holders only</p>

		<p>parking bays in RPZA without time restriction.</p> <p>The council also issues medical permits to organisations that offer medical care services to residents that live within a residents parking zone. It is up to the service provider, rather than the resident, to apply for this type of permit.</p>
26	<p>I am a City Councillor and live in Zone A. The consultation process clearly showed a majority of people living further away from the City Centre did not want residents only.</p> <p>I object to making all of Zone A residents only - this is unnecessary and will cause significant inconvenience to residents and their visitors e.g. health care workers. I propose we go back to the original proposal that only Belle Vue Road, Albany Road, Endless Street be residents only. I am not clear how the change of plan which was put to me about a year ago can be justified.</p>	<p>The report published in January 2016 that considered the comments submitted in response to the council's first RPZA TRO consultation contemplated the possibility of operating Zone A on a split zone basis. Whilst it would technically be possible to operate RPZA in such a way it was ultimately felt that such an approach would be confusing and unjust to residents and it was decided to proceed on the basis of making all residents parking bays in the zone permit holders only.</p> <p>For more information on this matter I would direct the correspondent to the aforementioned report. The report can be accessed via the following link - https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?Id=1086. Specifically, I would direct the correspondent to Paragraphs 38-42 and 54-57 of the report.</p>
27	<p>We no longer have a car, so are not occupying a parking space. The proposed visitors' permit for over 60s is useful but what happens if a visitor inadvertently goes off with it or we have several visitors together? I understand we can send in their registration numbers to get a one-off permit. Scratch cards are much more convenient. This is advertised as a simplification but it is not simpler for people who are not computer literate. Finally, the information about the scheme and how to apply for permits is piecemeal and fragmentary. I have been passed between Wiltshire Parking and miPermit. I am frustrated and grieving the loss of a system which worked well for us.</p>	<p>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. 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 be computer literate 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 or emailing parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p>
28	<p>The proposed new Parking Restricts for Zone A in Woodstock Road. Salisbury are NOT workable. If a household has visitors, where do they park? Not everyone can "go on line" for a permit, the elderly dont or cant fathom computers and some need nursing or carers help and 1 hour is not enough for these purposes.</p> <p>Since the Residents printed permit has disappeared we have noticed that most of the spaces on the first half of Woodstock Road are being used by all sorts, NOT vehicles from residence around here. Now you cant tell who is a resident or if they have a valid permit. Residents of said road are having great problems.</p> <p>Can you also explain how this will effect Disabled registered drivers.</p> <p>Parking is a very major problem in this road, it is very rare that we are able</p>	<p>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. 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 be computer literate 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 or emailing parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p> <p>Visitors to residents of Woodstock Road would be able to make use of any the proposed time limited parking bays within RPZA without needing to</p>

	<p>to park in our own road now there are NO visible permits. Clearly it is a "free for all". It is not right that you come home late at night and have to hunt the roads for a parking space.</p>	<p>display a visitor's scratch card or activating a virtual permit. The closest one hour parking bay to Woodstock Road would be located in Marlborough Road, with the next closest one hour bays being located in Hamilton Road and Wyndham Road. Visitors can also park in any of the residents parking bays, including those in Woodstock Road, by displaying a visitor's scratch card or activating a virtual permit.</p> <p>In addition to the above the council also issues medical permits to organisations that offer medical care services to residents that live within a residents parking zone. It is up to the service provider, rather than the resident, to apply for this type of permit.</p> <p>Currently, any motorist is permitted to parking in any of the residents parking spaces in RPZA without the need to display a parking permit. Therefore, irrespective of the introduction of the virtual permit system it would not be unexpected to see vehicles using the residents parking bays in Woodstock Road without a permit on display. However, the Parking Services Team will be made aware of the correspondents' general concerns that the parking bays in Woodstock Road may be being parked in illegally so that they can undertake enforcement action as necessary.</p> <p>The impact of the council's proposed changes on Blue Badge holders should be negligible. 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 just 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 just their Blue Badge.</p>
29	<p>1) As I'm a pensioner and trying to maintain my independence it means that I need help with cleaning weekly,gardening monthly. On occasions I need help from tradespeople ,medical etc. Does that mean I have to pay for a parking ticket the minute they arrive ?,at the moment a visit can last for 2hours before I need to ask for a ticket. Usually these visits never exceed the 2hour limit.</p> <p>2) Local businesses, butchers, newsagent, dentist, B&B are all going to fall foul of these new proposed plans.How are you going to support them.?</p> <p>3) It important that a breakdown of all the costs incurred in preparing this report becomes available for all to see where our Council Tax is disappearing.Everyone involved from the person measuring each area on the roads mentioned on the 9 page document,to the final costings for new signage for the lamp posts. Everything please.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to Comment Number 21.</p>
30	<p>Below is a precis of the issue raised by the correspondent.</p> <p>Properties with a postal address of Kings Road are only present on the</p>	<p>The correspondent has been in contact with the council over this issue for a period time and as part of their comments in response to the advertised proposals submitted the full chain of correspondence they have had with the</p>

	<p>north-western side of the road. On the south-eastern side of the road there are only accesses to the rears of Nos. 21-51 Wyndham Road. The accesses to all but two of the aforementioned Wyndham Road properties include private off-street parking spaces in the form of garages and/or driveways. The area in front of the properties on the north-western side of the road is covered by a 'No Waiting 9.00am-5.00pm' Monday to Saturday' (single yellow line) restriction.</p> <p>The correspondent is experiencing problems with vehicles parking on the single yellow line restriction outside of its hours of operation and in doing so preventing access and egress to their garage and has requested that the single yellow line restriction is replaced with a double yellow line restriction.</p>	<p>council on this subject, which totals some 33 pages. So as to not unnecessarily elongate this document a precis of the issue has been provided.</p> <p>Please refer to main report as this issue has been considered as a substantive issue.</p>
31	<p>1. The long bays should be demarcated with dotted lines indicating each parking space. Due to so many people having no consideration for other people parking (parking with extra space especially from the end bay marking), there are on average 5 unusable spaces in every road, every day.</p> <p>2. Each property should only be issued with a maximum of one parking permit.</p> <p>3. Permit parking should begin at 4pm (until 8am) to give parking wardens time to check on their patrols between 4-6pm. This would mean visitors could still use the many empty spaces between 8am-4pm for up to 2 hours as is currently the case. The only thing that would change is the 4pm start for permit parking only, allowing residents better access to parking in the evening and overnight which is the critical time. With the implementation of all these measures, parking in all the affected streets of the area would be easy.</p>	<p><u>Response to Comment 1</u></p> <p>Evidence suggests that, contrary to the correspondents' view, the marking of individual parking bays actually reduces the efficiency of parking. When marking individual bays they must be a minimum of 6.6 metres in length to account for the turning manoeuvres of the largest sized vehicles that are permitted to use them. Bays of this size are often not required, particularly in residential areas. By not providing individually marked bays the council is actually maximising the number of parking spaces available to residents, albeit that on some occasions residents do not park in the most efficient manner possible within the available space. By way of a practical example of this approach I would direct you to the parking bay opposite No. 108 St. Mark's Road. The bay in question measures approximately 26 metres in length and five vehicles regularly park within it. If the council was to mark individual bays (as outlined above) only four spaces would be provided.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 2</u></p> <p>Subject to a policy change the terms and conditions relating to the issuing of resident parking permits could be altered. However, any such policy change sits outside of the scope of this review process. If the correspondent wishes to take this matter up they will need to contact the council's Parking Services Team directly. They can do so via parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</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 and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of</p>

		<p>8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. The only way to realistically address such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</p> <p>Salisbury District Council (when responsible for the residents parking schemes in Salisbury) undertook some limited consultation work in respect of possibly extending the hours of operation of residents parking schemes into the evening. The results of the consultation indicated that residents didn't favour such an option because any extension of the hours of operation would require the cost of permits to be significantly increased to cover the cost of undertaking enforcement later into the evenings and the availability of free parking in the city centre meant that extending the enforcement of residents parking schemes later into the evening would likely only impact upon themselves rather than commuters and shoppers.</p> <p>Subject to a policy change the hours of operation of residents parking schemes in Salisbury could be altered so that they operated later into the evening. However, any such policy change sits outside of the scope of this review process. If the correspondent wishes to take this matter up they will need to contact the council's Parking Services Team directly. They can do so via parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p>
32	<p>I object to the proposed change in Zone A to 'residents only' parking on the basis that the proposal fails to address the very real issue of a parking 'squeeze' during the evening and night time periods when residents return home from work.</p> <p>The additional spaces proposed generally only serve to incorporate the 'single yellow line' areas currently used, therefore providing little, and in most cases no extra provision when there is a demonstrated need.</p> <p>I have lived in Zone A for eight years and have never experienced a difficulty parking within a reasonable distance from my home during the day, however, the situation has often been very different upon returning after 5pm.</p> <p>In this respect I fail to see how the proposed changes will bring positive change. Conversely, removal of the general, free to all users, two hour provision can only serve to adversely affect businesses in the city centre.</p> <p>It is a great asset for Salisbury that people can freely come to our city centre and park free for short periods, it is of great benefit to businesses and brings</p>	<p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. The only way to realistically address such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</p> <p>Salisbury District Council (when responsible for the residents parking schemes in Salisbury) undertook some limited consultation work in respect of possibly extending the hours of operation of residents parking schemes into the evening. The results of the consultation indicated that residents didn't favour such an option because any extension of the hours of operation</p>

	<p>life to the area</p> <p>I would suggest a far more practical solution would be to extend the parking provision as per the proposed additional spaces whilst retaining the current waiting restrictions without change, or possibly with just the additional restriction of 'no return to zone with 24 hours' after the two hour period.</p>	<p>would require the cost of permits to be significantly increased to cover the cost of undertaking enforcement later into the evenings and the availability of free parking in the city centre meant that extending the enforcement of residents parking schemes later into the evening would likely only impact upon themselves rather than commuters and shoppers.</p> <p>Subject to a policy change the hours of operation of residents parking schemes in Salisbury could be altered so that they operated later into the evening. However, any such policy change sits outside of the scope of this review process. If the correspondent wishes to take this matter up they will need to contact the council's Parking Services Team directly. They can do so via parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p> <p>Shoppers visiting Salisbury are well catered for in terms of parking provision. In addition to Park and Ride sites, city centre car parks and on-street Pay & Display parking bays 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 on the residents parking bays 'Waiting Limited to 2 Hours, No Return to Zone A That Day' are technically feasible. However, the use of such a restriction would not be concordant with the main aim of the council's proposals, which seeks to maximise the number of parking spaces available within RPZA for residents and their visitors. The removal of the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays within RPZA during their hours of operation, as per the council's proposals, helps to maximise the number of parking spaces available within the zone to residents and their visitors.</p>
33	<p>I wish to raise some observations and objections to the above proposed Orders. In summary they will;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cost me more money • be seen to be extracting more money from visitors through forcing them to pay for parking on otherwise empty roads • increase unemployment • increase social isolation. <p>The current scheme as it operates at the moment is fundamentally flawed as</p>	<p>It is accepted that streets such as Hamilton Road (where the correspondent lives) and Marlborough Road currently experience fewer daytime parking problems than the roads within RPZA that are located closer to the city centre, where there are greater problems with commuter and shopper parking reducing the number of spaces available to residents and their visitors. 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 the streets in RPZA located further away from the city centre. As such the council is seeking to address the zone as a whole by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays, doing so will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p>

	<p>it allows people to park for 2 hours and then simply move to another bay (often just across the road) to get another 2 hours free parking. This bay hopping was a common phenomena when CAPITA, and Friends Provident were open, and ironically used by workers out of Bourne Hill offices in surrounding streets. If the scheme was properly implemented to include 'No return within 4 hours to Zone A' as per your Engineer PS dated 2/11/10 then there would be little issue with parking in the area.</p> <p>Introducing Residents only parking will bring the Council into disrepute. I attach photos of Marlborough Rd and Hamilton Rd on typical schooldays and during the day at about 11 am. Please see photos. As can be seen there is masses of unused spaces and I have several photos from different days showing the same thing. Introducing Residents Only will cost me and/or my visitors a parking fee for a space that would ordinarily be empty anyway. I have spoken with one mother who has school age children who reports that this will prevent her friends from popping in for a quick cup of tea and lead to some social isolation for her and no doubt older residents in the area.</p> <p>We have the benefit of a cleaner who calls twice a week for 2 hours. This will have to be reduced as the cost of unnecessary car parking charges will probably force us to reduce this down to once a week. Again this visit is during the week at off peak car parking times ie during the day when the street is empty.</p> <p>The only time that car parking is an issue here is in the evenings when people return home from work and these proposals will not affect that, and on Saturdays when people are generally not out at work.</p> <p>I would support No return to Zone A within 4 hours, but your present proposals for residents only parking is mean spirited and will cost residents extra unnecessary expenditure.</p>	<p>The report published in January 2016 that considered the comments submitted in response to the council's first RPZA TRO consultation both outlined the history behind the ability for motorists to swap from bay to bay within RPZA and how that issued had now been resolved. For more information on this matter I would direct the correspondent to the aforementioned report. The report can be accessed via the following link - https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?Id=1086. Specifically, I would direct the correspondent to Paragraphs 6 and 7 of the report.</p> <p>The council's proposals include the provision of one hour parking bays in both Hamilton Road and Marlborough Road which could be used by visitors to residents of the roads (including trades persons) without needing to display a parking permit.</p>
34	<p>We have already had to deal with a new virtual ticket system for visitor parking, which is stressful and complicated for some elder residents.</p> <p>However the times of the system we have at the moment works very well as it is. It does not need to be changed. Friends turn up unannounced and can chat, and have a cup of tea, with no distractions of rushing for the computer or to the phone, straight away they put their foot in the door. Why should our networks of friends and acquaintances be limited and curbed, at the whim of a traffic planner. Our road has no problem in the daytime with the present system. The new system does not in any way affect the night time when there can be a parking problem.</p> <p>Why should we have to have the bother and expense of having to buy</p>	<p>It is accepted that St. Mark's Road (where the correspondent lives) currently experiences fewer daytime parking problems than the roads within RPZA that are located closer to the city centre, where there are greater problems with commuter and shopper parking reducing the number of spaces available to residents and their visitors. 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 the streets in RPZA located further away from the city centre. As such the council is seeking to address the zone as a whole by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays, doing so will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p>

	<p>tickets for our friends and helpers such as plumbers, gardeners and cleaners, when we have no problem at the moment for their 2 hour stay.</p> <p>Presumably people visiting us for the timed hour would have to park in the special designated parking area. This might be at the other end of the road from where they want to visit. The designated special area might be full. What then?</p> <p>This new scheme in no way improves the amenities of the area through which the road runs. In fact it further curbs our freedom to live our lives as we want.</p> <p>Could it be that it is just a plan to make more money out of residents who have no drives and already have to pay for parking where they live?</p>	<p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. As the correspondent alludes to the only way to realistically address such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</p> <p>Visitors or trades persons visiting residents of St. Mark's Road would be able to make use of any the proposed time limited parking bays within RPZA free of charge and without needing to display a visitors scratch card or activating a virtual permit. There is a proposed one hour bay in St. Mark's Road and 30 minute and one hour bays proposed in Estcourt Road (as the roads closest time limited spaces to the correspondent). If these spaces are full visitors would have the option of using the residents parking bays in St. Mark's Road (or any within the zone) but would need to display a visitor's scratch card or activate a virtual permit during their hours of operation.</p>
35	<p>I am writing to you to discuss the proposed new traffic order in Salisbury, specifically Woodstock Road. As a resident at number 2 we are concerned that the new parking will block access to our own off street, driveway parking.</p> <p>I hope you can see from the plans here http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/tro-salisbury-zone-a-site-notice-woodstock-road.pdf that the proposed permit parking will block access to our driveway at number 2, as well as other houses numbers 3, 4 and 5 on the road. I am unsure if you have visited the site, as it would be clear to see that this is the case, or have you relied upon Google maps which are out of date showing the previous front gardens, that did not have a drive way and where the implementation of this scheme would be less of a concern?</p> <p>The previous owners had only laid the driveway, with the use of a council agreed company, within the last year. We have only recently moved into the property and we were sold the house under the understanding to both us and our solicitors that the dropped kerb and driveway had been agreed buy the council, so much so that the previous owners had to modify the driveway</p>	<p>Obviously the council undertook sites visits in preparing its proposals for Woodstock Road. In between the council's proposals for Woodstock Road being drafted and advertised for comment the dropped kerb accesses referred to by the correspondent have been installed.</p> <p>In view of the installation of the new dropped kerb accesses the council will clearly not be seeking to install the proposed residents parking bays. Instead the council will lay driveway protection (white bar) markings in front of the dropped kerbs.</p>

	<p>before the sale to fit in with the councils regulations regarding hard standings within the first meter of the premises.</p> <p>I have attached pictures of the street to enable you to see the problem that your proposal would incur for us as the proposed bays block access to our property, Number 2 which has the blue Vauxhall Astra on the driveway. it also shows the problems that you will be creating for houses 3-5 along the road.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you with plans of the changes that you will be making to this proposal,</p>	
36	<p>The reasons for changing the parking in Zone A in Salisbury "To provide additional parking spaces in Residents Parking Zone A, Salisbury" does not cover the times outside of 8am - 6pm Monday to Saturday where the real problem lies.</p> <p>During the day there is always somewhere to park. Outside of these hours when people return from work or visit the city then there is no parking.</p> <p>This can only create more problems when a visitor arrives and wants to stop for half an hour for a cuppa. Or a care worker needs to visit a patient. Or a trades man comes for a short time.</p> <p>If any changes are needed then extending the 2 hour free parking times beyond 6pm would be much more workable. Or even moving the times from 6pm to midnight giving the residents time to get home from work and park.</p> <p>Another suggestion (if this goes ahead even though I have not found a single person in this street in favour of it so would be interested why it did go ahead) would be to give the residents the option to let their guests have 2 hours free parking with a card or via online instead of having to give a 24 hour parking permit for someone popping in for half an hour.</p>	<p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. The only way to realistically address such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</p> <p>Salisbury District Council (when responsible for the residents parking schemes in Salisbury) undertook some limited consultation work in respect of possibly extending the hours of operation of residents parking schemes into the evening. The results of the consultation indicated that residents didn't favour such an option because any extension of the hours of operation would require the cost of permits to be significantly increased to cover the cost of undertaking enforcement later into the evenings and the availability of free parking in the city centre meant that extending the enforcement of residents parking schemes later into the evening would likely only impact upon themselves rather than commuters and shoppers.</p> <p>Subject to a policy change the hours of operation of residents parking schemes in Salisbury could be altered so that they operated later into the evening. The same applies to the terms and conditions relating to the issuing of visitor permits or the types of visitor permits issued. However, any changes of this nature sit outside of the scope of this review process. If the correspondent wishes to take these matters up they will need to contact the council's Parking Services Team directly. They can do so via parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p>

		<p>The council's proposals include the provision of one hour parking bays in both Hamilton Road (the road in which the correspondent lives) and Marlborough Road which could be used by visitors to residents of the roads (including trades persons) without needing to display a parking permit.</p>
<p>37</p>	<p>As a resident of Hamilton Road, I would like to clarify one or two points about the proposed changes to the parking in Zone A.</p> <p>Point 1 Hamilton Road – restricted area: 1 hour no return 8 – 6 Monday to Saturday Can residents still park in this area and not be restricted to 1 hour?</p> <p>Point 2 Wyndham Road Similar to Hamilton Road – Zone A permit holders not restricted to 1 hour parking in marked areas between 8 – 6 Monday to Saturday?</p> <p>Point 3 Castle Street Pay and Display Can Zone A permit holders park there without using the pay and display facility and for how long?</p> <p>Cost of parking permit</p> <p>Could you please confirm what the cost of a resident's parking permit will be once the changes are in place. My renewal is due in October.</p> <p>Late evening parking</p> <p>As you realise Zone A is an area with difficulties parking already as most residences do not have off-road parking. My main concerns include restricted parking for residents in the 1 hour parking zones which I hope you will be able to clarify for me.</p> <p>Another concern is late evening/night parking. It is already difficult to find a parking space within a reasonable walking distance from my home if I take the car out during the evening. With bad knees and concern for walking home on my own late at night, I am now concerned that some of the restrictions may impact on this to an even greater degree.</p> <p>Past 6p.m. there is no 'policing' of the parking and with no restricted time limit for visitors, I don't see this improving at all. In fact, with extra restrictions on parking spaces, I see this being even more difficult. This is extremely annoying, when as a resident you pay for the privilege to park near to your home but more often than not, have no chance of this if you have taken your</p>	<p><u>Response to Points 1 & 2</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 Hamilton Road and 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><u>Response to Point 3</u></p> <p>RPZA permit holders will be entitled to park in the Pay and Display parking bay in Castle Street without charge and without time limit.</p> <p><u>Cost of Parking Permit</u></p> <p>If the council's proposals are introduced on the ground then the cost of a residents parking permit will be £40 per year.</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 - http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/salisbury-residents-schemes-ts-and-cs-2016-feb.pdf.</p> <p><u>Late Evening Parking</u></p> <p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. The only way to realistically address</p>

	<p>car out in the evening.</p> <p>I would be grateful if someone could come back to me about these points.</p>	<p>such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</p> <p>Salisbury District Council (when responsible for the residents parking schemes in Salisbury) undertook some limited consultation work in respect of possibly extending the hours of operation of residents parking schemes into the evening. The results of the consultation indicated that residents didn't favour such an option because any extension of the hours of operation would require the cost of permits to be significantly increased to cover the cost of undertaking enforcement later into the evenings and the availability of free parking in the city centre meant that extending the enforcement of residents parking schemes later into the evening would likely only impact upon themselves rather than commuters and shoppers.</p> <p>Subject to a policy change the hours of operation of residents parking schemes in Salisbury could be altered so that they operated later into the evening. However, any such policy change sits outside of the scope of this review process. If the correspondent wishes to take this matter up they will need to contact the council's Parking Services Team directly. They can do so via parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p>
38	<p>I am responding to your plans for the new traffic for zone A and parking restrictions in Woodstock Road in Salisbury</p> <p>I live at No. 4 Woodstock Road. The proposed plans show proposed parking Mon-Sat 8 am - 6 am for Zone A permit holders only. I have recently obtained dropped kerb permission for the front of the house and this has been completed. My car is now parked on my drive. Your proposals would allow cars to park in front of my drive, leaving me unable to gain access or leave my house.</p> <p>I hope you can see that this must be a miscommunication between departments and that you will be able to reassure me of this.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to Comment Number 35.</p>
39	<p>I have looked carefully at the proposed new parking and waiting restrictions in St Marks Road, Salisbury, which the Council intends to change to "No waiting at any time" and "Permit holders only".</p> <p>As you know, when we were consulted previously, the majority of St Marks Road residents asked to keep the two-hour visitors' parking allowance. Now it seems that your Sustainable Transport Group has decided to ignore our response. May I ask why?</p> <p>The proposed restrictions will be completely unworkable for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residents without an internet connection will not be able to have visitors 	<p>It is accepted that St. Mark's Road currently experiences fewer daytime parking problems than the roads within RPZA that are located closer to the city centre, where there are greater problems with commuter and shopper parking reducing the number of spaces available to residents and their visitors. 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 the streets in RPZA located further away from the city centre. As such the council is seeking to address the zone as a whole by removing the ability for non permit holders to use the residents parking bays, doing so will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p>

	<p>during those restricted periods which fall outside the Council's office hours;</p> <p>2. Residents not at home, or not available to make a phone call or to access the Council's website, will not be able to have visitors;</p> <p>3. Anyone visiting while a resident is away (for example, to feed a pet or water the garden) will in many cases be unable to park legally because no-one will be available to organise their permit.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions are also completely unacceptable for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. For residents without an internet connection they will have a very severe impact. Many such people are vulnerable and elderly, and are likely to have caring needs which cannot always be planned for in advance. For instance, what will happen if such a person needs a carer to visit at short notice during the restricted period but outside the Council's office hours?</p> <p>2. It seems quite ridiculous to offer just four one-hour parking spaces at one end in a road with more than 100 households.</p> <p>3. In the case of urgent visits (for instance to attend to a gas or water leak), permits may be impossible to arrange in advance.</p> <p>4. If you were to visit St Marks Road between 8am and 6pm on any weekday, you would see that there are always plenty of vacant parking spaces. Daytime parking simply isn't a problem. Why are you taking this away from us?</p> <p>5. The Council has consulted residents, but has taken no notice of their replies.</p> <p>To conclude, I would remind you that the Council gave its reason for the changes as "For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs". In St Marks Road, Salisbury, we are all aware that this is a farce.</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 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 or emailing parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p>
40	<p>I have to say that I strongly disagree with your proposals. There might well be a case for your proposal close to the town centre but not for Marlborough Road where I live. We seldom if ever have problems with parking during the day. There can be problems at night when the parking is free.</p> <p>Your new system can only cause problems for tradesmen and businesses in the area. It also stops our friends from having a quick coffee.</p> <p>I also strongly object to the new system of issuing parking permits and ticket</p>	<p>It is accepted that Marlborough Road currently experiences fewer daytime parking problems than the roads within RPZA that are located closer to the city centre, where there are greater problems with commuter and shopper parking reducing the number of spaces available to residents and their visitors. 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 the streets in RPZA located further away from the city centre. As such the council is seeking to address the zone as a whole by removing the ability for</p>

	<p>which are not old people friendly. This was arbitrary introduced by Trowbridge without any consultation.</p> <p>I have raised this with my local councillor Mr Hoque, who has yet to reply to my email.</p>	<p>non permit holders to use the residents parking bays, doing so will result in more spaces being available to residents and their visitors across the whole of the zone.</p> <p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times.</p> <p>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. If the correspondent needs any help with the MiPermit system they can contact the council's Parking Services Team directly by phoning 01249 706131 or emailing parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p>
41	<p>I wish to object to the proposal to replace double yellow lines with a single white line in front of my garage which has been there for over 70 years. It will result in cars blocking access to my garage. This already can occur with the yellow lines, but with an 'advisory' line regular obstruction is inevitable causing me huge inconvenience. Please acknowledge and let me know exactly what the relevant regulations will say</p>	<p>The use 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 creates additional parking spaces elsewhere within RPZA.</p> <p>However, if the resident does not believe that the provision of a driveway protection marking at this location will be of benefit then one does not need to be provided.</p> <p>Therefore, the council will not proceed with the provision of a driveway protection marking in front of the driveway of No. 10 Queens Road and shall instead retain the existing double yellow lines.</p>
42	<p>I wish to comment on the plans for Zone A parking in Salisbury, reference LJB/TRO/SALSA.</p> <p>I would like to suggest a reduced-cost (to the Council) change to these plans (Point 1), and also make an objection to a point which gives serious concern to residents (Point 2).</p> <p>1) The parking issue for residents has always been the 2-hour free parking allowance for all-comers, giving immense pressure on parking in this area. Removing the 2-hour free parking and making the Zone Permit Holder-Only Parking will relieve most of this pressure during the daytime on Mon-Sat. It is therefore questionable whether so many of the proposed new parking</p>	<p><u>Response to Point 1</u></p> <p>The answer to this comment is a little bit yes and no.</p> <p>In the short term the fewer changes that are made in RPZA the less the scheme will cost to introduce on the ground. This is because there would be a need for fewer new signs to be manufactured and erected and less road markings to be laid.</p> <p>In the long term not providing the additional bays at this time would ultimately end up costing the council more money. The council would be required to undertake an additional TRO consultation to introduce the additional bays.</p>

	<p>bays are needed. I do understand that we must plan for future expansion of car ownership; however I do not think it necessary to expand the number of parking bays so much, and not doing so would surely save the Council some of its costs.</p> <p>2) I wish to <i>object strongly</i> to the proposed additional parking bays across the junction of Belle Vue Road with the entrance to Albany Road, and those at the right-angled bend on Albany Road by numbers 39 to 47. As someone who lives near this junction I have witnessed countless occasions over the years where heavy vehicles have strayed into this area by mistake: they cannot negotiate the corner on Albany Road even now, without any extra parking bays, so they reverse down Albany Road to the junction of it and Belle Vue Road where, with multiple manoeuvres, they turn and head back down Endless Street. I have already witnessed damage done to parked cars while this is happening; if there were cars parked across this junction during the daytime, the heavy vehicles would be unable to turn round and would be completely stuck on Albany Road.</p> <p>I would also point out that there are many bone fide heavy vehicles such as removal lorries which use these streets on a regular basis and which would experience great difficulty in negotiating corners that are filled with parked cars.</p> <p>I mentioned Point 2) in a previous consultation and the reply was that a sign would be erected on Endless Street. Please note <i>there has been a sign</i> on Endless Street for many years and it has made no difference at all. Anyone living in this area would be able to tell you about this problem.</p> <p>I am sure these bays have been planned with the best of intentions and with the aid of measurements and angles on a street plan. Believe me, HGV drivers do not conform to measurements and angles when turning their vehicles.</p> <p>Please do not impose a worse problem upon both the residents and the lost drivers, by putting parking bays in these specific areas which may then have to be removed again at a later date because of the issues they would cause. This would also be a great cost to the Council which I know it can ill afford.</p>	<p>This would incur costs in advertising its proposals in the local newspaper and the putting up / taking down of the site notices – costs which have already been paid for in respect of the additional parking bays as part of this TRO consultation. Additionally, factors such as inflation would also likely result in the works to provide the additional parking bays costing the council more.</p> <p><u>Response to Point 2</u></p> <p>If the council's proposals are implemented it is hoped that the proposed 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 and Belle Vue Road. Irrespective of the councils proposed amendments to RPZA the Salisbury Area Board (via its Community Area Transport Group) has agreed to fund the provision of improved signage in Endless Street informing drivers of large vehicles that this route is unsuitable for their vehicles.</p>
43	<p>I am writing to you in connection with the proposed changes to parking in Zone A in Salisbury. I am a resident of Park St and also work at Bourne Hill Council offices.</p> <p>My view is that these proposed restrictions are not helpful. I work for Wiltshire Council as an Advisory Teacher and the nature of my job, and many others who work in Bourne Hill offices, involves visiting schools and</p>	<p>I can address this point as an officer who works in Bourne Hill and that is in and out of the office undertaking site visits.</p> <p>It is in part the kind of parking described by the correspondent by Wiltshire Council staff that has led to requests for parking issues within RPZA to be addressed. It is understood that in the context of currently being able to use the spaces within RPZA why the correspondent feels that it will be more</p>

<p>also spending time in the office often for periods of less than 2 hours. In this sense the change will not affect me as I have a residents permit but many of my colleagues will find the proposed restrictions both inconvenient and time consuming as they have to travel from car parks like Central or Culver St for these brief visits. This is particularly the case as Salt Lane car park is no longer to be used with Council parking permits and I expect that the number of workers in the Bourne Hill offices parking in Zone A has increased since this change to council permits was made. There are many others who work in the building who have a similar pattern to their day and need to be in and out of the office.</p> <p>As a resident I find the hardest time to find a space is in the evening when the majority of residents are home from work. In this sense the proposed restrictions will not make any difference. I am also concerned that the very limited amount of 30 minute waiting will impact on the one shop in the area, the butchers at 99 Park St, as this may reduce the number of customers who come to the shop by car.</p>	<p>inconvenient for their colleagues to have to use Culver Street or Central Car Parks. Ultimately, though the correspondents' colleagues, like the majority of Wiltshire Council Bourne Hill staff have, will need to adapt to using the aforementioned car parks. With regard to Culver Street Car Park, it is only a five minute walk from the council office and it is difficult to argue that walking to and from it is significantly more inconvenient or time consuming than walking to and from a street within RPZA.</p> <p>Residents parking schemes in Salisbury operate between the hours of 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and are not intended to address parking problems outside of these times. Outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sundays all council owned city centre car parks are free to use. All city centre on-street Pay & Display parking bays are free to use and have no time restrictions on their use outside of the aforementioned hours. Similarly, outside of the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm all city centre on-street loading bays are unrestricted and can be parked in. Given the availability of free and unrestricted parking in the city centre there are few reasons for commuters or shoppers to be seeking to park within RPZA in the evening. The main factor affecting parking availability in the evening in RPZA is considered to be high levels of car ownership by residents of the zone. The only way to realistically address such problems is for residents of the zone to own fewer cars.</p> <p>Salisbury District Council (when responsible for the residents parking schemes in Salisbury) undertook some limited consultation work in respect of possibly extending the hours of operation of residents parking schemes into the evening. The results of the consultation indicated that residents didn't favour such an option because any extension of the hours of operation would require the cost of permits to be significantly increased to cover the cost of undertaking enforcement later into the evenings and the availability of free parking in the city centre meant that extending the enforcement of residents parking schemes later into the evening would likely only impact upon themselves rather than commuters and shoppers.</p> <p>Subject to a policy change the hours of operation of residents parking schemes in Salisbury could be altered so that they operated later into the evening. However, any such policy change sits outside of the scope of this review process. If the correspondent wishes to take this matter up they will need to contact the council's Parking Services Team directly. They can do so via parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p> <p>In addition to the council's proposal to introduce a 30 minute parking bay outside of Harrison's The Butchers (which could be used by customers visiting their premises) owners of businesses operating within RPZA are, subject to terms and conditions, entitled to apply for business permits.</p>
---	---

		<p>Business permits are designed to be handed in and out to customers visiting a business situated within a residents parking zone. Motorists displaying a valid business permit would be able to park in any of the permit holders only parking bays in RPZA without time restriction.</p>
<p>44</p>	<p>Subject to our reservations below, we agree in principle to the Council's proposed general upgrading of Salisbury's Zone A from a limited waiting residents parking zone to a no free parking residents only parking zone.</p> <p>Our first reservation is to ensure that all local businesses in Park Street and Estcourt Road will have adequate parking places near their premises during each working day for their visiting customers, clients or patients needing short-term parking.</p> <p>Our second reservation is about the way you propose to implement your virtual visitors parking permit scheme in Salisbury Residents Only Parking Zone A, compared with the old scratch card system you intend to phase out.</p> <p>The old system was simple and easy for residents to comply with, and for Council to administer and enforce. The proposed virtual system is unlikely to prove so - especially in relation to its visitor parking permit allocation requirements on residents. Compared to the old system, it appears unduly complex and not well thought through. It risks proving inefficient, difficult and costly to implement and manage (both for residents and Council).</p> <p>I've found the proposed virtual visitor parking allocation system not well understood by residents, and even by some of your staff I've been in touch with. The communication and technology demands it will likely place on elderly, infirm and other vulnerable residents could be particularly worrying and burdensome for them, their families and friends. This could lead to unexpected, inappropriate or mistaken parking fines for some of their visitors. Many elderly or vulnerable residents find the expected demands on them difficult to understand and likely difficult to do.</p> <p>Looking at the two systems more closely, the old scratch-card system showed all the information needed by enforcement officers for effective oversight and enforcement on the streets (unique number and date).</p> <p>By contrast, the proposed virtual allocation system requires residents to communicate to you, for the first time, new information not required before - the registration number of the visitor's vehicle, plus the time of day it will be parked -Why? Because, without the old scratch card permit of date allocated and a unique permit number, you won't have enough information for effective residential parking compliance oversight or enforcement.</p> <p>Under the old scratch card allocation system, a prepaid single permit card</p>	<p>The council's advertised proposals contain a number of 30 minute or one hour parking bays within RPZA to support the businesses and organisations operating within the zone. With specific regard to the correspondents' comments customers would be able to make use of the 30 minute bay proposed in the Park Street or the 30 minute or one hour bays proposed in Estcourt Road without needing to display a visitors scratch card or activating a virtual permit.</p> <p>In addition to the above, owners of businesses operating within RPZA are, subject to terms and conditions, 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 zone. Motorists displaying a valid business permit would be able to park in any of the permit holders only parking bays in RPZA without time restriction.</p> <p>The majority of the other comments submitted by the correspondent 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>Subject to a policy change the terms and conditions relating to the issuing of visitor permits or the types of visitor permits issued could be altered. However, any such policy change sits outside of the scope of this review process. If the correspondent wishes to take this matter up they will need to contact the council's Parking Services Team directly. They can do so via parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p> <p>More generally, 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 who do not understand how the virtual permit system works can contact the council's Parking Services Team directly by phoning 01249 706131 or emailing parking@wiltshire.gov.uk for assistance with it.</p>

could be allocated by the resident multiple times each day to successive visitors for parking, providing no two or more parked their respective vehicles in the zone at the same time. Each departing visitor could hand it back to the resident to pass to the visitor who will next arrive and park. Diligent officers could easily discern abuse and take enforcement action, where appropriate.

However when I asked your officials how the new virtual system would work with successive visitors, I got differing answers. One said a separate permit would be required for each separate visitor's car parked in the zone in the 24 hour period, regardless of whether their respective park periods overlapped or not. The other said that the one permit would cover each and all such notified vehicles under that permit in that 24 hour period, provided none of vehicles in fact parked on site under that permit at the same time.

All this new additional information you require residents to communicate to you for each expected or unexpected visitor, is information they may not always know in advance – reliably, or at all. The grace period is only some 10 minutes after the visitor parks, so is likely to be often exceeded (eg., due to a visitor needing to retrieve registration details from a recently rented car). Moreover, mistaken number plate details may be communicated, despite the best intentions of residents, their visitors and your staff. Any corrective action in any such case is likely to need at least another call, email, text or online communication to your staff from the resident, visitor or both.

Note also that there are also some factual inconsistencies within your different your website parking information materials, eg, the unit cost of a resident's only parking visitor permit will cost £4 for a book of 10 up to max 100 per annum. The next 50, will cost £2.85 each at current prices, equivalent to around 2-3 hours parking at a central Salisbury carpark, then any more at full central Salisbury all day prices (currently (£7.40 to £8.00) each. That is a huge cost to residents, remembering the £0.40 per permit will only apply if the resident uses just over 2 permits per week. That's just one tradesman's vis, a house cleaner and one friend to an elderly person. These inconsistencies and errors need rectifying quickly please, with the clearest and most prominent accurate online per permit pricing.

So your proposed virtual allocation system seems to load many new incremental burdens and potential compliance problems onto Zone A residents, which weren't there before under the old system. And those new burdens seem to flow solely or mainly from your decision to (a) scrap the need for visitors to display a prepaid, physical, visible, checkable and traceable allocated card permit within the visitor's parked vehicle, and (b) replace it with a virtual system requiring residents to communicate to you entirely new transient information for every visitor in every 24 hour permit

	<p>period for the new system to work at all</p> <p>In doing so, you seem to be passing most of the incremental burden and socio-economic cost of providing it onto the residents themselves, within communities in whose best interests you are elected and paid to act for the common good of all.</p> <p>At the least, it needs serious rethinking by those responsible, so that as far as possible the outcome is a win/win for all – including residents, their visitors and the Council.</p> <p>We recommend you simply continue a simple parking voucher allocation system. A scratch card is unnecessary and an undue expense. All that is needed is a ticket with printed unique number for enforcement purposes, and for the resident allocating it to simply handwrite their premises address on it together with the relevant pre-paid parking date.</p> <p>That revised simple system without a scratch card component should involve no incremental costs or burdens on either residents or the Council, and remove any premium cost Council may have had to pay for the production of the scratch card system within the old permit cards. And for both sides, it should reduce or avoid most unnecessary transaction costs, repetition, uncertainty, and wasted time, trouble, effort and expense – plus undue social embarrassment and unease between an allocating resident and visitor if a parking fine results.</p>	
45	<p>Very sad to see this proposal to reduce the available spaces for short two hour parking. This will impact on local shopping and visits to the three doctors, surgeries and many dentists in the vicinity. Such visits may exceed the 1 hour limits of " on street " paid parking, and greatly extend the distances from car parks. Once again Salisbury residents are destined to be charged excessive prices for using local services if this proposal is allowed.</p>	<p>A number of time limited parking bays are proposed within RPZA which can be used free of charge by visitors to Salisbury. These bays will be located within Belle Vue Road, Estcourt Road, Hamilton Road, Marlborough Road, Nelson Road, Park Street, St. Mark's Road and Wyndham Road.</p> <p>More generally shoppers visiting Salisbury are well catered for in terms of parking provision. In addition to the Park and Ride sites, city centre car parks and on-street Pay & Display parking bays 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>
46	<p>Please consider making the area in front of no 79, 81 'permit holders only '. The area on the right as you first drive into St Marks Road could be 'Parking Mon-Sat 8am-6pm 1 hour. No return within 2hrs'. This would be more convenient as there are no houses there.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to Comment Number 5.</p>
47	<p>Please note that the plan indicates an existing 'No Waiting at Any Time'</p>	<p>The correspondent is mistaken. The council's advertised proposals showed</p>

	<p>marking outside No75 which protects the driveway parking area of the house - in fact this is a White Bar area and we request that it remains as a White Bar area.</p>	<p>the area in front of the access to the driveway of No. 75 St. Mark's Road would be covered by a driveway protection (white bar) marking.</p>
<p>48</p>	<p>I agree with the main idea that the road should be permit holders only parking, but I do have issues with the green area, of one hour parking, Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm. Which is near my house at number 44.</p> <p><u>Firstly</u>, where are all the delivery vehicles going to park in that road, the van drivers will end up blocking the street when making deliveries, as no provision has been made for them in the road. Also when people have workmen coming to do repairs they will have the same problem. I suggest that the green area should be left for these people to use and not for one hour parking. Your idea by default means a different vehicle will be there every hour, every day, for however many spaces that you propose.</p> <p><u>Secondly</u>, the parking area that is green on your plans, that is near my house, that you are proposing should be one hour parking, is not a practical area for these spaces. Those houses directly affected by the parking will experience noise and the irritation of several vehicles every day, revving their engines, changing gear, doing five point turns to get their vehicle in the correct position, playing loud music or talking loudly on their phones, not to mention the slamming of doors. The best site for these people, wishing to avoid paying for parking, is around the corner by the post box which is on the wall of the car park.</p> <p>I realise that you may think that this is selfish of me not to have parking outside my house but despite the current restrictions about 30 cars a day park outside my house and I have experienced this disturbance for many years and I would not wish it on anyone else. I do hope you will consider my suggestions.</p>	<p><u>Response to Comment 1</u></p> <p>The removal of the ability for non permit holders to park in the residents parking bays within Belle Vue Road will create additional parking spaces. Delivery drivers would be able to park in these spaces to make deliveries. Additionally delivery drivers would be able to use the proposed one hour bay or park on any of the double yellow lines in the road to make deliveries.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 2</u></p> <p>The main aim of the review of RPZA is to provide as many parking spaces as possible for residents. However, meeting this aim has to be achieved whilst supporting businesses and organisations operating within the zone in accordance with the priorities set out within the council's business plan.</p> <p>A one hour space was proposed outside of Nos. 40-44 Belle Vue Road to aid the operation of a home business within the road. However, with the above said the suggestion of essentially swapping the restriction of the bay outside of Nos. 40-44 Belle Vue Road with that of the bay opposite No. 3 Belle Vue Road would not be detrimental to the overall aim of the review.</p>
<p>49</p>	<p>I strongly object to the suggested proposals. The only two houses to be adversely affected by them would be my own, no 81 and my adjoining neighbours at no 79 as you are suggesting the new "strip" of one hour parking to be sited outside our houses. This would undoubtedly restrict our ability to park here. I feel truly discriminated by this and want to know how you justify your decision especially as we pay the same for a residents permit as everyone else. It seems grossly unfair particularly as the "strip of parking" along from my house, no 81, and towards the junction of Queen's Rd has no homes fronting it and yet it is to be deemed residents parking only. Surely this should be the place for the one hour parking and the area in front of our houses returned to residents only parking. This way we, like the rest of the residents, have the possibility of parking in front of our homes - accepting there are no actual designated parking spaces - and will not be the ONLY ones having to contend with the one-hour "parkers".</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to Comment Number 5.</p>

	Please consider the alternative I have given you, it makes sense.	
--	---	--

Photos that Accompany Comment Number 33



Photos that Accompany Comment Number 35

