

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED IN OPPOSITION TO / COMMENTING ON THE COUNCIL'S
PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS, SALISBURY**

Comment Number	Comment	Officer Response
1	I object to the proposals being made for no waiting at any time. The cars parking along the road slows other drivers down and makes them take more care when passing the parked cars. Martins Close exit is on a blind corner therefore the slower the traffic the safer it is to pull out.	The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Heronswood will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.
2	<p>I was absolutely horrified to come home to this notice for proposed No Waiting on Heronswood after my holiday.</p> <p>There are very little parking areas for residents as it is and no garage parking either. This area is very much needed for residents parking.</p> <p>I am quite concerned with the traffic that comes down Heronswood from the housing areas further up. They drive down so fast and then have to slow right down near the parked cars (which is a good thing) and reduce to the correct speed. If this area becomes No Waiting, I can see a lot of accidents happening where the traffic won't slow down!</p> <p>I also have very elderly parents who visit quite often and if No Waiting is there, this will affect them and many other families around the area.</p>	The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Heronswood will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.
3	<p>I live in Martins Close Ridings Mead</p> <p>I feel we have never had a issue with parking in this area, I really don't know where you think all the cars are going to park there is not enough spaces in martins close as it is which is why people have to park on the road, if they are unable to park there the cars will be in closes that they don't live and cause them congestion</p> <p>Have you actually been in Heronswood during the day (there are no cars parked there)</p> <p>Absolutely outraged resident</p>	The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Heronswood will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.
4	My husband and I are residents of Martins Close where you propose to put no waiting at any time. From Heronswood up by Maplecroft to outside no 26 Martins Close Parking. It is very difficult now, so by stopping people parking on the road will make it almost impossible to park near our homes. It will just make people move further up the estate in crouching on other residents	The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Heronswood will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.

	<p>further up being unable to park. Many residents have adult offspring living at home because they cannot afford to get a place of their own. So therefore many households have more than 1 vehicle to park.</p> <p>I hope that you will not proceed with this.</p>	
5	<p>I do not understand the reason behind this proposal as this part of the road is only parked on at night when everyone is at home and then only on the western side. There is never congestion and in the 34 years that I have lived here there has not been an accident that I know of. Any further restriction on parking here will be a great inconvenience to residents of Martins Close and Ravenscroft who park vehicles on the road at night.</p>	<p>The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Heronswood will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.</p>
6	<p>With reference to the proposal of double yellow lines in Bower Gardens, Manor Farm Road and Shady Bower.</p> <p>I am a resident of Manor Farm Road and would like to register my disagreement with the proposal of double yellow lines for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parked cars currently impede the speed on this road, which is a good thing; the 20mph speed limit is consistently ignored so trying to exit a residence is always hazardous. 2. Double yellow lines would seriously impede weekend and evening activities for residents; as an 80 year old, visitors are important to me and if they couldn't park nearby, may not be able to walk from further away. 3. My neighbours are adults with learning difficulties - they require 24/7 carers who need to arrive and leave without restriction and who need to collect the residents sometimes for day trips. I would like to propose that instead of double yellow lines, you install single yellow lines and/or residents permit parking. <p>Furthermore, although this doesn't directly relate to the current proposal, I would suggest that speed humps would be much more effective in implementing the 20 mph speed limit.</p>	<p>The correspondent lives at the southern end of Manor Farm Road. The comments below relate to this location only.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 1</u></p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the presence of parked cars does help to slow vehicles down at this location, some of the parking that is currently taking place is also obstructing footways and impinging on access to and egress from private driveways. It is these issues that prompted requests from local residents for additional waiting restrictions to be introduced and the Council's proposals are designed to address them.</p> <p>Vehicles will continue to be able to park in Manor Farm Road even if the Council's proposals are implemented. The parking that remains will still help to control vehicle speeds as they approach the correspondent's property from the northern end of the road. The physical layout of the road already helps, and will continue to help, control vehicle speeds as they approach the correspondent's property from the southern end of the road.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 2</u></p> <p>As stated above vehicles will continue to be able to in park in Manor Farm Road even if the Council's proposals are implemented. If implemented, parking would be available approximately 40 metres to the north of the correspondent's property. In view of this it considered that the Council's proposals would not unduly impede resident's weekend and evening activities.</p> <p>In addition to this it should be noted that the correspondent has room to accommodate a minimum of three vehicles on the driveway within their property curtilage.</p>

		<p><u>Response to Comment 3</u></p> <p>It is not clear to which of her neighbours the correspondent is referring but all residents properties at the southern end of Manor Farm Road (below Westbourne Close) have driveways within their property curtilages that could accommodate a minimum of two cars. Therefore, the carers of the neighbours referenced by the correspondent should not have any issues accessing the property in question.</p> <p>More generally, the No Waiting At Any Time (NWAAT) restrictions proposed at this location should make it easier for the carers to access the property concerned as it will remove the parking that impinges on access to and egress from private driveways.</p> <p>The use of a 'No Waiting' (single yellow line) restriction would not be practical in this instance as outside of its hours of operation motorists would be able to park in such a way as to cause the problems that the Council's proposals are seeking to address. The introduction of a residents' parking scheme is outside the scope of these proposals; however, the correspondent can request the introduction of a residents' parking scheme through the Council's waiting restriction request process.</p>
7	<p>Martins Close properties do not have allocated parking spaces therefore parking is on a first come first served basis. Any restriction of parking on Heronswood will have a detrimental effect on residents as currently limited spaces will be further reduced. If this proposal goes ahead I envisage residents parking on paved areas at the entrance of Martins Close, especially when returning at night as there will be no alternative. As residents of Martins Close we strongly object to this proposal.</p>	<p>The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Heronswood will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.</p>
8	<p>Having reviewed this in more detail please be advised that I do NOT support the proposed "no waiting at any time" on both sides of Tollgate Road. The original request was for outside numbers 4-10 only to allow residents of those houses and "Stonemasons Yard" to turn left out of the estate without having to cross to the other side of the carriageway on the exit of a sharp corner. Restricting waiting on the opposite side will have no effect on anything, residents and their visitors park there already without a problem, as do visitors to the nursing home and associated doctors, nurses and the like. The loss of parking from outside 4-10 is mitigated by the additional spaces created outside 26 – 36 but restrictions to the other side of the carriageway would just make a difficult situation worse. Also the restricted waiting zone that applies outside no 14 – 24 needs to be extended down the hill to the dropped kerb outside No.12. Happy to meet on site to discuss but I would rather pull the no waiting zone completely than restrict both side of the street.</p>	<p>The original request for additional NWAAT restrictions in Tollgate Road raised two issues. One being that vehicles were parking on the footway outside Nos. 8-10 Tollgate Road when the 'No Waiting' restriction in situ was not in operation and as such parking was forcing pedestrians to walk in the road. The second, as stated in the comments, was to remove parking from outside Nos. 4-10 Tollgate Road so that vehicles turning left out of Stonemasons yard did not have to cross into the wrong lane and risk colliding with cars entering Tollgate Road from Rampart Road.</p> <p>In considering the issues raised replacing the existing 'No Waiting Mon-Saturday 8.00am-6.00pm' restriction outside Nos. 4-10 Tollgate Road with NWAAT restrictions would address them. However, by providing NWAAT restrictions at this location the problems being experienced could simply be just shifted to the opposite side of Tollgate Road where there is currently a 'No Waiting Mon-Saturday 8.00am-6.00pm' restriction in situ. Retention of a 'No Waiting' restriction outside of Nos. 5-27 Tollgate Road would potentially allow vehicles to park on wider parts of the footway and that vehicles</p>

		<p>egressing the private driveways could be forced to cross over into the wrong lane. As such, the introduction of NWAAT restrictions outside of Nos. 5-27 Tollgate Road was proposed to prevent such issues from arising.</p> <p>Since receipt of these comments, officers have undertaken six visits to Tollgate Road outside of the hours of operation of the existing 'No Waiting' restriction. During those site visits only one car was witnessed to be parked on the 'No Waiting' restriction. On this basis it would appear that the 'No Waiting' restriction is subject to limited amounts of parking and that the introduction of NWAAT restrictions outside of Nos. 5-27 Tollgate Road would not cause undue problems for residents and their visitors. Any parking that does take place on the 'No Waiting' NWAAT restriction outside of Nos. 5-27 Tollgate Road would be able to be accommodated in the additional spaces proposed outside of Nos. 28-36 Tollgate Road or in the underutilised spaces available Fowlers Hill (which adjoins Tollgate Road).</p> <p>The existing parking bay outside Nos. 14-26 Tollgate Road does not currently extend to the top of the dropped kerb outside of No. 12 Tollgate Road to aid visibility for motorists egressing from Stonemasons Yard. Visibility at this location is already restricted by the presence of the existing parking bay, the curvature of Tollgate Road and the building line. Extending the parking bay would unnecessarily restrict visibility for motorists egressing from Stonemasons Yard and would be in direct contradiction to the comments submitted by residents of Stonemasons Yard (please refer to Comment No. 16) in response to the Council's proposals which have asked for the parking bay in question to be shortened to improve visibility.</p> <p>In consideration of the above it is not proposed to make any changes to the Council's proposals for Tollgate Road.</p>
9	<p>Regarding Wiltshire Council's proposal to prohibition and restriction of waiting, taxi rank clearways and on street parking consolidation order ...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why? 2. There is currently no problem with parking, waiting or taxi rank waiting. 3. This would be a costly waste of money. 4. Nobody has inspected this road. If they had, they would see that there are absolutely no issues with any of the above in this road. 5. Very, very few cars park along here during the day – maybe three or four. In the evening the cars park neatly on one side of the road only. Enforce parking restrictions and you are merely going to cause parking problems in nearby streets. Ever heard of building on flood plains and what happens further downstream? The same principle applies. 6. Please do not do it!! <p>Thanks for reading this.</p>	<p>The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Heronswood will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.</p>

10	<p>I am writing regarding the proposed changes to the road markings outside of my property 1 Bouverie Ave. I can see no reading whatsoever for making these changes and would oppose them strongly.</p> <p>1. There have not been any accidents on the road to my knowledge. 2. The changes would not be regulated in any meaningful way. We have had cars parked on the double yellow lines outside my parking bay obstructing the view of the road for days and no tickets have been issued. I have previously called to complain about this. How often do parking wardens come up to Bouverie Ave? 3. Clearly this would cost money and as a tax payer I object to my money being wasted on this when there are so many other things that need improvement.</p>	<p>There are existing NWAAT restrictions on the south-western side of Bouverie Avenue which end in line with the boundary between No. 1 Bouverie Avenue and No. 122 Coombe Road. The resident of No. 122 Coombe Road has requested that the NWAAT restrictions are extended to prevent vehicles parking in between the end of the existing restrictions and the start of the dropped kerb access to their driveway as parking at this location obstructs access to / egress from their driveway.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 1</u></p> <p>The collision database maintained by the Police which records the details of all collisions on the highway that result in personal injury indicates that in the preceding 10 year period to March 2018 (as the most recent data available) there have been no recorded collisions in Bouverie Avenue.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 2</u></p> <p>Parking Services undertake regular enforcement in Bouverie Avenue and seek to visit the area at least twice a week. If the correspondent feels a greater level of enforcement is required in Bouverie Avenue or targeted enforcement is required to deal with a specific issue then they can request such activities by contacting Parking Services via 01249 706131 or parking@wiltshire.gov.uk.</p> <p><u>Response to Comment 3</u></p> <p>The comment is noted.</p>
11	<p>I have just become aware of your consultation to make Lime Kiln Way a no waiting area. I regularly park for short times on Lime Kiln Way as I visit my sister who lives there and at no time have I witnessed a problem with parking. A few cars park in the layby (possibly hospital workers) and other cars on the road obviously belong to residents. If this becomes a no waiting area I will have to find places to park further in the estate which will cause a bigger problem. I will not be able to use the layby more than once as it is only for 2 hours and I may pop in 3 or 4 times perhaps for only 20 or 30 minutes at a time. I regularly help out with my sister's dog and deliver shopping and this no waiting will mean it will be difficult for residents to have visitors. I would understand if there was a problem with parking all along this road but there is not. I feel it will be the residents and their visitors that will be disadvantaged.</p>	<p>The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Lime Kiln Way will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.</p>
12	<p>Why? There is currently no parking restrictions of any kind. The road is effectively a cul-de-sac within a housing estate with no through traffic. The road is lightly used and has 20 mile an hour speed restriction. It seems ridiculous that a no waiting any time restriction is being proposed. Where are residents and visitors supposed to park? It will just cause problems in</p>	<p>The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Lime Kiln Way will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.</p>

	nearby streets when there is no problem at the current time. There are sometimes cars parked outside houses but there is plenty of room for cars to get through. To my knowledge there has never been a problem.	
13	<p>I am objecting to the proposals for Lime Kiln Way as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any parking problems in Lime Kiln Way have only started since the NHS Trust started charging for staff parking at the nearby hospital. 2. Any parking problems in Lime Kiln Way exist because the designated Visitor Parking lay-by is now occupied predominantly by hospital workers in the daytime; hence visitors to Lime Kiln Way have to now park on the road. 3. By denying visitor parking in the designated lay-by (which the proposal restricts to 2 hours; not long enough for e.g. family visits), and also on the road, there is nowhere for visitors to park at all. 4. On the original build plans (I have a copy), the layby was designated for visitor parking; the proposal denies this capability other than for short visits less than 2 hours. <p>Any current problem that we do have in Lime Kiln Way is a result of the NHS parking policy at the hospital; hence the proposals address a symptom of a problem and not its root cause, and in doing so deny the capability of residents in Lime Kiln Way to have visitors.</p> <p>Therefore please reconsider the proposal.</p>	The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Lime Kiln Way will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.
14	<p>We are writing to object to the proposal to restrict parking in Jewell Close, Bishopdown, in front of numbers 15-21. Parking outside these numbers Jewell Close does not cause any visual obstruction to the corner. Parking on the corner past the residential dwellings we agree does and this problem has increased greatly since the arrival of the current residents of number 15 Jewell Close. They have a number of visitors in cars and vans daily who also park on the grass area immediately outside the flat and across the road from Jewell Close in front of London Road. There are also issues with various care workers parking irresponsibly on the outside of the bend at the entrance to Hallum Close at numerous times of the day. . Parking is already limited in this section of Jewell Close and limiting this further will only force more parking moving to adjacent streets and on the front grass gardens which will impact on the view of the corner more . The main problem with this area is that residents drive too fast around the corner with no care or concern. We would suggest a traffic calming bump would have more impact on the problem. We feel this restriction would also impact on the value of our property. The problems have also been caused with lack of foresight when the roads leading on from Jewell Close were originally built. If the safest option is to keep part of Jewell Close clear then additional parking should</p>	The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Jewell Close will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.

	<p>have been provided with a parking bay opposite as there are in other areas of the estate. We have lived here for twenty years and cannot recall any accidents. We have had concerns about safety only due to people driving too fast for the road conditions. If you decide to implement these proposals people will in our opinion only drive faster through our close thus endangering a large number of young children living in and playing around / walking to and from school in this area. We appreciate the numbers of vehicles and speed have increased since the estate was built but at the moment cars are generally more careful when driving through our road because of the corner. People need to appreciate it's a residential area with no speed humps and treat it as such.</p>	
15	<p>I am concerned that the introduction of further parking/waiting restrictions on Highbury Avenue will place more pressure on the residents' car park at The Spinney.</p> <p>Despite only two of the residents' (myself included) actually owning a car, the car park is often filled to capacity, with residents from nearby properties/streets frequently ignoring the signage and parking and/or waiting there themselves.</p> <p>I am not against further restrictions in principle, but strongly feel they need to be implemented in conjunction with a resident's permit scheme for The Spinney car park.</p>	<p>It accepted that the introduction of the Council's proposals for Highbury Avenue may displace parking currently taking place within the road into the resident's car park at The Spinney (a Council owned block of flats). However, in a practical sense it won't change the parking situation in The Spinney car park which, as the correspondent acknowledges, is already often full.</p> <p>The introduction of a residents' parking scheme is outside the scope of these proposals. It is worth noting that the Council consulted residents of Highbury Avenue (including those living in The Spinney) on the introduction of a residents' parking scheme in 2016 but received insufficient responses to progress with a scheme. However, the correspondent can request that the introduction of a residents' parking scheme in the area is revisited through the Council's waiting restriction request process.</p>
16	<p>The Stonemasons Yard Management are requesting that the proposed scheme be modified to conform with our original request of January 2016.</p> <p>The reason for that request was for safety issues due to the poor visibility when leaving Stonemasons Yard especially of traffic coming from the direction of Southampton Road. This problem is clearly indicated on the plan shown as a part of the present proposal.</p> <p>To eliminate this problem it was proposed that the parking bays in front of Nos. 14 , 16 and 18 Tollgate Road should be removed and replaced by addition parking bays outside No, 28 to 34 Tollgate Road</p> <p>In addition it was also suggestion that the existing single yellow line should be changed to double yellow lines. This is because casual parking on the single yellow lines often obscures traffic coming from Rampart Street.</p> <p>Stonemasons Yard Management are fully in agreement with the proposed double yellow lines with restrictions at all times.</p>	<p>The original WR1 form submitted to the Council requesting amendments to the waiting restrictions in Tollgate Road to aid vehicles egressing Stonemasons Yard made no reference to removing the existing parking bay in front of Nos. 14-18 Tollgate Road. Accordingly, doing so was not considered by the Council as part of its proposals.</p> <p>However, even had the WR1 form referenced removing the aforementioned parking bay then it is unlikely that the Council would have taken such a proposal forward. Whilst it is accepted that visibility at this location is already restricted by the presence of the existing parking bay, the curvature of Tollgate Road and the building line the existing parking bay ends at a point where 10 metres of visibility of traffic approaching from the right is afforded to motorists egressing Stonemasons Yard. This level of visibility is line with the advice provided in the Highway Code.</p> <p>In consideration of the above it is not proposed to make any changes to the Council's proposals for Tollgate Road.</p>

	<p>However it would seem that our original and main requests concerning the lack of visibility due the positioning of the parking bays outside Nos. 14, 16 and 18 Tollgate Road has been totally ignored.</p> <p>Perhaps you should reconsider this proposal in the light of the original intentions of the request.</p>	
17	<p>I would like to say that in life no matter what race or creed a person lives under the general idea is to live our life from the cradle to the grave, HELPING everyone to live their lives as peacefully without stress as possible.</p> <p>Do unto others as you would be done by. Forgive us our trespasses AS WE FORGIVE THOSE THAT TRESPASS AGAINST US.</p> <p>I protest against the proposed parking restriction to be introduced in Jewell Close as being totally unnecessary. And would cause a lot of unnecessary stress and inconvenience for the residents involved. It would be a contradiction of people helping each other in a forgiving tolerant manner. What are the reasons for imposing this restriction? I imagine that it will be said that the roadside parking causes a danger. Well my reply to this is that every time I go out I am in potential danger, from being run over.</p> <p>The danger is not the road but is always the case it is the way the vehicle is being driven. For the benefit of those who do not know. The rule of speed is ONLY DRIVE AT A SPEED THAT ALLOWS YOU TO STOP SAFELY WITHIN THE DISTANCE THAT YOU CAN SEE TO BE CLEAR ON YOUR SIDE OF THE ROAD. That proves the danger is not created by the parked cars, but by the careless drivers approaching the corner too quickly, there are more vehicle on the road than ever, it should not be a surprise if unprepared we meet another vehicle on a corner, a good driver should be anticipating that happening. If any situation creates a situation where drivers have to slow down, it is a frustration for them, so in this case they say the obstruction is dangerous, and the obstruction removed, without caring how this would affect others.</p> <p>So if this is implicated vehicles will go even faster down this narrow road where families live with many young children playing.</p> <p>I would like to know, how many accidents have taken place in this bit of road since it was built in 1960? And how many serious injuries and deaths, I suspect none.</p> <p>The parking problems that we all have were created by the lack of foresight of so called planning experts in 1960, who did not anticipate the increase in vehicle use. And made no provision for this in their plan. They no doubt are</p>	<p>The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Jewell Close will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p>The Council is currently in the process of implementing proposals to introduce waiting restrictions in both Somerset Road and Bishopdown Road to address the school parking problems referenced by the correspondent. If the correspondent wishes to find out more about these proposals then they can do so by visiting the following webpage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=1297 <p>The collision database maintained by the Police which records the details of all collisions on the highway that result in personal injury indicates that in the preceding 10 year period to March 2018 (as the most recent data available) there have been no recorded collisions in Jewell Close. However, there has been one recorded collision in Woodvill Road which is accessed via Jewell Close.</p> <p>The correspondent makes several references to locations where they believe speeding vehicles are causing road safety concerns, including within Jewell Close. If the correspondent wishes to see if any of the locations referenced do actually have speeding problems they will need to raise an Area Board Issue. This would then allow the Council to arrange for metro count surveys to be undertaken in any locations identified. A metro count survey is a type of traffic survey that records the volume and speed of traffic using a road. The results of this survey will help to determine if speeding is creating a highway safety problem in the road(s) surveyed and what, if any, measures would be appropriate to deal with the problems identified. An Area Board Issue can be raised via the following webpage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://services.wiltshire.gov.uk/Forms/area_board/report_issue.php?area_board=Salisbury

	<p>living in the sun on a huge pension in Spain with a smile on their face.</p> <p>What thoughts or consideration is being given to the residents needs who will have to find another place to park their cars, which will make them more likely to be vandalised if parked out of sight? Plus the inconvenience of getting to and fro in bad weather. This will also affect property values. Most homes now own more than one vehicle, which adds to the problems with nowhere to park this restriction will only add to my problem in Hallum Close, which is already very congested. There are no alternative parking places in the area. So where will the vehicles park? If not allowed in this road.</p> <p>I recently wrote to my County Councillor about parking problems in Hallum Close, He did not bother to reply to my letter no doubt too busy on all the various committees he serves on. That makes the slogan where everybody matters a joke, they should add, apart from the public who have to do what Uncle Joe tells them to do. We have to just simply do as we are told bleat like Sheep pay our Taxes, vote and shut up.</p> <p>The number of carers who park in Hallum Close visiting elderly residents two or three times a day. Already causes a problem, which we tolerate. But with all the parking spaces occupied by residents of Jewell Close without a parking space of their own, will be another problem created. And cause a lot of friction in what is now a quiet friendly atmosphere.</p> <p>The parking situation in Hallum Close in which there are 15 properties is that only half of these have kerbside parking of which 7 of the remaining places are taken by two families and the parking bay with a dropped kerb is completely blocked all the time.</p> <p>As for road safety there is a speed limit of 20 mph in force for the whole of Bishopdown which is never enforced most drivers ignore it and speed along at about at 35mph on Bishopdown Road. And some do along Jewell Close.</p> <p>Parking by the schools in Cornwall Road/Bishopdown Road is chaotic and very unsafe dangerous but allowed by the authorities. Drivers parking on both sides of the narrow road which is a bus route create conditions that make it difficult and dangerous for bus drivers to get by, there already has been an accident when the Police were called. The parking on the pavements which were never built to take the weight of vehicle damages the surfaces and cost a lot of money to repair. This arrogant thoughtless behaviour of not obeying the Highway Code, gives children who we all care about a very bad example of how to behave on the road. As children use their parent and elders as role models what does this teach them?</p> <p>This parking restriction in Jewell Close is proposed under the guise of</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>safety. Yet the safety issues that I have raised will continue to be ignored. Yet the parking in Jewell Close becomes an Issue WHY?</p> <p>If the Council introduce the parking restrictions. Probably about six families directly and many more indirectly will be affected by this parking restriction who will be in despair at the lack of respect and consideration for their daily lives and needs.</p> <p>Safety issues may be used as an excuse to ban parking, but the real reason maybe to allow large vehicles to progress more easily.</p>	
18	<p>I am absolutely opposed to the proposed extension to parking restrictions on Bouverie Avenue, very few of the houses at this end of Bouverie Avenue have off street parking, and in addition 5 houses on Coombe Road - 126 - 134 have access from their back gardens to this end and we all use this part of Bouverie Ave to park our cars, as there is very little other parking available to us. In addition it serves no purpose, as a car parked in the proposed area to restrict does not cause an obstacle, in fact it would make more sense remove some of the yellow lines, there is at least one more space that could gained by doing this with no disruption to traffic.</p>	<p>There are existing NWAAT restrictions on the south-western side of Bouverie Avenue which end in line with the boundary between No. 1 Bouverie Avenue and No. 122 Coombe Road. The resident of No. 122 Coombe Road has requested that the NWAAT restrictions are extended to prevent vehicles parking in between the end of the existing restrictions and the start of the dropped kerb access to their driveway as parking at this location obstructs access to / egress from their driveway.</p> <p>The Council is aware that Nos. 126-134 Coombe Road have access to Bouverie Avenue via their back gardens and that residents of these properties seek to park in Bouverie Avenue because it is not practical to park on Coombe Road. If the Council's proposals are introduced they will not prevent residents of Nos. 126-134 Coombe Road (nor any residents from properties in Bouverie Avenue) from being able to park in Bouverie Avenue but might slightly change where within the road they do park.</p> <p>If the correspondent wishes to find out more about the introduction of the existing waiting restrictions in Bouverie Avenue then they can do so by visiting the following webpage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://cms.wiltshire.gov.uk/ieDecisionDetails.aspx?ID=128
19	<p>I am absolutely opposed to the parking restrictions being extended. There is simply not enough parking space currently, the majority of houses at this end of Bouverie Avenue do not have off street parking, and in addition 5 houses in Coombe Road 126-134 have access to this end of Bouverie Avenue and we use this to park our cars. There is simply no reason to extend the restrictions, in fact it would be more sensible to reduce the restricted area as there is at least one additional space that could be utilised if the restrictions were reduced. Additional restrictions will lead to an additional parking burden. Unless there are plans in place to create additional parking spaces on Coombe Road this will cause parking chaos.</p>	<p>This comment has been submitted by the same correspondent who submitted Comment No. 18 and the content is very similar to Comment 18. Therefore, please refer to the response Comment 18.</p>

20	<p>I would like to make an inquiry about the above proposal we have seen posted near where we live.</p> <p>First based on our address, are we going to be affected by this, as it will be great concern for us where we can park our car.</p> <p>Secondly if we are affected, surely the proposal should have been cascaded to the residents that will be affected, not just posted on a lamp post about 15 meters away from us.</p> <p>I would like to know if there was any concern/ issues raised hence the proposal was made. Surely as a neighbouring community, people should be adult enough to talk to one another.</p> <p>On my understanding the area that are being proposed are the only access we have to get in out of our homes. There are few flats on that road, so surely there will be a lot of residents that will be affected and I do feel are being singled out by this proposal. If the council can provide a suitable parking maybe this should be considered too.</p> <p>The corner of where we live, residents normally park there sensibly, but during the course of the day, there are lots of carers and district nurses who comes and go to visit older residents who live on that area.</p> <p>I think that these proposals are very unfair and discriminating to certain residents only, because if the council choose to do this, they should consider these to all residential areas in Salisbury. There are is also not enough council garages that you can rent out and if you find one, it is very expensive for people to afford.</p> <p>I hope you can please give us an answer on this inquiry and answer if this will go ahead at all, or would like to know the process how this is approved by the council.</p> <p>We have lived on the area for the last 12 years so we would like to know if this is going to affect our way of living.</p>	<p>The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Jewell Close will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p>Whether or not the correspondent will be affected by the proposals is clearly something for them to determine.</p> <p>Highway law states the public highway is for the passage and re-passage of persons and goods, and consequently any parking on the highway is an obstruction of that right of passage. There are no legal rights to park on the highway, or upon the Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking on the public highway, but parking is condoned where the right of passage along the highway is not impeded. As there are no legal rights to provide parking on the public highway its removal is not considered to be discriminatory.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council follows the nationwide procedure for consulting on the introduction of waiting restrictions (such as double yellow lines or parking bays). As part of this procedure the Council erects notices in the streets where restrictions are proposed to inform residents of them. Residents can then view the proposals in detail online (or in person at Salisbury Library) and submit comments on the proposals. This process has been followed. Indeed the comments submitted by the correspondent have been submitted as part of said process. All comments received by the Council are then considered in a report presented to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Waste who will then, in consideration of the comments received, make the final decision as to whether or not the proposed NWAAT restrictions will be introduced on the ground.</p>
21	<p>Thank you very much for taking time on replying to my email. The information you gave was very informative, but to a person like us who has very little understanding on highway law, it is very exhausting.</p> <p>I appreciate that a local resident has raised a concern regarding parking on the junction that was mention, but by just looking at the poster that was put by the council, how I understand is, we will be the only resident that will be potentially affected by this. Looking at the said poster it looks like that the front of our house was very much singled out if the double yellow line will</p>	<p>The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Jewell Close will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report. Specific comments not addressed in the main report will be considered below.</p> <p>For the purpose of clarity the originator of the request for NWAAT restrictions to be introduced in Jewell Close did not single any residents or properties out in their comments. The comments submitted as part of said request were about general road safety concerns arising as a result of parking taking place in the vicinity of the bend.</p>

	<p>reach up to the front of our house. I can assure you that maybe every single junction on this estate, people are parking on every single junction. These area are residential not a main highway road that will cause risk and accident to motorists. That is why I mention quite discriminating because if it is a single complaint or concern, surely the council should look at every single junction on this residential area, that we can all complaint about. Otherwise council are not looking at all the highway law fairly on this type of residential location.</p> <p>You mention about parking on Hallum Close. It might not be an issue to anybody, but 2 years ago, my car wheel trim was stolen and a horrible person wipe a dog poo on my windscreen, whilst I was park just right at the side of our house in Hallum Close. My car was even hit my somebody and just run off without taking responsibility of the accident. This was reported to the police, but has never really suspected that a neighbour can do this to us. Since then we just stay away from parking there just to keep away from the neighbours who seems to be very territorial on the parking spaces. I do park on the junction in Hallum Close and Jewell Close, but we always make sure that Car can turn and pass through the street and not causing any disruption to other resident. We are not troublesome people and we keep things and personal life to ourselves, but I do feel now that we are target because we have different nationality. I do not believe on raising issue on race, but to me a good neighbour can be honest and open to one another if they think that where we park our car is causing concern and nuisance to our neighbour.</p> <p>As I said we are not the only one parking on that area, but feel that if this goes through we are the only resident being penalised for this. We have also in the past inquired renting council garages but, spaces are very limited and very costly.</p> <p>We would like to be very much informed if the proposal will happen. If we were the only the resident that will be affected by this, we would like to know if we can make an appeal and lodge a reconsideration from the Council.</p> <p>We do are not difficult people and always abide the law hence we are raising our concern on this proposal.</p> <p>Thanks once again and I hope that this email are logged and added on this TRO Consultation.</p>	<p>In general there is no need to introduce double yellow lines at every junction because, the Highway Code (to which all users of the public highway must adhere) states that motorists should not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction. If motorists park within 10 metres of a junction they could be considered to be causing an obstruction of the public highway and liable to enforcement action by the Police. However, when the Council receives concerns about parking it has to consider the introduction of measures to address those concerns which is why NWAAT restrictions are being considered in Jewell Close.</p> <p>The correspondents' property is not the only property in Jewell Close that it is proposed to introduce NWAAT restrictions in front of and if introduced these restrictions will stop all motorists parking at the locations they are provided and not just the correspondent.</p>
22	<p>As residents of Russell Road we are writing in response to the current proposal for 'No waiting at any time' on Russell Road Ref-LJB/TRO/SALStrev.</p> <p><u>The issues</u></p>	<p>The Council is fully aware of the pressure on parking in Russell Road. This is why residents of Russell Road (amongst others) have twice been consulted on the introduction of a residents parking scheme. First in 2005 and then again 2016. In 2005 there was no overall support for the introduction of a residents' parking scheme from residents of the road. In 2016 there was marginal support for a scheme to be introduced into the road from the</p>

<p>Although we understand the requirement for this proposal we feel there is a strong need to raise our concerns and discuss the affect that any restrictions would have on a road that is already struggling under the strain for the demand for parking in the area. We feel if the restrictions were introduced without consideration or without possible other changes being introduced the issues detailed below will only be exacerbated.</p> <p>Russell Road is made up of 88 properties that include Raglan Court (a set of 35 retirement flats with a small amount of off street parking) and another 40 houses in the road, built on the old Nestle Factory site, which already have their own dedicated parking spaces. This leaves 11 houses, of which 2 have garages for off street parking, which need to park on Russell Road. These 9 houses battle with the parking overspill from Bedford Road, Highfield Road, Devizes Road and the numerous other streets that lead off Devizes Road. Also visitors and carer's for Raglan Court come and go regularly using the on street parking.</p> <p>During the week when many people are at work this is not usually an issue until after 5pm. However after this and on weekends the road is overly congested as it gets filled with cars from the surrounding streets as well as people who use the road to park work vehicles over the weekend such as tool hire companies, driving instructors and taxis. Some people also leave there cars here for weeks, presumably they are away and this is a great place to park if you don't want to get a ticket. This itself has caused other issues as detailed below. The sheer volume of cars means people are almost daily double parked and parking on every inch of available space including the proposed no waiting zone. Please refer to the photographs and map included that shows the limited parking areas.</p> <p>Non-residents cars have also caused more serious issues when parked here due to not being able to identify them to ask them to move if needed. There have been incidents where emergency vehicles have struggled to manoeuvre because of these vehicles being parked on corners. There has also been an issue when the water board had come and coned off an area to find they could not do the planned work as a car was parked over the drain and had been for 3 days; as a nonresident of the street the owner could not be contacted to move the car. If there were allocated areas for resident's cars to park, any cars causing any potential issues would be easily identified as so and could therefore be asked to move. Non-resident's cars if restricted would need to move within a shorter time frame and this would ease the congested parking situation. As you can see although some of these issues may appear to be minor, they are causing concern amongst the residents in case a real emergency happened in our street.</p> <p>Russell Road is now an island for parking due to the restrictions in the</p>	<p>residents who responded to the consultation. However, the response rate to the consultation was insufficient to allow a scheme to be introduced. For a scheme to be considered for introduction a response rate of 50% or greater to the consultation is required. The response rate from residents of Russell Road was 22%.</p> <p>The Council would be prepared to consider the introduction of a residents' parking scheme in Russell Road if residents can demonstrate that there is now a sufficient level of support for one. The correspondent can request the introduction of a residents' parking scheme through the Council's waiting restriction request process.</p> <p>In respect of the request for allocated parking spaces for the nine properties in the Russell Road without a dedicated parking space then it is not possible to allocate parking spaces on the public highway for use by an individual resident (or property).</p> <p>The NWAAT restrictions proposed for Russell Road were requested to improve visibility at a junction between Russell Road and one of the spurs off of it to address a road safety concern.</p> <p>The correspondent's comments focus on the fact that the provision of NWAAT restrictions would reduce the number of parking spaces in Russell Road and thereby put further pressure on the remaining spaces within the road. It is important to consider these comments in the context of what both highway law and the Highway Code states on the provision of parking on the public highway.</p> <p>Highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of persons and goods, and consequently any parking on the highway is an obstruction of that right of passage. There are no legal rights to park on the highway, or upon the Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking on the public highway, but parking is condoned where the right of passage along the highway is not impeded.</p> <p>The Highway Code (to which users of the public highway must adhere) states that motorists should not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction. This is specifically to protect visibility and turning manoeuvres at junctions. Any residents parking within 10 metres of a junction could be considered to be causing an obstruction of the public highway and liable to enforcement action by the Police. Therefore, whilst it is proposed to introduce NWAAT at a junction between Russell Road and one of its spurs it should be remembered that motorists should not be parking at this location any way.</p>
--	---

<p>surrounding roads and there has been a noticeable increase in vehicle activity because of this. The road as previously mentioned is saturated and often people, including residents, are unable to park here and then have to rely on roads such as Highbury Avenue to park. Cars are also double parked due to the limited space and this itself causes issue.</p> <p>The planned restrictions would mean the loss of at least 4 parking spaces here and a possible 10 on Highbury Avenue. It is inevitable that the issues will only increase due to a limitation of spaces. Having spoken to some of our neighbour's they already feel that they cannot go out in the evening or weekends in case they come home and cannot park. Having had to struggle with a child and shopping from streets away back to Russell Road we can certainly understand their concerns and often ourselves choose not to go out because of the anxiety of not being able to park in the vicinity of our home. There is a need to address an already strained parking situation before it becomes much worse due to the inevitable rise in car ownership within the existing residences. The number of proposed new properties being built off the Devizes Road and within the vicinity of Russell Road will only increase demand for parking. By limiting the spaces here without addressing the mentioned parking issues it is going to make daily parking on the street much harder.</p> <p>We are sure you already appreciate Russell Road is an area quite different from those streets in its vicinity due to the makeup of the residential properties. We would therefore ask you to consider that there needs to be changes made to the parking. The Council has previously written to residents with a parking questionnaire and residential parking was one of the options mentioned. We still don't believe residential parking is right for this road as Raglan Court has many visitors and carers that we feel shouldn't have to pay every day for additional parking permits. The people who use the road to park for work and leave by 5.30pm also do not contribute to the parking problem. We are also concerned that if too many permits were to be given to neighbouring streets this would result in very limited parking opportunity for the residents already here, despite the fact that most of us only have one car.</p> <p>We would highlight that we just want the residents to be able to park within their street. This does not seem unreasonable. We would therefore like to make some suggestions:</p> <p><u>Possible Resolutions</u></p> <p>We feel there could be better solutions to help manage the situation some of which we've listed below:</p>	<p>However, the Council is acutely aware of the pressure on parking spaces in Russell Road and has taken this into account in developing its proposals by, as it is considered safe and practical to do so, proposing NWAAT restrictions less than 10 metres in length (something the Council is permitted to do by the Highway Code as the local highway authority). This approach provides a balance between retaining parking spaces and addressing the road safety concern raised.</p> <p>The map and photographs supplied by this correspondent are provided at the end of this appendix for information.</p>
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential parking for the area of these 9 houses (properties shown as red in attached map) between the hours of 6pm to 8am Monday to Sunday. This would mean all residents of Russell Road could park within the road leaving additional spaces for those in neighbouring streets and visitors. This would alleviate many of the issues listed above and still allow the use of the remaining parking for non-residents. Allocated parking spaces for these 9 residencies to give all the 9 properties access to one space per household; with all other street parking being available to residents of Russell Road and the surrounding streets. This would also mean parking could be marked out and this would mean an end to the loss of spaces where cars are 'badly' parked. <p>Looking also to future proof the street with the government looking to reduce our carbon footprint by 2020, the introduction of electric cars will, we are sure, be made more desirable and people will need access to charge their vehicle outside of their homes. In addition a change to the parking bays outside and opposite Raglan Court would increase the number of spaces by widening the bays and turning the parking to face the properties.</p> <p>We hope that we have been able to express to you our concerns regarding the planned restrictions in the area and in particular Russell Road. We would welcome the chance for you to come and visit post 5.30pm to witness these issues first hand and to speak to the residents.</p>	
23	<p>I have applied for Vehicle access to my property (Ref LK13975). The access is to drop the kerb outside my property and remove the marked parking space which is currently outside my property.</p> <p>The above proposal is to remove the lines for the parking spaces outside number 17 and 19 in my road. Can I request that this proposal is revised to include the removal of the marked parking space outside my property please.</p> <p>This will be more cost effective for the council and also reduce the inconvenience to other residents in the road as the 2 sets of work will only need to be done once.</p> <p>Please can you advise me if this is possible or if you need any further information.</p>	<p>The following response was sent to the correspondent on 23 May 2018 and is included below for information.</p> <p>"Unfortunately, it is not possible to revise the existing proposals to remove the parking bay outside of your property as part of the current work to remove the parking bay outside numbers 17/19 Douglas Haig Road. Waiting restrictions (such as yellow lines and parking bays) painted on the public highway must be supported by a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). A TRO is a legal document that gives the council the power to paint waiting restrictions on the ground and take enforcement action against vehicles who park in contravention of them. Once waiting restrictions have been painted on the ground any changes to them requires the completion of a statutory process to amend the TRO that supports them. The rules that govern amending TROs mean that once proposals have been advertised (as is the case in respect of the proposed removal of the parking bay outside numbers 17/19 Douglas Haig Road) the only changes that can be made to the proposals are ones considered to be less onerous. The removal of parking bay outside of your property would be considered to be a change that is more onerous because it would be removing the ability for people to park. Changes that are</p>

		<p>more onerous must be subject to a separate TRO amendment process.</p> <p>Whilst it is not possible to add the removal of the parking bay outside of your property into the current work there is no issue with including it in a future TRO amendment process. As such, your request will be kept on file and added into the next TRO amendment process undertaken in Salisbury. However, at this stage I am unable to provide you with any information as to when that TRO amendment process will be undertaken."</p>
24	<p>As residents of Martins Close, Salisbury we would like to outline our comments on the proposal to introduce a 'No waiting at any time' on the Heronswood road.</p> <p>As you will appreciate as our house and back gate lead on to the Heronswood road we park on the road regularly. We would like to dispute the proposal for a 'no waiting area' to be imposed for the following reasons outlined below;</p> <p>We believe that if the proposal was approved this would have a major impact on parking on the estate of Martins Close. We have a small circle in the middle of the estate and bay parking to the left however this does not provide sufficient parking for all of the residents. The bays and parking spaces are not allocated to specific houses so many households with more than one car use this parking and therefore we would at times be unable to park near our house if we could not park on the Heronswood road. We believe if this proposal was implemented this would cause friction between residents as many would not be able to park within easy reach of their house.</p> <p>The parking in the circle and also in the bay parking is not easily accessible for everyone especially as both are on sloped land. This becomes an issue in the winter as the road gets icy and it is hard to get out of the parking areas or even to your car safely. Parking on the road is much more accessible and on flatter ground so elderly people etc are able to reach there cars much more safely.</p> <p>Futhermore, we already have an issue with some residents / visitors parking in the entrance to the circle parking. There is signs indicating this should not be allowed but for whatever reason people choose to ignore these. This means it would be very hard for an emergency vehicle such as an ambulance to access the circle. I believe if the proposal were to go ahead this would make the problem much worse and encourage more people to park in ways that could obstruct emergency vehicles.</p> <p>I volunteer at a Brownie group on Monday nights. As there is sometimes events on at the church (St Thomas's Church) further down the road when I</p>	<p>The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Heronswood will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.</p>

	<p>come back from Brownies at around 8pm sometimes there is already very limited spaces available including on the road. People who use the church would have nowhere else to park and this would make this situation even worse. It would mean that people would have to park further up the hill and create parking issues up there thus just moving the parked cars further up the road. As above the bays etc are not allocated to residents so currently anybody can park there. This could mean that people returning to their houses in the evenings are left without anywhere to park as they would be unable to find a space.</p> <p>We have never seen anybody use the parking along Heronswood road for any other reason than being a resident or visiting a resident therefore we do not see why a 'no waiting time' needs to be implemented. If the reason is to stop people parking and getting the bus / walking to town we have never witnessed this happening before and and we get the bus and walk in to town at peak times during the day. We also strongly believe that allowing cars to park along Heronswood actually helps to make the road safer. People slow down to give way etc as there are parked cars and this means that generally the speed used is slower and safer.</p> <p>We believe as residents of Martins Close we would be heavily impacted in a negative way by the proposal. We do not see any possible positives arising from implementing a 'no waiting at any time' on the Heronswood road.</p> <p>We would appreciate it if you could please confirm that this email has been received safely.</p>	
25	<p>My concern is not so much about parking but I am sure it will create a problem if implemented those cars at the moment actually slow down the traffic.</p> <p>My thought is the speed of traffic if cars have a clear path unlike at the moment traffic slows down at the junction of Martins Close which is a bit of a blind corner.</p>	The issue of the proposed waiting restrictions for Heronswood will be considered as a substantive issue in the main report.
26	<p>I object to the proposal for extending the double yellow lines (No Waiting at any time) on Devizes Road as this will affect daytime and nighttime parking of four vehicles belonging to residents of Devizes Road. During the daytime this also provides clients of Sarum Physiotherapy additional parking. The residents vehicles will still need to be parked and this proposal will most likely cause vehicle owners to park on the opposite side of the road, or to park in neighbouring roads (Roman Road and Roberts Road). Devizes Road is well illuminated and the road signage (Give Way) leading from Roman Road on to Devizes Road is clearly visible. If the intent of this proposal is to make the junction "safer", then I would suggest adherence of the current speed limit would be more than sufficient.</p>	<p>The additional NWAAT restrictions proposed for Devizes Road were requested to improve visibility for motorists turning into Devizes Road from Roman Road.</p> <p>The Council's proposals will remove a small amount of parking from Devizes Road in the vicinity of its junction with Roman Road. As the correspondent identifies, this is likely to displace any parking taking place to other parts of Devizes Road or into nearby roads such as Roman Road or Roberts Road. There is sufficient capacity in the aforementioned locations to accommodate any displaced parking.</p>



