

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

Comment Ref. No.	Comment	Officer Response
1	<p>I would like to enquire into the reason behind the proposal to limit parking on Finchley Rd. this is the only on street parking available to residents on Wilton rd between Ashfield Rd - Longlands and between Finchley rd and Highbury avenue. there is no space on Highbury avenue for their own residents never mind anyone else. Ashfield rd is residents parking only. There will be about a dozen houses completely without parking. Please advise as to where is available instead.</p> <p>I am not aware of any problems with regard to access for emergency vehicles etc so don't understand the need for changing the current parking availability.</p>	<p>The proposed parking restrictions in Finchley Road have been requested by residents of the road to address several road safety concerns arising from the parking that takes place.</p> <p>Parking within 10 metres of a junction is a contravention of Rule 243 of the Highway Code. Motorists habitually park within 10 metres of the junction of Finchley Road and Wilton Road. Doing so obscures visibility for motorists undertaking turning manoeuvres at this junction. The proposed No Waiting At Any Time (NWAAT hereafter) restrictions will prevent parking from taking place close to the junction and improve visibility for motorists undertaking turning manoeuvres at this location.</p> <p>The footway on the eastern side of Finchley Road protrudes into the highway opposite the car park for the Horse and Groom public house. At this point the remaining carriageway width is 4.4 metres. Vehicles parking at this location reduces the available carriageway width to 2.4 metres. Wiltshire Council's absolute minimum width for a carriageway lane is 2.75 metres. Therefore, the parking taking place at this location reduces the width of the carriageway to an unacceptable level, particularly for larger vehicles, and has on occasion prevented ambulances from being able to reach the entrance to the block of flats located at the northern end of the road. The proposed NWAAT restrictions will prevent parking and improve access along the road for larger vehicles.</p> <p>Whilst some parking would be removed from Finchley Road if the Council's proposals are implemented, it is important to note that it will continue to be possible to park within the road.</p>
2	<p>As a resident of Longland (no.X<sup>1</sup>) I'd like to register my strong opposition to the plans proposed in traffic order LJB/TRO/SALS27, specifically the new restrictions on Longland. I would respectfully ask that consideration be give to the rejection of the restrictions proposed in Longland. There is long standing precedent for the current parking arrangements and strong and broad opposition by the residents. The direct impact of these proposals on our household would be huge, as it effectively removes our primary parking option. This has been a source of a great deal of stress since it was proposed. Also, as we represent 50% of the directly affected residents I'd</p>	<p>The Council is fully aware of the parking arrangements that exist in Longlands, and that residents have co-operated amongst themselves in managing those arrangements over an extended period of time. However, the council has received a request for the provision of additional NWAAT restrictions in the road to prevent vehicles parking on a section of the footway and causing an obstruction of the public highway. Having received such a request the Council is duty bound to consider it.</p> <p>Highway law states the public highway is for the passage and repassage of</p>

	<p>hope that our objections are considered accordingly.</p> <p>The parking arrangements in Longland have been unchanged for decades and hence set a long-standing precedent for their continuation. I would be very keen to understand the rationale behind this proposal, all of the neighbours I have spoken to about this are also strongly opposed. If these proposals are in response to specific complaints relating to access might I suggest a limited application of restrictions only outside those addresses calling for them.</p> <p>Our direct experience (of 6 years), and as far as I can gather from longer standing neighbours, this has never been problematic in terms of either pedestrian or vehicle access. Recycling trucks, delivery trucks and, recently ambulances, all access the street without issue all whilst cars are parked in the area designated for restrictions.</p> <p>Anyone parking in the space outside no. X<sup>1</sup> always park such that neither vehicles nor pedestrians are obstructed. We have never had any issue with vehicles and pedestrians are regularly seen to use the space left between cars and the house.</p> <p>Furthermore the restrictions would cause immediate knock-on effects for the remainder of the residents in the street. As it stands, each resident has the width of their house which is viewed, informally of course, as their primary parking option. The restrictions will mean that two or three cars will inevitably overflow into the remaining spaces further down the street. This will cause significant upset and, ultimately, disharmony throughout an otherwise tight-knit street. My wife and I have been very concerned about the impact of these restrictions since they were proposed. After a tough 18 months for everyone this has caused significant additional stress and worry. All of the neighbours I have spoken to about this are in agreement and in light of this strong and broad disapproval of these plans I very much hope that the restrictions are reconsidered.</p>	<p>persons and goods. There is no legal right for motorists to park on the public highway, nor obligation upon Wiltshire Council (as the local highway authority) to provide parking. Parking within the confines of the public highway is tolerated so long as it does not impede the right of passage along it.</p> <p>A typical example of the parking that obstructs the footway in Longlands can be seen in the photo provided below. It is apparent that the vehicle parked on the footway in the photo is only being parked in that manner to ensure that vehicles can continue to travel along the carriageway; however, in doing so the parked vehicle is clearly impeding passage along the footway.</p> <p>The proposed introduction of additional NWAAT restrictions in Longlands must be considered in the context of highway law. The proposed restrictions in Longlands will prevent parking from taking place on the footway and enable the Council to meet its statutory duty to ensure that the right of passage along the public highway is not obstructed.</p> <p>In recognition of both the parking requirements and longstanding arrangements in Longlands the Council has proposed the introduction of the minimum length of additional NWAAT restriction required to address the issue that has been raised.</p>
3	<p>With regard to the posted changes to the parking regulation to Endless Street, Salisbury, what I can ascertain, if the supplied street plan is accurate, is that this proposal actually reduces the number of resident parking spaces in a street that does not have enough as it is and is in a part of the city where parking is already open to abuse of the current rules.</p> <p>It seems the expansion of the existing No-Waiting Zones does nothing to solve the parking issues in the street (or this particular section of Endless Street). Perhaps it may give drivers who park in these no waiting areas overnight/or 'blue badge up' before the Civil Enforcement Officers appear in the morning pause for thought, but other than that it seems to reduce capacity.</p>	<p>The proposed amendments to waiting restrictions in Endless Street involves the removal of two sections of a residents parking bay. The southern section of parking bay it is proposed to remove is being removed because it is situated in front of a dropped kerb access. The owners of the property to which the dropped kerb access relates have a legal right of access to their property and as such the parking bay in front of their dropped kerb access must either be removed or shortened to ensure parked vehicles do not prevent access / egress.</p> <p>The northern section of parking bay it is proposed to remove is being removed to facilitate a new dropped kerb access to the bin store in the McCarthy &amp; Stone Development. The provision of this access is to enable</p>

<p>Whilst I will not call Endless Street unique, I would highlight it does have special considerations over that of other Zone A Locations with it being a Residential and Commercial Street and being part of the actual city centre. This makes it very attractive parking location to seek and use/abuse.</p> <p><b>Current Users of Parking Spaces in this Section 3 of Endless Street are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legally entitled residents of the street of with valid MI Permits (Zone A)</li> <li>• All other MI Permit holders of the very large Zone A area of Salisbury</li> <li>• Residents of Zone A properties that park in Endless Street during the day when going to work because its closer to their office/place of work (E.G., residents of Belle Vue Road driving to the street parking in Endless Street, saving a 5-minute walk to city employment)</li> <li>• Castle Street Parking Permit Holders that display permits and are not penalized while parking in Zone A</li> <li>• Overnight Care Givers with hand-written or home printed signage stating their profession, valid or not.</li> <li>• Commercial trades people, Clients of Endle Vets Clinic and the newly expanded Innovate Centre</li> <li>• Visitors to the residents in multi-unit flats</li> <li>• Permanent and tarpaulin covered parking for owners of Sports Car</li> </ul> <p><b>AND</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Non-Residents that have been able by some private arrangement to apply and hold MI Permits and use the street as weekday work parking, I assume from non-car owners of Endless Street residents or the wider, larger Zone A</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Possible Solutions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a Zone A1 (<b>A1</b>) for Endless Street – Address the needs of residents in this city centre location vs other purely residential Zone</li> </ul>	<p>the bins from this development to be easily wheeled from the bin store to the road where they can then be emptied. The provision of this dropped kerb access is a legal requirement of the planning permission granted in respect of this development.</p> <p>The correspondent's comments about the operation of parking in Endless Street relate to the northern section of the road which is located within Residents Parking Zone A (RPZA hereafter). Resident's parking schemes in Salisbury operate on a zonal basis. This means that any permit holder for the zone is permitted to make use of any of the parking bays within any of the streets that make up the zone. RPZA operates between the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday. Outside of these times use of the parking bays is unrestricted and as such can be used by residents and non-residents alike.</p> <p>With respect to the current uses of the parking spaces in Endless Street identified by the correspondent then, apart from non-residents of the zone having obtained permits to park within RPZA during its hours of operation, they are all permitted to take place subject to the vehicles parking having the relevant parking permit, tradesman's waivers or in the case of visitors to the veterinary and doctors' surgeries a Pay and Display parking ticket.</p> <p>All residents and visitors parking permits are now issued electronically and as such motorists are no longer required to display a physical permit within their vehicle. As such the correspondent has no way of knowing if any vehicle parked within RPZA is entitled to do so, or whether the owner of the vehicle has obtained a permit outside of the council's terms and conditions for their issue. However, if the correspondent has suspicions that any permits have been incorrectly issued then they should raise these directly with the Council's Parking Services Team who will investigate them and undertake remedial action as necessary.</p> <p>Regarding the possible solutions then creating a zone just including Endless Street would not be practical for residents of the road. Doing so would severely limit the number of parking spaces they and their visitors would have access to and as such is not something the Council would seek to pursue.</p> <p>The Council does not consider that the permit application process requires an overhaul. The current system allows the Council to ask permit holders to prove eligibility of their right to be part of the scheme, this includes asking for a copy of the vehicle registration document or a current utility bill showing their details. Alongside this the Council undertakes spot checks of permit holders' details. Where permit holders have failed to produce the required documents the Council will cancel their permit.</p>
--	---

	<p>A streets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete overhaul of the permit application process to reduce misuse - Link MI Residents permits to <b>V5c DVLA</b> forms – so non car owners residents cannot make private arrangements – favour or financial. The DVLA V5C forms show address that the owner resides, and this should match permit applications for parking</li> <li>• Remove metered parking in this section of Endless Street to enable Council Tax paying Residents to park there</li> <li>• Allow Scots Lane metered street parking spaces to also be Zone A (or Zone A1 Endless Street Residents)</li> <li>• Allow Residents of Endless Street/Permit holders to use Salt Lane Car Park – create nearby area for overspill if Endless Street spaces are full of users/abusers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>I do hope you will take into consideration the varied users types of spaces in Endless Street and the proposed possible solutions. At the very least I hope you will reconsider reducing the number of spaces as per your proposal and thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. These decisions need to have all the facts and details of residents and not be made in a vacuum.</p>	<p>The Pay and Display parking bay in the section of Endless Street in question is a shared parking bay that already allows RPZA permit holders to park in it if they have a valid residents or visitors permit. The Pay and Display element of the operation of the parking bay is there to support the services provided by the doctors and veterinary surgeries located in this section of the road. Given that RPZA permit holders can already make use of the bay there is no justification to remove the Pay and Display element of the parking bay.</p> <p>Scots Lane is predominantly a street occupied by commercial properties and as such the Pay and Display parking bay situated within the road is there to help support the operation of those properties. The hours of operation of the Pay and Display parking bay are 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sunday. Outside of its hours of operation use of the bay is unrestricted and as such could be used by residents of Endless Street in the evenings and overnight when a greater number of residents are typically seeking to park.</p> <p>Similarly, Salt Lane Car Park is a short stay car park that is primarily intended to be used by visitors to Salisbury City Centre. Its hours of operation are 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and 10.00am to 4.00pm on Sunday. Outside of its hours of operation use of the bays within the car park is unrestricted and as such could be used by residents of Endless Street in the evenings and overnight when a greater number of residents are typically seeking to park.</p> <p>Additionally, residents of RPZA with valid permits can park in College Street Car Park between 5.00pm and 9.00am free of charge. Parking is free in all Wiltshire Council Car Parks between 6.00pm and 8.00am but the concession offered to RPZA permit holders provides them with two hours of free parking per day.</p>
4	<p>I am writing on behalf of residents in Fairview Road.</p> <p>The dangerous parking area you wish to remove was agreed by a member of your department some years ago (probably ten or more years) after Stroud Place was built. At the time residents of Fairview Road were horrified by the decision. Yes please do remove this allocated parking area!!</p> <p>However when this dangerous area was added, a total of 3.5 parking spaces were also removed/lost on either side of the entrance/exit to Stroud Place.</p> <p>Fairview Road is a one way street &amp; at the time neighbours could not understand why they had to lose so much space.</p>	<p>The length of parking bay that it is proposed to remove from Fairview Road is not being removed on safety grounds. As with when the parking bay was installed there are no concerns around its safety. However, since the bay was first installed a dropped kerb crossing point has been constructed in the vicinity of the junction of Fairview Road and Manor Road. One of the dropped kerbs has been constructed behind the parking bay. To avoid the dropped kerb in question being obstructed by parked vehicles the parking bay is being reduced in length.</p> <p>Regarding the length of NWAAT restrictions at the junction of Stroud Place and Fairview Road, the correspondent first raised this issue with officers in March 2010 and was advised of the reasoning for their provision.</p> <p>Since the introduction of the NWAAT restrictions the Council has not</p>

	<p>If you observe Cleveland Court at the far end of Fairview Road you will understand our reasoning - parking space has never been reduced there to such an extent, either side of their entrance/exit</p> <p>It was assumed that Fairview Road residents had plenty of space to park when yellow lines were added to Stroud Place but this decision was viewed during the day, not at night!!</p> <p>Please can you reconsider giving us at least one parking pace (or even two) at the entrance/exit to Stroud Place??</p> <p>While emailing you - can I mention another matter please. I would be grateful if you would pass this on to the correct department - TREES!! As one enters Fairview Road you will see two dying trees have been removed by the council. Please could these two tree areas be dug over &amp; flattened &amp; returned to pavement/tarmac. In their present form the areas are hazardous for the elderly/infirm pedestrians &amp; for those wheeling a pram.</p>	<p>received any complaints from residents of Fairview Road that there are insufficient parking spaces either within the road or the immediate vicinity of the road. If the correspondent wishes for the NWAAT restrictions at the junction of Stroud Place and Fairview Road to be reviewed to determine whether they can be reduced in length they would need to formally request that this work is considered through the Council's waiting restriction process. Information about that process is available on the Council's website on the following webpage – <a href="https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/parking-on-off">https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/parking-on-off</a>.</p>
5	<p>I strongly disagree with removable of a parking bay in Wessex Road parking in Wessex Road is horrendous at the best of times. People from Clarendon Road and Elm Grove Road also park here so residents have not got a chance to park outside their houses. The said property has more than enough space for two cars to get on and off the drive as it is at the moment. Most of the properties at this end of the road have drives anyway so this is not a problem for parking for them. We at the other park of Wessex Road do not have the luxury of a drive. To remove this parking bay would cause no end of problems for us. I may I also point out that some people with drives do not use them. <u>PLEASE</u> reconsider removal of this parking bay making it fair for residents to be able to park. We pay for a parking permit people with drives do not. Think of council tenants not private properties. Thank yoo I hope this does not happen.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment to the waiting restrictions in Wessex Road involves the removal of a residents parking bay where the owners of a property situated in the road have installed a widened dropped kerb access. The owners of the property have a legal right of access to their property and as such the parking bay in front of the widened dropped kerb access must be removed to ensure parked vehicles do not prevent access / egress.</p>
6	<p>Today, a notice was posted on lampposts in Cornwall Road by the Council. It is seeking objections to the removal of parking spaces outside my neighbours house after they have dropped the curb. I do not object to this. However, I do wish to state that, in principle, it is highly undesirable.</p> <p>Recently several residents of the road have removed their front walls and gardens, and created a paved parking area in front of their homes. The net effect is that dropping the curb reduces the availability of curbside parking for others. It creates exclusive parking.</p> <p>As Salisbury residents and unlike many other parts of the County, we have to purchase Council parking permits and adhere to parking restrictions. The restrictions mean that when our family and friends visit, we must also</p>	<p>It should be noted that the correspondent who submitted these comments subsequently provided the same comments direct to the Cabinet Member for Highways and has already received a response to them.</p> <p>Under planning law homeowners have a permitted development right to create an off-street parking space at their premises. Where that space requires access onto an unclassified road, as is the case with Cornwall Road, this can be done without the need for planning permission so long as the off-street parking space does not exceed a certain square meterage and the property is not a listed building.</p> <p>Although planning permission is not required, consent to cross the public highway is required to allow a legal right of access to the off-street parking</p>

	<p>purchase visitor parking permits online for them and, increasingly, they are struggling to find a space to park.</p> <p>Furthermore, the current policy of pretty much unrestricted development of semidetached homes in the area is facilitating the creation of houses with 5 bedrooms plus. Houses of this size will inevitably lead to higher occupancy and ergo, more cars. It is going to become ever more difficult to park.</p> <p>Without gardens the road does not look as attractive. They are proven to improve air quality. This is particularly important as Cornwall Road is a walking route to four schools.</p> <p>I suggest that the removal of gardens will make Wiltshire Council's pledge to achieve the Government's 'Carbon Neutral Challenge' difficult. Surely this also flies in the face of the Council's 'Environmental Protection Policy' and its commitment to the worldwide climate emergency.</p> <p>I request that a survey of the road and surrounding roads is undertaken to assess the impact on residents and their guests' ability to park and the wider environmental impact of these increasing and unsustainable trends.</p>	<p>space created. This consent is applied for through the Council's dropped kerb application process. Because of the permitted development right the council is obligated to grant consent for the highway to be crossed and allow the dropped kerbs to be installed. The only grounds on which the Council could refuse is if granting such a consent would result in the creation of a road safety issue.</p> <p>Therefore, there is very little that can be done to stop residents converting their gardens to off-street parking spaces if they wish to do so. Any change to this situation would require a change to national planning law and is something that the correspondent would need to raise with her local MP John Glen.</p>
7	<p>With reference to the above consultation and the proposed new parking space outside 12 Devonshire Road.</p> <p>We had planning permission (now lapsed) which included extending the dropped kerb to provide additional off-road parking. These plans are currently being re-drawn with a view to re-submitting within the next couple of months and will, again, include this additional off-road parking.</p> <p>Due to this new traffic order proposal I have decided to expedite the planned dropped kerb and am in the process of obtaining quotes with a view to submitting a Vehicle Crossing Application independently of the planning application. Currently, obtaining quotes is proving somewhat difficult as no-one is returning my calls! I will persevere but am unsure as to whether I will be able to submit this prior to the end of the consultation period on 15th July.</p> <p>Bearing this in mind, I would ask that you suspend the plans to include the additional parking space outside 12 Devonshire Road to avoid the time and expense both to the council in installing it and ourselves in getting the markings removed again.</p> <p>I hope you will take this into consideration. Please let me know if there is any further information you require.</p>	<p>When it was first proposed to introduce residents parking in Devonshire Road in 2012 this correspondent wrote in response to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultation and explained that they had recently obtained planning permission to build an extension to their property, which included the provision of a widened dropped kerb access and off-street parking area. Given that at that time the correspondent had a valid planning permission to allow this work to be undertaken it was agreed that the Council would provide a driveway protection (white bar) marking in front of the property in question in anticipation of those works taking place in the near future. However, in the near ten-year period since then neither the works to construct the extension or the widened dropped kerb access have taken place.</p> <p>At this point in time the correspondent does not have consent for a widened dropped kerb access and given the period of time that elapsed without the aforementioned works having taken place the Council can have no surety that if the white bar marking in question was left in place outside of the correspondent's property that a widened dropped kerb access would be provided.</p> <p>If the correspondent obtains consent for and constructs a widened dropped kerb access then the Council will reinstate the white bar marking once the necessary TRO amendment process has been completed.</p>
8	<p>This used to be how the parking was previously and it was a nightmare! I do not understand why you would change a system that isn't perfect but a right</p>	<p>The comments submitted by the correspondent relate to the proposed amendments in Donaldson Road.</p>

	<p>side better than it was before. Working partly from home due to covid the time limit is actually fine for those walking into the office for a few hours. What is the point of creating all these park and ride areas if you are going to change the parking regulations? Seems like an awful waste of money.</p>	<p>The proposed amendments to waiting restrictions in Donaldson Road involves the removal of three sections of a residents parking bay as a result of owners of properties situated in the road installing dropped kerb accesses. The owners of the properties where dropped kerb accesses have been installed have a legal right of access to their property and as such the parking bay in front of their dropped kerb accesses must either be removed or shortened to ensure parked vehicles do not prevent access / egress.</p> <p>More generally, all marked parking bays in Donaldson Road will remain part of Residents Parking Zone H (RPZH hereafter) and be subject to the existing restrictions placed upon their use.</p>
9	<p>I object to the proposals to amend the restrictions along Donaldson Road. We have very limited residents parking, which is full every evening, and anything done to remove some or all of this will have a negative impact on ratepaying residents.</p> <p>The proposals you have put out, in the poster on lamp posts, and the Amendment No 27 notice on the same page, are, at best, misleading, and conflicting. The wording of the proposals is very ambiguous. I have sought further clarity and am still unclear as to exactly why parking is proposed to be removed from residents. I bought my house, on the basis of residents parking, pay for a permit and object to anything that will remove this option, and potentially damage my property value. There are residents along this road with driveways, who also use on road parking, despite not being allowed to, and the Council does not police this as it is in the evenings and night. To further restrict other residents is unfair, and should not be allowed when space is at a premium anyway.</p>	<p>The proposed amendments to waiting restrictions in Donaldson Road involves the removal of three sections of a residents parking bay as a result of owners of properties situated in the road installing dropped kerb accesses. The owners of the properties where dropped kerb accesses have been installed have a legal right of access to their property and as such the parking bay in front of their dropped kerb accesses must either be removed or shortened to ensure parked vehicles do not prevent access / egress.</p> <p>More generally, all marked parking bays in Donaldson Road will remain part of RPZH and be subject to the existing restrictions placed upon their use.</p> <p>Turning to the correspondent's comments concerning residents with driveways also using on-street residents parking bays. Residents living in residents parking schemes in Salisbury are entitled to apply for up to two residents parking permits to enable them to make use of the on-street parking bays. However, this entitlement is reduced by one permit if the resident's property has a garage or a driveway and by two permits if the resident's property has both a garage and a driveway (or a driveway big enough to accommodate more than one vehicle). Subject to the permit entitlements outlined above it is possible for residents with a driveway to make use of the on-street parking bays.</p> <p>With regard to the parking situation in the evening and overnight then RPZH operates between the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday. Outside of these times use of the parking bays is unrestricted and as such can be used by residents irrespective of whether they have a residents' parking permit or off-street parking spaces available at their property.</p> <p>If the correspondent believes that any residents of Donaldson Road have been issued with permits to which they are not entitled they can report those residents to the Council's Parking Services Team who will investigate the matter and undertake remedial action as necessary.</p>
10	I am writing to express my concerns regarding the above proposal in Hulse	Under planning law homeowners have a permitted development right to

Road, Salisbury.

Anyone who is familiar with, or who has been to Hulse Road (as opposed to simply looking at plans) will appreciate the general lack of on-street parking space and that parking has long been an issue for residents. So much so, that a few years ago, to tackle problems caused by commuter and shopper parking Wiltshire Council introduced the residents' permit parking scheme, for which we as residents pay an annual premium; not to park directly outside our own properties, or even in the road in which we live, but simply to have **the opportunity** to park in our parking zone.

### Environment

That people choose to live in Hulse Road is due to its green ambience, despite its close proximity to the A36 ring road. I am aware that a precedent to drop kerbs and restrict parking opportunity has already been set by numerous properties on the west side of the road. However, Wiltshire Council's continuing reliance upon this precedent will only further destroy the very aspect of Hulse Road that attracts people to live here. For example, should this proposal be agreed for property 23 and should neighbouring property Numbers 25, 27 and 29 also elect to drop their kerbs across the **entire width** of their properties, based upon such a 'precedent', **when will the erosion of green city gardens, to be replaced by tarmac or paved areas, cease?**

### Parking

The above proposal, to drop the kerb and restrict parking for the entire width of property 23, as opposed to limiting the dropping of the kerb sufficiently to give access, will result in the effective removal of 2 general use parking spaces, to enable access and parking for 1 off road vehicle (See Photo 1<sup>2</sup> attached). Property 23 will of course also benefit from the private use of these 2 parking spaces since they, as the sole owner of that property, will be able to park over "white-bar" markings by a dropped kerb vehicle access, whilst in addition also utilising the benefit of the one parking permit they are permitted to hold (See Photos 2&3<sup>2</sup> attached).

I understand that the purpose of reducing permit allocations per household is to make sure that all residents get a **fair chance** of finding a parking space within their zone. **However, permitting the dropping of kerbs, and thus reducing the overall number of 'available' parking spaces, is in direct opposition to this purpose.**

I understand that the cost of securing of 3 private parking spaces, one off road and two directly outside a property protected by a "white-bar", is covered by the property owner, however this is negligible when compared to the £25,000+ increase to the value of the said property, plus the ongoing

create an off-street parking space at their premises. Where that space requires access onto an unclassified road, as is the case with Hulse Road, this can be done without the need for planning permission so long as the off-street parking space doesn't exceed a certain square meterage and the property is not a listed building.

Although planning permission is not required, consent to cross the public highway is required to allow a legal right of access to the off-street parking space created. This consent is applied for through the council's dropped kerb application process. Because of the permitted development right the council is obligated to grant consent for the highway to be crossed and allow the dropped kerbs to be installed. The only grounds on which the Council could refuse is if granting such a consent would result in the creation of a road safety issue.

The permission for the owners of No. 23 Hulse Road to install a dropped kerb access was granted in February of this year. The owners of the property have a legal right of access to their property and as such the parking bay in front of the dropped kerb access must be removed to ensure parked vehicles do not prevent access / egress.

Whilst the concerns raised by the correspondent are understandable the reality of the situation is that the Council in this instance had no option but to grant permission for the provision of the dropped kerb access and having done so has no option but to remove the parking bay in front of it.

A group of residents at the northern end of the southern half of Hulse Road have approached the Council about obtaining part of the public highway with the intention of creating off-street parking spaces. The land in question has very limited use as public highway and therefore is an ongoing maintenance liability to the Council. The Council, as is always the case, seeks to reduce its ongoing maintenance liabilities wherever it can, so is obligated to consider such an approach. There are several processes to be completed before the residents could obtain the land and convert it to off-street parking spaces, as such there is no guarantee at this stage they will do so.

<p>cost benefits of accessing off-road electric car charging.</p> <p>Sadly, residents on the east side of the road, will continue to face several disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A loss of opportunity of parking within the parking zone in which we live - with the risk of future increasing costs</li> <li>• A decline in value of our properties - due to the ongoing risk of continued parking erosion.</li> <li>• A lack of the general ambience of a road in which many residents have lived for years.</li> </ul> <p>The above proposal will have a negative impact on the environment in which we live, and the lives of the people who live in Hulse Road, and for these reasons I ask that the proposal is reconsidered.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the desire of 'those that can' to have off road parking, a more pragmatic, and considerate approach, given the demand for parking, would be for Wiltshire Council to have approved the dropping of the curb at No. 23 for 1 car length, thereby affording the owner to access his property, have a private 'white line' parking space whilst giving due consideration to others. This would be especially pertinent given Wiltshire Council's current plans to sell off green land at the opposite end of the street to residents, thus also providing private parking whilst removing a further 4 general use parking spaces in a short cul de sac where demand is considerable.</p> <p>Within a short period, this will result in the <b>REMOVAL of 6 parking spaces from general use</b> - Thereby considerably reducing the opportunity to park with the parking zone, let alone the street within which we live, a further flagrant disregard for your own residents' permit parking scheme.</p> <p>I look forward to your response, though dare say that given Wiltshire Council has given permission for the owner of No.23 to drop the kerb for the entire width of the property, and as such, the so called 'proposal' on which we have been invited to comment is already a fait accompli.</p>	
---	--

**Notes**

<sup>1</sup> – Information removed so as to not identify the correspondent in line with the Council's procedure for reports considering comments on proposed TRO's

<sup>2</sup> – Photos removed so as to not identify the correspondent in line with the Council's procedure for reports considering comments on proposed TRO's

