

Appendix 6: Results of survey of Vinery Gardens on scheme design

NB: Results as at 17/2/2010 – Closure Date 16/2/2010

Overall Support for a Permit Parking Scheme in Vinery Gardens

Question	Do you Support Permit Scheme?	
	Yes	No
Total	18	4
Percentage	82%	18%

Preferences over design of a Permit Parking Scheme and provision for Limited Waiting

Permit Scheme Design / Preferences	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	Not in favour
Design 1: Signing only Permit Scheme (as originally proposed) - see Map at Appendix 1	15	3	1	3
Design 2: Signing only Permit Scheme with Limited Waiting bays near the junction with Winchester Rd (as per the amended proposal) – see Map at Appendix 2	4	9	0	5
Design 3: Standard Permit Parking scheme with 2 Hour Limited Waiting & 1 Hour Limited Waiting beside 158 Winchester Rd (added for Survey) – see Map at Appendix 3	3	1	1	15

Objection statements to Standard Permit Parking Scheme (as not previously advertised)
Design 3 removes the safeguard of being able to park outside your own home. With the Orchard Development on the Oakfield House site providing limited parking the inevitable consequence will see Vinery Gardens being used as a convenient parking lot with the high likely outcome of residents regularly being denied parking in their own road, let alone outside their own home. Design 3 seems designed wholly for the benefit of a local business and not addressing the needs of the whole
No householder in a residential area should have no parking in front of their own house
I favour the most restrictive scheme to exclude non-residents from parking. I do not favour Design 3
Review 2 and 3 if Plan 1 proves inadequate, please. Circumstances and use are yet unknown. Each plan has advantages and disadvantages. Very difficult, but appreciate options under discussion.
Needs of business (e.g. Chiropractors) can be met by Design 2. As residents we will receive “visitor” passes for family/friends. I do not feel that 2 hour waiting needs to be extended to the whole road.
Design 3 would be of no benefit to residents in fact it would make life even more difficult. No waiting any time preventing residents from parking outside their own properties! 2Hr Limited Waiting ‘inviting’ anyone and everyone to park in the road. As the Chiropractor at the end of the road is apparently leaving, why would anyone other than residents need access to the cul-de-sac?
It would seem that this scheme would only really benefit patients of the chiropractors. Also, people, visitors and residents of the new flats being built. I also want to make sure that any bay marking for parking will take account of dropped kerbs to driveways.
Currently there are house owners cars parked at the bottom of the road (Turning Point) which does not cause any concern for residents further down the road. If there was no waiting at any time these cars would be forced to park outside other residents houses where there are already limited spaces
Loss of parking suffered by residents at cul-de-sac end of road
I object to this new scheme as it will solve no problems and will remove parking spaces from the road and reduce space
We do not want Double Yellow lines outside 26 & 24 Vinery Gardens – as this will cause even more parking problems in the road.
I do not agree with Design 3 as it does not benefit the road at all. We may as well not do anything with this option. Our main problem is with the clients of the Chiropractor parking down our roads and blocking our drive. This option allows them to continue and gives the Chiropractor the green light to keep using Vinery Gardens as the car park for his business.

Appendix 6: Results of survey of Vinery Gardens on scheme design

Objection statements to Standard Permit Parking Scheme (as not previously advertised)
Creates more problems by removing 6-9 spaces at the end of the road – Beyond Stupidity, The goal is to ease parking problems not create more. Your maps are nearly unreadable can't tell the difference between blue and green. This survey may be invalid.
This does not seem appropriate in a residential area; why do residents require parking bays. Surely the provision of permits to park outside one's house is sufficient. This proposal seems to speak to commercial premises. If that is the case, may I suggest the commercial premise moves to a more suitable location
Please don't do this. Please don't prostitute this serene little cul-de-sac into a car park for the Chiropractor. If its customers are so wedded to their cars that they can't be bothered to walk from a genuine parking place in Shirley, its no wonder they've got bad backs. Marked parking bays will add a degree of stricture to my world that I don't have the emotional strength to withstand. If I've got to worry about being central in a marked space at the end of each day, I think I am going to snap.
I object most strongly to this proposal. This will reduce overall parking availability for residents which will cause friction and inconvenience.
We not having enough space down the road for parking already and Option 3 would cause problems to us (resident). Also my neighbour is disabled and he needs to park at the end of the road.
As I live at 26 Vinery Gardens I strongly oppose Design No3. No parking outside my and my opposite neighbours house would increase the parking problems in the street. I am also disabled & have trouble carrying as I only have one arm & no parking outside my house would put increased pressure on me as I would have nowhere to park my car.