

## Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals

### FROM A RESIDENT OF ABBOTTS WAY

#### Re: Portswood Resident Gardens Permit Parking Proposals

I refer to your letter dated 29<sup>th</sup> July 2011 and confirm our objections to these proposals. We do not accept the response that efforts will be made to provide access to Portswood by shop workers and charity shop volunteers as at all adequate, nor does there seem to be any concern for the essential workers and others who live in residential premises in the centre who will have nowhere to long term park nearby on weekdays and thus be greatly inconvenienced by this pointless exercise.

Additionally, we endorse previous comments by other objectors that enforcement is likely to be non-existent as it is with the present parking restrictions which are constantly violated. Thus the whole exercise is wasteful of time and money when the council should be concentrating on economies and avoiding present labour disputes continuing without prospect of settlement.

The only possible benefit might be the clearing of long term blocked highway gutters and drains for lines to be painted.

### FROM A RESIDENT OF BLENHEIM AVENUE

Re: 'THE CITY OF SOUTHAMPTON (BASSETT, HIGHFIELD AND HAMPTON PARK) (RESIDENTS' PARKING SCHEME) (AMENDMENT NO 2) ORDER 2011'.

Thank you for your letter of the 29th July 2011. This proposal will have a negative impact on my road and as far as I am concerned little regard has been placed on this. I fully support the rights of other residents to petition your office for changes to their roads, but I expect the council to consider the wider picture. I am afraid I am not satisfied with the responses that you have made and still object to the proposal. If I was to understand the reasons for this proposal in detail and could see their merit which may outweigh my own concerns I would be happy to support them. However, I don't think you have made the case and despite communication by email and letter you have not been able to explain to me how you have undertaken a rigorous approach to making the case for changing the status quo or that the knock-on effects of this proposal have been thought through. I hope the Council's Cabinet will scrutinise the evidence supporting the need for a change in the current parking system in this area and consider whether the needs of surrounding residential areas have been fully considered. My original comments and your responses (*italics*) with further comments in **bold** are below.

1. The roads in which new restrictions have been suggested are wide enough for roadside parking and the properties have off-road parking. Why are extra restrictions required? I think that aesthetic reasons are not valid as these are public roads.

*The Local Transport Plan 2006-11 states that "Parking policy in residential areas will continue to focus on ensuring that residents do not experience problems resulting from commuter parking, or from parking generated by major attractors (such as hospitals, education establishments, leisure venues, etc). There is no distinction based on the width of the roads concerned.*

**How is it that the weight attached to the effects of commuter parking or other parking is not moderated by resident's ability to park off road? This seems to be suggesting that the council does not take a practical view of the situation and would rather stick to procedural responses.**

## Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals

2. The proposal makes no attempt to prevent displacement into neighbouring roads currently without parking restrictions. My road would be likely to suffer significant impact from these proposals. The difference is that many properties in my road do not have access to off road parking. Therefore displacement parking will have a greater significant negative impact on my area.

*Over recent years the Traffic Management team have asked the Oakmount Triangle Resident's Association (OTRA) whether they would wish, given the increasing level of non-resident parking in the area, to be included within any proposed permit parking scheme. As OTRA has continued to oppose permit parking restrictions in the Oakmount Triangle and in neighbouring areas, they have rejected the only means by which we could prevent displacement into this locality.*

**It is disingenuous to blame OTRA for the failure of the council to consider local residents. Firstly OTRA are a subsidiary of the Highfield Residents Association (HRA) and OTRA have always petitioned for an area wide view on parking needs and have argued strongly against residents parking in areas beyond the triangle. As a consequence of the case OTRA made, the previous proposals were adapted outside the area of the triangle. In recognition of OTRA's views, as far as I am aware HRA do not officially support this parking proposal as**

**they recognise the needs of OTRA as well as the HRA members in other areas who have petitioned you for the changes. Secondly, residents impacted by this scheme are not necessarily associated with either organisation. Surely, the council should wish to take a view that would be seen to be in the best interests of all the residents. The current proposals seek to introduce residents parking to the whole area by stealth because the extension as proposed will eventually mean that all areas will need residents parking because of displacement. My point is that the needs of the whole of Highfield should be considered and discussed rather than in small bites which lead to an inevitable spread of parking schemes.**

3. As per email communication with Graham Muir, Traffic Engineer, Southampton Highways Partnership, these proposals have been drafted at the request of individuals in the area of the proposed changes who would like to prevent others parking outside their houses. However, I would suggest that consultation for this process has been inadequate as the council has not adequately approached either the residents of surrounding areas which will be affected by displacement or the road users who are currently parking there. I don't consider that the poster attached to a number of lampposts adequately represents the proposed changes as there is no map. *The Public Notices meet the legal requirements. The high number of response to the notices advertised on street and in the Daily Echo shows that they have reached a wide and varied audience. The Public Notices also provided a contact number for further enquiries and information (including maps), as required.*

**I am sure that you have met the legal requirements. However, the legal requirements do not necessarily set the best standard by which the traffic management office may engage local populations. Nevertheless, I accept your point that a high response rate suggests that this is not a concern. I would assume that by a high response rate, you would have had perhaps 50 letters?**

## Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals

4. Graham Muir also suggested that many of the residents' who proposed these changes did so on the assumption that the Sainsbury's development on the other side of Portswood would negatively affect the parking on their road. Firstly, I would suggest that any impact is audited once Sainsbury's is opened and that changes to planning are not made on the basis of presumption. Secondly, the impact of Sainsbury's may well not have a negative impact and certainly any local area impact should have been considered in the Sainsbury's planning application and the council cabinet should refer to this process.

*In my email response on 4th April, I highlighted that whilst "future concerns regarding Sainsbury's have been mentioned by a number of residents, the scheme would still have been proposed on the basis of current parking concerns". I would not therefore see any basis for delaying the proposals or decision, unless the Cabinet of the Council decide so, based on their consideration of any sustained objections.*

**Your original reference to Sainsbury's in response to my question about why these new proposals were prompted, stated in reference to the Portswood residents' survey 'Together with existing concerns over the level of university and retail-related parking, there are now also major concerns over the impact of the Sainsbury's development on parking in this locality'. It would seem that Sainsbury's may have been a major factor in influencing the outcome of the survey. As I suggested above, I think that there has been very limited formal soundings by your office and to the best of my knowledge the whole scheme was based on the submission of a resident's survey and I am unaware of the questions used in the survey to gauge opinion or of the validity of the sample (ie which residents were canvassed, how many responses were there etc.). I would be grateful if you have further information.**

5. In my discussion with Graham Muir, there has been no indication of any monitoring of what's happened in the 12 months since the current restrictions came into force, no evidence of any real 'review' of what's been achieved/problems caused by the restrictions. No reference was made to any road safety arguments in support of restrictions. Whilst the council should rightly respond to the needs of its residents it is important to recognise that the council should consider all residents rather than just those who shout loudest.

*All enquiries and correspondence related to the parking in the Portswood Resident Gardens area have been registered since the introduction of the Brookvale Road permit parking*

*restrictions. Local Resident associations were also invited to comment on the points raised, including the request from residents for Permit Parking restrictions in the area. The scheme was then proposed and advertised as this provides a formal legal process through which the public can raise objections, which can then be duly considered and decided upon.*

**Your response is clear, yet I am sure you may appreciate that from an external perspective the process seems very opaque. Why have you not summarised the correspondence? Surely, in making the case to concerned residents like myself, you might be able to provide greater detail on the real need for these restrictions?**

6. Non-resident parking in residential areas is caused by a variety of reasons, including underutilised public transport and road design unsuited for bicycle users. In these times of limited resources, investment would be much better spent in correcting these problems than by painting white lines, employing traffic wardens and shifting the problem elsewhere.

*The growth of the Uni-Link bus service from 1m to 4m passengers per year over the last 10 years in our view shows that enhanced public transport provision and permit parking can work together to reduce congestion and carbon emissions around the University.*

## Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals

The increased use of bus services is of course good news. The problem is that despite these data, other than Sainsbury's and retail parking the main objection seems to be related to University students/staff parking. Therefore, despite the good news about UniLink more needs to be done. Furthermore, a 400% increase in 10 years suggests that there is an appetite for further public transport investment. I would support this approach over the blunt instrument of residents parking.

Residents parking has some advantages in that it limits who can park in your street, but similarly, this is also a disadvantage because having friends and colleagues to visit becomes difficult. Even tradesmen such as plumbers and electricians etc. count as one of the 60 visitors per year unless a 2 week business permit is purchased. To some people this becomes isolating and I don't believe it is good for the community. The extensive street markings and posts etc are a secondary disadvantage.

### 3) FROM A RESIDENT OF WINN ROAD

Dear Mr Muir,

Thank you for your thorough letter of 29 July about Portwood parking. I see what you mean but still profoundly disagree. I feel that the expense of putting in all the signs and white lines cannot be justified in the present hard times.

Moreover, enforcement of yet more regulations costs money, at a time when more important services such as refuse collection are endangered. Putting up signs without enforcing them leads to the worst of all results - the public just ignoring the regulations and extending their disregard to other, more useful schemes. Enforcement costs money: neglecting it is worse.

I suggest, too, that these proposals are merely blowing the smoke away from the fire, which is the lack of provision for university parking.

Best wishes

RECEIVED

## **Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals**

### **FROM A LOCAL RESIDENT**

Dear Mr Muir,

Thank you for the copy of your letter of 29th July.

I would still urge the Cabinet of the Council to consider the impact of the proposed restriction in Abbots Way and Russell Place on local businesses, banks and the library with the greatly reduced availability of parking. Living in Russell Place, we seem well able to cope with the present arrangements (H-bars across the entrances to the house) and only rarely is our egress or entry to the property made difficult by poor parking. Should the new restrictions come in, can businesses 'buy' 8-hr parking slots?

I fear that the new arrangements will lead to a major loss of facility on the Parade.

Yours sincerely

Professor John Norman

### **FROM THE OAKMOUNT TRIANGLE RESIDENT'S ASSOCIATION**

Dear Mr Muir

#### **Re: Portswood Resident Gardens Permit Parking Proposals**

Thank you for your letter of 29<sup>th</sup> July 2011, responding to our Representation sent to the Solicitor to the Council on 14<sup>th</sup> April, which should be read in conjunction with this letter.

OTRA has given careful consideration to your comments, but we feel that they do not adequately address many of the issues we raised in our earlier letter, in which we objected to those parts of the proposed Amendment

- 1) introducing permit holder parking only on the north side of Brookvale Road
- 2) introducing 2 & 4 hour waiting except permit holders in Abbots Way & Russell Place.

With regard to Brookvale Road, we now accept that since, as you have pointed out, this is a bus route, some form of parking restriction may be desirable. Although we are still not clear how a residents-only parking scheme would achieve this, we are willing to withdraw this part of our objection.

With regard to Abbots Way and Russell Place, we stand by our original objection.

- 1) All properties in Abbots Way and Russell Place have ample off-road parking and, in consequence, little need for on-road parking by residents. The proposal for '*limited waiting except permit holders*' is recognition that there can be no justification for excluding non-resident parking, and also recognition that these roads are sufficiently wide that parking does not constitute a hazard to traffic. Because parking restrictions have been introduced on wide roads elsewhere does not negate or remove the point made in our objection, which is that roadside parking in Abbots Way & Russell Place causes no hazard or concerns about safety.

## Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals

- 2) OTRA continues to oppose the incremental extension of parking restrictions. We understand that the City Council's present policy is to promote restrictions piecemeal, in response to requests from residents. In your letter, you quote from the Strategic Parking Policy *"Residents' Parking Schemes should be introduced where there is excessive parking in an area by non-residents"*. It appears that residents groups are being allowed to establish their own definition of *"excessive"*, ranging from *"potentially dangerous"*, as occurs in areas of high-density housing where families with young children have to walk long distances between the nearest available parking space and their homes, to the merely *"unsightly"*, as is the case in Abbotts Way and Russell Place. You also state that *'Parking policy in residential areas will continue to focus on ensuring that residents do not experience problems resulting from commuter parking or from parking generated by major attractors'* There has been no demonstration that residents in Abbotts Way & Russell Place experience real problems as a consequence of roadside parking.
- 3) OTRA notes that there has been no formal review of the impact of the restrictions introduced in Brookvale Road following consultation with residents in the wider area (letter to residents in Oakmount Triangle, Portswood Residents Gardens, Highfield Lane & Brookvale Road 27th June 2008). The only reference is to *'positive feedback from residents within Brookvale Road'*; there has been no review of the displacement effect of those restrictions on neighbouring areas. This challenges the literally correct statement that the Cabinet has not previously considered permit parking in Abbotts Way & Russell Place, but this is not what we said in our objection. What we correctly said was that there had been consultation in 2008 on draft proposals which included restrictions in Abbotts Way & Russell Place and following that consultation, they were not progressed further. The point in OTRA's objection stands; there has been no substantive change justifying reversal of that decision & no proper review & examination of the impact on surrounding areas of the restrictions which were introduced in Brookvale Road following that consultation.
- 3) OTRA objects to the public expenditure involved. The City Council should not, especially in present circumstances, be promoting a scheme which has little or no public benefit and will involve both initial investment and continuing expenditure. Since the properties that would benefit have their own off-street parking, little revenue can be expected from second or visitor permits. The cost of the residents parking scheme would therefore fall almost entirely on taxpayers.
- 4) Parking will be displaced from the Residents' Gardens area if the proposed restrictions are implemented. This will increase competition for the limited, and already pressured, on-street parking available in the Oakmount Triangle, encouraging the removal of front-garden walls and planting which are so significant in giving the area the special character recognised by designation as a Conservation Area\*.

OTRA understands that the proposal, and representations made on it, will be reported to a meeting of the Cabinet which will decide whether the Order should be confirmed as it stands or be amended. OTRA would wish to be offered the opportunity to make representations at that meeting of the Cabinet.

\*(see Oakmount Triangle Conservation Area: Character Appraisal & Management Plan, 2008, pp. 14-15)

**John Marshall**

Professor John Marshall (OTRA, Chair)

## Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals

From a resident of Winn Road

### THE CITY OF SOUTHAMPTON (BASSETT, HIGHFIELD, AND HAMPTON PARK) (RESIDENT'S PARKING SCHEME) (AMENDMENT NO2) ORDER 2011

#### Conclusion

Thank you for your letter dated July 19<sup>th</sup>.2011, responding to my comments on April 15<sup>th</sup> 2011, relating to the Application noted above.

I do not accept your reply.

#### Argument

Your letter does not reply logically or accurately to the comments I made to the Solicitor to the Council in April. Reflecting your report on the parking levels in Westwood Park I am delighted that you say "...we travel on these roads at different times and are aware of that (sic) in certain sections parking is becoming concentrated". No accurate, professional surveys, to determine the existing traffic conditions, have been carried out in Westwood Park for many years. The effect of the proposals cannot be judged accurately.

You "judge the proposals appropriate". On what basis? Theory and experience based on the occasional "drive-by" with no grounding with observed fact?

Whilst noting your belief that you are "unable to see any impact from the timing of the Notice" I question whether it was appropriate to publicise them in a "Swing Ward" so close to the Council Elections.

Allied to this is my concern that the basic traffic issues have become subordinate to the need, identified in earlier Cabinet Minutes, to "maintain the good relationship" between the Council and the RGA: additionally reinforced by Details 13,14 and 15 recorded in the Cabinet Decision Statement of April 11<sup>th</sup>.

Conservation is important but it should not be used, as in this case, as a weapon to improve the quality of life for RGA residents, with the potential to diminish the safety and welfare for the average man in the adjacent areas

Please ensure that my original comments, your response and this letter are laid before the Cabinet

[See documents below]

## **Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals**

### **Re: Portswood Resident Gardens Permit Parking Proposals**

Thank you for letter of 15<sup>th</sup> April highlighting your views over the permit parking proposals for the Portswood Resident Garden's locality.

We have undertaken some analysis of potential displacement of parking from the restrictions in the locality of Portswood Residents Gardens based on our own observations and information from residents. Any such analysis by its nature is limited in that we can only observe patterns of parking or the absence of parking (e.g. during the University term). We can then take an indicative view based on source of the attraction for parking, as to where some displacement may occur.

Our assessment is that around 35 vehicles would be displaced from Brookvale Road, Abbots Way and Russell Place (that could not be accommodated within the remaining unrestricted parking in these roads). Of these we estimate around half are University-related vehicles, which we would expect to displace into the Oakmount Triangle or potentially eastward to Grosvenor Road. The remaining retail-related parking, we would expect to displace into Westward Road or south of Portswood Road. Winn Road may however be subject to some displacement, if parking is not available in these roads and potentially some short-medium stay parking, if this is not absorbed within the limited waiting capacity in Abbots Way and Russell Place. It however remains our experience and view that it is difficult to predict these patterns of displacement.

Given there was a very high response rate to the Public Notice and that Ward Councillors were kept informed of the proposals and responses, I am unable to see any impact from the timing of the notice.

The role of the Cabinet of the Council is to consider and decide on any sustained objections to parking regulations. In making these decisions they will judge whether further technical advice or information is required..

I share your view that there has been an increase in parking in the locality (albeit with the variations you have highlighted) this reflects a convergence of university, retail and commuter-related parking. Whilst no quantitative surveys were undertaken in Winn Road and Westwood Road, we frequently travel on these roads at different times and are aware of that in certain sections parking is becoming concentrated.

The difficulty with Winn Road and Westwood Road is that it has been subject to major developments for which it is expected that parking will be accommodated on site. Thus proposals have been drafted to help provide better visibility around the accesses, in response to requests from residents.

A permit parking scheme has not been considered, as any developments since April 2001, would be excluded from entitlement to permits and resident requests have focused on the issue of accessibility, rather than on-street parking availability.

In terms of your Freedom of Information request (see below), your questions were worded as follows:

- a) The dates and details of Parking Surveys carried out in Winn Road and Westwood Road since January 2008.
- b) The dates and details of Automatic Traffic Counter Surveys carried out in Winn Road and Westwood Road since January 2008 with details of traffic speeds noted
- c) The dates and details of any other relevant parking surveys or speed checks carried out in both roads since January 2008.



## Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals

- d) Details on the rationale that determined the date for the publication of the new parking restrictions.

Whilst I appreciate that subject matter is closely related the questions in your letter of objection that you refer to as being part of your FOI request are different and were not therefore previously responded to.

- + How many vehicles will be displaced from the Residents' Garden Area?
- + Where is it anticipated that these vehicles will relocate?
- + What studies have been carried out to determine the likely effect in Westwood and Winn Roads?
- + What provision will be made for residents in the two roads, living in blocks of flats built after 2001, where on-site parking space is limited by Government and Council Regulation, who are obliged to park offsite.

The response to the first three points, as far as it possible to do so, is covered above. The answer to final questions is also partly addressed above. As government and Council Policy for the planning permission for developments after 2001 was based on the assumptions that parking would be on-site and limited to promote the use of sustainable travel, there is no intended provision for parking other than the unrestricted parking that currently applies in these roads.

In terms of your criticism of the work associated with these proposals, as highlighted above, it would be a matter for the Cabinet of the Council to decide whether further work is required to address your objections.

Whilst I appreciate your concerns over vehicles speeds, the provision of additional speed checks / traffic flows in Winn Road, would generally be considered to outside the scope of this public consultation process, unless the Cabinet of the Council consider otherwise.

Whilst I therefore appreciate your concerns, Traffic Management remains of the view that the proposals are still appropriate (with the exception of a minor amendment in Church Lane). I hope that you will find this decision acceptable, but if, for any reason you do not, and you wish to make an objection to this proposal, you have a right to do so. Your objection would then be placed before the Council's Cabinet for a decision.

**Should you wish to make an objection in this way, please write to me stating your reasons for doing so and making sure your letter reaches me no later than 31<sup>st</sup> August 2011.** Please note that in the event you wish to make an objection and request that it be considered by the Council's Cabinet body, any such correspondence will be included within a Cabinet report accessible by the public or be subject to disclosure under Freedom of Information legislation. To protect the personal information of private individuals, the Council will remove the address, telephone number and/or email address from their correspondence prior to disclosure. Otherwise objectors would need to advise the Traffic Management team, if there is any other personal information they would wish to remain confidential.

If you require any further information please contact me, otherwise please note that Traffic Management is now part of Balfour Beatty working for Southampton City Council, as part of the Highway Services Partnership.

Yours sincerely,

*Graham Muir*, Traffic Engineer, Traffic Management

**THE CITY OF SOUTHAMPTON (BASSETT, HIGHFIELD, AND HAMPTON PARK) (RESIDENT'S PARKING SCHEME) (AMENDMENT NO 2) ORDER 2011**

I wish to comment on the elements of the order above, relating to the proposals affecting Brookvale Road, Abbotts Way and Russell Place and the effect of those proposals on Winn Road and Westwood Road.

Comments

+ No data has been collected or analysis made by the Traffic Management Section to determine the potential for increased parking in Winn Road and Westwood Road that may follow the proposals noted above.

+ The timing of the publication of the proposals was inappropriate, so close to the Council Elections in May

Discussion

In seeking to understand the research undertaken by Traffic Management in reaching their decisions I asked for information from Councillors Vinson and Capozzoli. Both Councillors commented that their level of expertise on the subject was insufficient to answer the questions posed but they would obtain a response from Traffic Management. This was done with speed and efficiency.

Reflecting the reaction of two Councillors, it is logical to assume that the traffic expertise of the Cabinet Members, who will make the final decision on the proposals, is at the same level. They will depend on accurate and up to date information: particularly important in the constantly changing parking patterns in Westwood Park

The patterns vary significantly through the year, with a lower parking density during the School and University holidays. Outside the vacation periods these vehicles, added to the large number owned by commuters, evident on any working day, cause significant visibility and access problems for residents

The situation has worsened since parking was restricted in Cemetery Road in November 2009. A quote made at the time, commented that Cemetery Road had become a "Park and Ride" centre for commuters- the problem was simply transferred to Westwood Park

In earlier requests to the Council under the FOI Act, I established that a Parking Survey was carried out in Westwood Park in January 2008, twenty-two months before the restrictions were imposed in Cemetery Road. I assumed that further checks had been carried out to determine the effects of the restrictions that would provide an accurate base to determine the effect of the new proposals on surrounding streets. In a recent FOI request I learned that no quantitative surveys on the level of on-street parking in Winn Road or Westwood Road have been carried out since 2008. No up to date information on the existing status is available.

## Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals

Abbotts Way and Russell Place provide all day parking for businesses in Portswood through the working week. The density varies, principally because Waitrose Partners are allowed to use the onsite car park on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday but not on Thursday, Friday and Saturday. I anticipated that the Traffic Management Section would hold information on the effect of the proposed changes. I therefore asked four questions: -

- + How many vehicles will be displaced from the Residents' Garden Area?
- + Where is it anticipated that these vehicles will relocate?
- + What studies have been carried out to determine the likely effect in Westwood and Winn Roads?
- + What provision will be made for residents in the two roads, living in blocks of flats built after 2001, where on-site parking space is limited by Government and Council Regulation, who are obliged to park offsite.

The reply from the Traffic Management Section, in response to the first three questions, stated that no studies had been carried out to determine the effects of the displacement on the adjacent areas.

The response to the final question advised that while Westwood and Winn Roads already have a high level of on-street parking, permit parking in the area is not considered appropriate. A scheme is being considered to prevent parking at any time near vehicle accesses for proposal in 2011/2012

Viewing this data, it is difficult to understand a technical defence for the proposal. Whilst unfamiliar with the detailed aspects of Traffic Management I can only relate the process of decision-making to my own pre-retirement working life, first as a Navigating Officer at sea, later supervising and commissioning complex Refinery plants. I cannot imagine the reaction of my Managers had I proposed plans, operations or changes based on data five years old, yet this appears possible within the Cabinet organisation responsible for important decisions-surely a confirmation of Northcote-

Commenting on this reply, as a retired, non-driving pedestrian, I suggest that overall conditions have changed in the last five years. How valid are five year old volumetric flows on an established 'rat-run'? Whilst accepting that the effective narrowing of the road tends to slow the speed of responsible drivers it does not deter those to whom speed is all. Simple observation will confirm that view. I suggest this should be done after the School and University holidays. That will at least ensure that one current fact is available in judging the total issue.

## **Appendix 2 General Sustained Objections to the PRG Parking Scheme Proposals**

### **FROM A RESIDENT OF WINN ROAD**

Thank you for your letter of 29<sup>th</sup> July 2011. I am pleased that consideration will be given to restricting parking close to accesses in Winn Road and Westwood Road. However, I am disappointed that you consider the proposals still appropriate. Abbot's Way and Russell Place are very wide roads and there is room for car parking each side of these roads while still allowing 2 way traffic flow; and they are not on bus routes. Implementing the proposal will put more pressure on other areas less able to cope. Problems with non-residential parking are a reflection of the car born age in which we live in and the burden needs to be spread over as wide an area as possible; the proposals, as outlined, will simply transfer the problem and, for this reason, I wish to register my objection

### **FROM PORTSWOOD HARDWARE A RETAIL BUSINESS ON PORTSWOOD ROAD**

Thank you for your letter of 29<sup>th</sup> July regarding the parking proposals for the Portswood Resident Garden's locality.

I would still like to make an objection to these proposals. I feel that the proposals for limited 2 hour and 4 hour parking in the proposed roads is of no use to anyone. I run a small business in Portswood Road and if these parking restrictions come into force I will be unable to park and neither will my staff. As for the permits I can not afford to pay £306 per annum for myself and my staff, there is also the issue of safety in the winter, sometimes I have to walk round in the dark on my own, and knowing it is a short distance to my car I feel quite safe.

I have spoken to numerous residents from this area who are customers of mine and I have yet to find any that wish these proposals to go ahead. With the Sainsbury store going ahead there is plenty of parking for customers, and if Waitrose were made to let their staff use the car park it would make life easier, as it is you can only use Waitrose's car park whilst shopping in their store.

We are not the only business in Portswood who are worried about this, as with no where for us to park, as workers, how are we supposed to run our businesses, we need all the help we can get in the current climate. If permits were to be issued for all day parking at a reasonably cheap cost within the Portswood area this may be a solution for many of us, if not and these proposals go ahead I can see most of the small independent businesses in Portswood closing.