

## Extraordinary Full Council Meeting – Mon 14 Dec 2020

### Public Questions and Statements relating to Agenda Item 9

**Total no. of Questions and Statements = 96**

1.	<p>I cannot believe you are considering reintroducing the ill-conceived Salisbury city centre scheme. To ban cars is one thing, but to make the roads that will take some of the extra traffic narrower at the same time by cycle lanes is absurd. The roads are full but the cycle lanes are empty space as not used. Councillors are there to do what the residents want. Not make their own decisions. Disgusted.</p>
2.	<p>Thank you for demanding the removal of the Salisbury Low Traffic Zone constraints. Whilst the ideals may be noble, the crude implementation and continued installation in the midst of the Covid19 pandemic was deeply flawed, ill-conceived and only further strangled any attempt for local shops to trade and survive in this economic turmoil.</p> <p>It is a relief to see that common sense has prevailed.</p>
3.	<p>Councillors</p> <p>I am a local Salisbury resident who lives in a street which suffered detrimental effects as a result of the introduction of the People Friendly Streets scheme. I have already voiced my concerns in Feedback to Wilts CC, and welcomed its withdrawal.</p> <p>I would like to raise the following question at the Council meeting:</p> <p>I believe the ETRO needs to be part of a wider scheme if it is to be fully effect. If the scheme is introduced, to what extent will the impact on nearby residential streets be taken into account, in relation to increased traffic flow through these areas?</p> <p>Reasons for my question: The recent trial scheme merely deflected traffic onto nearby residential streets adjoining the restricted area. I live in Gigant St and, from the day the LTZ zone was introduced, there was a considerable increase in motor vehicles driving through this narrow, side street, and roads like it. This also had the effect of exposing local residents to a much higher level of pollution. You cannot merely reinstate the previous scheme unless the wider implications for traffic flow are managed correctly and fully monitored.</p> <p>Sincerely</p>
4.	<p>Good Afternoon</p> <p>I am writing to submit the following question to the public session of the SCC EGM on the 14th Dec 2020.</p> <p>Many thanks.</p> <p>As SCC will be debating a proposal to re-introduce the ETRO in 2021, can I ask that before the council makes a knee-jerk decision to re-start the scheme, it first considers re-starting the consultation process with the Salisbury community to gauge support for the scheme? A public consultation, based upon what the public has seen of the ETRO thus far, will provide SCC with a clear mandate from the majority of residents and businesses as to whether the scheme should be re-introduced or not.</p>
5.	<p>Dear Salisbury City Councillors</p> <p>I am writing to the Council with regards to the Salisbury City Council extraordinary meeting to discuss reintroduction of the Salisbury Friendly Streets in 2021.</p>

	<p>In my opinion the People Friendly Salisbury ETRO whilst very admirable in its intentions to make the streets more people friendly and reduce road pollution, was introduced at the wrong time in the middle of the Covid pandemic and without properly considering its wider effects. It had an immediate detrimental effect on small businesses in the city centre such as Southons in Catherine St who could no longer park to unload near to their businesses, and on people living in neighbouring streets such in Rolleston St as vehicles diverted down other streets in the city centre. .</p> <p>Also driving my daughter to South Wilts Grammar School on the morning of 21st October, I noticed the immediate impact the introduction of the city centre road restrictions had on the A36 Salisbury ring road traffic with queuing traffic all the way down from St Marks roundabout to the Wiltshire College roundabout and a big increase in queuing traffic on all the approaches to the Castle Rd roundabout. This continued each morning until the start of the second lockdown.</p> <p>I therefore ask that you as SCC councillors petition Wiltshire Council (WC) for this to go back for further and wider consultation with the general public and with local businesses before supporting it being reintroduced, and at an appropriate time, with a proper assessment of its wider impact on the city, including the A36 trunk road and other peripheral roads.</p>
6.	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>Ahead of the meeting I would like to ask that my question below is considered and I will be logging into the Meeting on the Teams stream</p> <p>I ask that the council first takes on board the point that the original consultation only attracted 400 responses, so in light of the size of the local population it can hardly have been that well publicised.</p> <p>Taking into account the levels of recent campaigns both for and against the scheme, this matter is now more high profile than when the process was originally instigated and prior to any resumption of the decision to progress or otherwise surely its incumbent on SCC to start a new consultation process that is better publicised to get a more accurate view on local people and business and a proper mandate on how to proceed.</p>
7.	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>As a resident of Downton Road, and environmentally conscious individual I am all for reducing all our carbon footprints, cycle lanes and reducing pollution in city centres for everyone's benefit.</p> <p>However I feel that there needs to be proper public consultation going forward on the strategy to achieve this, rather than a knee jerk implementation of measures that is not right for everyone, it has caused terrible congestion in other parts of the city increasing air pollution in these areas no doubt, and problems for businesses that are having a hard enough time dealing with the pandemic and its associated costs.</p> <p>Public consultation will give all residents and business an opportunity to express concerns/solutions that can be taken on board so that an environmentally friendly scheme works for all residents, businesses not just for now but into the future.</p>
8.	<p>Dear Councillor Clewer and Salisbury City Council</p> <p>I am sending this email to put up my comment regarding the meeting SCC is having at 14th</p>

	<p>Dec 2020 to discuss People Friendly Streets and possible reintroduction of ETRO to our city. I would appreciate it if you could put forward my objections to this plan.</p> <p>We have already seen the disaster ETRO brought to our city just before the most recent lockdown, huge problems of traffic, creating rat runs, jams in back roads and lockdown of the ring road. I am stating this as I have experienced it personally on various trips to the centre.</p> <p>In order to make any changes to our city, problems outside will have to be sorted first otherwise further chaos will come in such obvious ways the people of Salisbury know. Not having any proper consultations with residents and suddenly placing the plan proved how wrong this procedure was. One of the main problems of our city is the way the ring road is in big problems, especially A36 which creates massive jams. As the ring road is always very slow, most drivers avoid it and drive through the city to cut across to where they wish to go. If the problems of the ring road are sorted, a fall in cars driving through the centre will decrease in a very large percentage.</p> <p>It is often argued that the plan had to be in place to reduce pollution in the city but we all saw how pollution basically got shifted in a far worse way to other parts of the city and around ring road where we saw so many people complaining on the SOS Save Our Salisbury Facebook page, which has thousands of members. If the ring road is sorted and flow introduced in various ways, such as removing cycle lanes from A36 and returning the road back to multi lanes as how it was, it would help in a major way. It would make so much more sense to put the cycling lane through the park and the meadows parallel to the A36 which would be so much cleaner and pleasant.</p> <p>Most of the population of Salisbury does not live in the city centre but live outside which means they often 'pop in' to the centre to do their work, shopping, meets etc. As there is hardly any good public transport system, most drive to the centre, not using a park &amp; ride as that would add further 1.5-2hrs to their trip when in fact they want to pop in for an hour or so to the centre. Which means very good and cheap parking should be introduced to get this footfall to the city in the most efficient way.</p> <p>In a short statement, no limit for any traffic should be done to the city centre until all the major problems have been sorted to the ring road and new plans put in place for bypasses. Once that is done, traffic in the city will no longer be a problem.</p> <p>PS I have attached an article from Telegraph recently, regarding results about LTN/ETRO, Pollution. Please read this as they back many of my statements.</p>
9.	<p>Dear Clerk</p> <p>I would welcome the opportunity to put the following question to the Full Council scheduled for the 14th December under agenda item Salisbury People Friendly Streets 2021.</p> <p>Please can you confirm receipt and acceptance that the question will be put to the Councillors for a response?</p> <p>Dear Councillors</p> <p>I would welcome a response to the following question in relation to the People Friendly Streets item on the agenda:</p> <p>“The adoption of the Salisbury Central Area Framework Document in August 2020 made it clear that a key element of the framework was to create people friendly streets in the centre of the city to allow the central area to become a better place for people to move around</p>

	<p>safely, comfortably and in a more pleasant environment with reduced noise, air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions; prioritising cycling, walking and public transport.</p> <p>The framework was subject to public consultation and workshop discussions with the community, local businesses and stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please can you confirm that Salisbury BID were consulted as part of the stakeholder engagement process and what their response was to the consultation exercise?</li> <li>• Please can you confirm the level of support that the framework received from local businesses and the public?</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to express my question to you all”</p>
10.	<p>Ref Meeting concerned with the City Centre plan which has caused recent controversy.</p> <p>I wish to state my concern that the recent introduction of traffic restrictions in the central area of Salisbury was abandoned far too soon.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The impact of the plan on footfall could not be fairly assessed in the short time it was in place, especially as the centre was locked down for a crucial month.</li> <li>2) The government has encouraged local areas to develop more pleasant environments for pedestrians and cyclists to be able enjoy without excessive car fumes and noise. The motoring lobby has clearly had an impact on this decision, and money spent putting the plans in place appears to have been wasted.</li> <li>3) There is plenty of access to perfectly good car parks and people need time to re adjust to the way they enter and use the city.</li> <li>4) Salisbury High Street as a pedestrian zone is far more pleasant than when vehicles entered, and the public adjusted to that in time.</li> </ol>
11.	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I'd be grateful if you could add my points to the above meeting.</p> <p>In the absence of the normal route through the centre, on an occasion there are roadworks/accident on the Relief Road (it is not a Ring Road unless you include Wilton Road and Netherhampton Road) then available roads into town to divert are narrow with tight corners. This was realised in Castle Street recently by the number of vehicles not managing Scots Lane and having to turn around.</p> <p>These narrow, tight-cornered roads will become the well-used cut-through for the traffic the LTZ is apparently designed to avoid. Local residents along these routes were up in arms about the increase traffic whilst the experiment was running. They will, again, I'm sure.</p> <p>There is a popular thought that increasing the number and times, that workers can work from home, will alleviate some of the traffic. Working from home does not produce anything. You cannot eat it, you cannot wear it and you cannot kick it around a field. These goods need to be manufactured, transported and delivered, hence vans and lorries will still be required to access homes and of course, shops. Couriers work all through the day so the timetabling such as in use in High Street, would not be of use. Similarly Number plate Recognition will simply penalise any courier company who hasn't acquired permits for their entire fleets!</p> <p>Lastly, as a resident on the outskirts (inside the P&amp;R range) I am often required to drop off and pick up in the centre. Not being resident within the zone, I did not qualify for a permit. I</p>

	<p>consider Salisbury as my home. Being banned from driving into it angers me. In 42 years of working at the college in Southampton Road, I can testify the air quality in Newbridge Road is a lot worse than anything I've come across in the centre. The fact the buses still drive through, in my mind, negates any advantage in banning my car. As an afterthought, I have heard many accounts that the 'lighter' traffic as a result, drives faster with the result of many near misses. This does not sound to me "safer"</p>
12.	<p>Good morning</p> <p>I am pleased to live in a town where Climate Emergency has been declared. I was pleased that actions were quickly taken by adding some cycling lanes and making the city centre "people friendly". But the grumpiness of a few drivers should not put an end to the great project.</p> <p>The city Council should save the life of the future generation rather than pleasing a few impatient drivers. Impatient drivers who hate the queues on the A36 to go shopping on Southampton road. Impatient drivers who don't have the time to come shopping in our own city centre.</p> <p>This is a great project, which fits nicely with the new Malting projects.</p>
13.	<p>FAO : Salisbury City Councillors</p> <p>Whilst I am not against a more "people-friendly", cleaner, safer Salisbury, any possible re-introduction of the recently withdrawn, flawed scheme, needs to be far better thought out and implemented, so as to not impact local businesses and jeopardise the future of our City - Salisbury MUST continue to remain open and it MUST remain easily accessible. I believe the ETRO very much gave the impression that Salisbury City Centre was closed and that no-one was welcome here. How on earth are businesses meant to survive, and if they then fail and close, what incentive is there to visit Salisbury, to live here and work here? I believe a balance needs to be struck between keeping Salisbury safe and clean, whilst also supporting our local businesses and ensuring the City still thrives.</p> <p>For the short time the scheme was in place, I really missed being able to freely "pop into town", and support local businesses - it was always so convenient to be able to nip in, find an on-street parking place (or be dropped off) and go and grab whatever I needed, especially in this day and age of "click and collect", used and needed even more so this year. The exorbitant parking fees put me off parking in a "proper" car park and have to pay for an hour, in order to quickly nip into a shop and be back in the car in less than 10 minutes - consequently I took my business elsewhere... to the supermarkets outside the city centre, where it's easy and free to park.</p> <p>It was also very frustrating to not be able to easily drop off items (often bulky/heavy) for the charity shops on Catherine Street, so again, they dip out too!</p> <p>There are several other reasons why I believe the scheme in its current format is not a positive move for Salisbury and not helpful for businesses, residents or visitors, not least that the through-traffic was simply pushed on to the ring road, causing greater congestion/pollution elsewhere, and making it even harder for emergency vehicles to negotiate. We need better infrastructure on the ring road and outside Salisbury to cope with such massive increased demand, generated by an uncompromising 24/7 ban on traffic through the centre. The measures recently implemented were just too severe - it's no wonder there was such a backlash.</p> <p>If the scheme IS reintroduced, I believe the following points should be considered :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- agree on a time frame each day when through-traffic is/isn't permitted, allowing</li> </ul>

	<p>deliveries/drop-offs/collections to continue to be easily made as normal, at certain times (without having to inconveniently arrange a permit), and allowing shoppers to easily "click and collect" and quickly nip in to wherever they wish to go - thus the impact on city centre businesses will not be quite as harsh</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reduce the parking fees in the main car parks, or at least implement a 20-30 minute "free parking" period or a reduced rate period, in line with on-street parking fees</li> <li>- further incentives introduced by WCC to shop from and support Salisbury City Centre businesses, operating within the traffic-free zone</li> <li>- limit the ban on through-traffic to a window during business hours only, Monday-Friday.</li> </ul>
14.	<p>I am afraid I am not in support of the proposal to reintroduce the recently abandoned People Friendly Salisbury scheme in its proposed state.</p> <p>Sadly, Salisbury is inherently plagued with access problems for vehicles, begging for a bypass, and it is ill-prepared for the city access to be removed. People are not going to sit in hours of traffic to get to a park &amp; ride site. Until the roads are addressed, you would drive further shoppers away from the city centre - against the intention of the scheme to improve city centre footfall and economy.</p> <p>The local businesses need all the support they can get to INCREASE footfall to the centre. The only sure way to do this is to reduce business rates in the city centre, encourage landlords through supplementary council-initiated schemes to reduce rents, and to reduce the cost of parking in the city centre. Pedestrianised areas are simply not necessary in an already people-friendly city. There were less incidents involving vehicle/pedestrian collisions before the scheme was trialled.</p> <p>What keeps people away is the terrible access, the cost to visit due to parking and the lack of choice; what keeps businesses away is the lack of footfall caused by the aforementioned. It's a vicious circle. You have to address the former to improve the latter.</p> <p>As an avid cyclist, I would welcome cycle lanes if I felt they were needed or appropriate but they simply aren't! I can cycle through the city without cycle lanes safely and there are plenty of routes already available to the hospital. The only area that needs addressing for me is the Portway from Old Sarum to Porton Down - where many commuters use the route on bicycles - and accidents are becoming more frequent and more serious.</p> <p>In short, if you want Salisbury to be more People Friendly, please listen to the People of Salisbury &amp; abort the scheme in its current state indefinitely.</p>
15.	<p>Dear Clerk,</p> <p>I would like to put forward my views regarding LTZ, as a long term resident of Salisbury, to the meeting on Monday, please.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; I have lived in Salisbury over 60 years so our beautiful city is very close to my heart.</li> <li>&gt;</li> <li>&gt; I strongly object to the LTZ imposed by Wiltshire Council (WC).</li> <li>&gt;</li> <li>&gt; My objections are as follows:</li> <li>&gt;</li> <li>&gt; This scheme was rushed in without a fair consultation with the residents of our city. I do not read the Journal, listen to local radio nor regularly review the WC webpages. The first I knew of this scheme was the unsightly bollards and barricades preventing me entering my</li> </ul>

	<p>home city.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; LTZ is a flawed concept. Mixing pedestrians with traffic is dangerous. Pedestrians think they are safe to step out into the road and less traffic increases speed. I am an ex-Special Constable (over 20 years' experience) and previously worked for WC Road Safety based at Melksham. I speak from a position of knowledge. Congestion slows traffic and reduces collisions. Those that do happen are at slower speed and are less serious. Please don't think of road humps, another unsightly blot on a beautiful medieval city and not the answer to impose a hated scheme.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; LTZ? WC issued 2000 permits to drive within the zone. Proving this area could not be shut off to traffic if over 2000 vehicles need access. Where is the reduction in traffic if 2000 can be within the zone?</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; The issue of permits was a disaster. Excluded were, and I am sure there are more, relatives of people living in the city who rely on their help, care workers, social workers and other vital services. We encourage the elderly to live in our city then bar their essential care workers from accessing the city. Social Workers in their own vehicles cannot make emergency calls in times crisis. Other essential, lifesaving services are expected to park in the Central and carry heavy lifesaving equipment many 100's of yards. The answer, before a WC councillor became involved, receive a penalty, appeal and hope for the best. Lease car companies charge £75 to pass on a penalty notice. This cannot be recovered even if the penalty is revoked. But what a lot of unnecessary expense imposed by WC red tape. Time and money wasted.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; Traffic has been forced on to the A36. An already congested route bringing it to a standstill on more occasions than previously and normally this route, without LTZ, is a nightmare of queuing traffic.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; The routes around LTZ have been extremely busy as vehicles use the alternatives of Scott's Lane, Endless Street etc. What about the residents here? What consideration was given to them when extra, heavy, traffic was imposed on their lives?</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; It is claimed this will reduce emissions. How? Emissions from stationery, queuing traffic on the flyover at Winchester Street will tumble down right into the heart of the Market Square. More emissions as the traffic waits longer to move. A scientific fact that slow traffic produces more emissions than moving traffic.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; Salisbury is still in recovery from the Russian attack. Traders need help to bring customers to their door not have the city closed. Those huge illuminated signs on each entry said, in effect, don't come into Salisbury.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; A cleaner, greener city, which I dispute will be achieved by LTZ, is no use if there are no shops to visit. We already have too many empty shops. Don't discourage trade to those left.</p>
16.	<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>I believe this is the correct email address to contact regarding the above matter.</p> <p>I hope that this scheme is not reintroduced to the city. Firstly I feel that it disconnects people from the city as it is a case of "out of sight, out of mind" if you cannot drive through without a permit.</p> <p>Secondly it has a very un-friendly feel when many people naturally come to Salisbury by car. It is also quite backward looking considering more and more people will be purchasing</p>

	<p>electric cars in future so the issue of fossil fuel emissions will become less. The barriers and signs looked absolutely awful and completely out of keeping with our medieval city.</p> <p>The way that the scheme was set up forcing cars to either turn in the road or buses to swing out onto the wrong side is hazardous to both pedestrians and other vehicles.</p> <p>The sense of pedestrian complacency the reduced traffic flow had was obvious every time I ventured into town. I saw more than one person walk straight into the road without looking because they believed there would be nothing coming. I've lived here 40 years and never seen anything like it. I believe it may be this or the previous reason that caused a child to become trapped under a bus, which is not something any of us ever wish to happen and could have ended tragically.</p> <p>Pushing traffic from the centre onto residential streets also generates more pollution in residential areas and caused delays and hold ups for many people trying to get to work and school.</p> <p>Essentially I think it is a horrible scheme and I would be very disappointed to see it back.</p>
17.	<p>I am writing to you in support of the People Friendly Streets Initiative to be discussed at the Extraordinary Full Council Meeting on Monday 14th December.</p> <p>I would like to make the following points:</p> <p>A number of streets have pavements so narrow that social distancing (even a metre apart) is not possible without using the roadway - for example Winchester St and Catherine St. This was one of the concerns that PFS was going to address and one that requires the scheme to be operating right now and almost certainly through much of next year, not something for future consideration.</p> <p>This is a very modest scheme. A very few roads are to be free of general traffic, people can still drive to and park within a few hundred metres of the centre of town, all the car parks are open as usual and parking meters are still available.</p> <p>I understand further money for improvements is likely to be available but will be contingent on this scheme being operative - we cannot afford in the current climate to delay everything and rely on unspecified future funding that may well never appear.</p> <p>I believe we need to get this scheme back in place and stop finding excuses to kick it into touch when it effectively deals with so many of the problems we have to face up to both in Salisbury and nationally.</p>
18.	<p>I want to register my wholehearted objections to this scheme being re-introduced.</p> <p>We live on Riverdown Park development and during the time at the beginning of the scheme (before lockdown) the increased traffic on the A36 ring road was unacceptable.</p> <p>Please do not bring this ill thought through scheme back.</p>
19.	<p>Please do don't ruin this city by reinstalling the LTZ and the ridiculous cycle lanes ,In my 60 years of living in this area they are the two worse ideas I've ever had the misfortune to see implemented. Business will suffer, the majority of residents will be angry and the tailbacks and traffic pollution will be worse than before due to funnelled standing traffic or be switched to the already clogged 20 year out of date ring road. Man up and admit it was a mistake with all the new electric and very clean petrol engine vehicles coming through will eradicate the problem in due time. Do not let the people in charge who are obviously educated beyond the realms of common sense and probably don't live in our city have any more say</p>

	<p>on this matter and any local councillors that supported should be named, shamed and eradicated at the next election.</p>
20.	<p>Good afternoon. I am one of those people who was against the people friendly scheme in Salisbury.</p> <p>Two questions I would like to pose is 1. 'what are you going to do about the traffic that significantly increased beyond all measure around the local roads, such as Tollgate Road, Rampart Road and Southampton Road as soon as the LTZ scheme started last time, if you were to reinstate? 2. How are you going to deal with the pollution and noise in these areas from the stationary vehicles that will cause health issues to local residents if you reinstate the scheme?</p> <p>A bypass or other traffic measures needs to happen before a LTZ is reconsidered.</p> <p>Please consider these questions first before any reinstatement of the scheme.</p>
21.	<p>I am very concerned about the reintroduction of the ETRO scheme in Salisbury and would like my objections to be made clear in the meeting on Monday.</p> <p>The reason for my objection to the ETRO Scheme is due to the poor infrastructure of the roads around the city centre. The A36 cannot cope with the volume of traffic and this was proven on Saturday 5<sup>th</sup> December. There was an unfortunate accident on Pepperbox hill around midday and the A36 at Tesco roundabout was closed off. This caused miles of tailbacks all around the 'ring road' and along the back roads, e.g. Rampart rd., Tollgate rd. and Milford Mill rd. Traffic didn't clear until 6 hours after the accident happened. Traffic was at a standstill going down Southampton Road. Now, if Southampton road was a dual carriage way the traffic may not have been so bad. How emergency services get down this road when it is like this I have no idea.</p> <p>The other reason for my objection to the ETRO scheme is its premise of trying to reduce emissions in the city centre. This is all well and good, however, pushing the traffic onto the already struggling A36 only increases the emissions at the roundabouts and the roads leading to said roundabouts. There was a report recently saying that the hotspots for emissions around Salisbury are already at these ring road roundabouts, so forcing more cars to sit in traffic on the A36 will only exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>I feel that until more is done to tackle the issue of congestion on the A36 then the ETRO scheme will not have as much support as it would if plans were in place to make substantial improvements to the A36.</p> <p>I hope you consider my objections and voice them in the meeting on Monday.</p>
22.	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I understand that one of the items on the agenda for the Council meeting on Monday, is a discussion about the potential reintroduction of the ETRO/ People Friendly Salisbury scheme.</p> <p>I was surprised to hear this was being discussed again so soon after the scheme was only just suspended "indefinitely"?</p> <p>I had logged my objection with Wiltshire Council to this scheme.</p> <p>I think that any future plans to make Salisbury more pedestrian friendly, should not take place until the whole road infrastructure around Salisbury is addressed.</p>

	<p>It does not even have a proper ring road, and is in desperate need of a bypass that is outside of the city boundary.</p> <p>The current traffic situation, particularly on the A36 and Southampton Road, has regular issues and traffic jams.</p> <p>Other routes into the city have become increasingly busy in recent years due to increased house building and associated traffic.</p> <p>The road infrastructure is under increasing pressure and just closing the city centre to traffic does not solve the problem.</p> <p>All it does is impact businesses by discouraging people from going into the city centre.</p> <p>Novichok and Covid 19 have already had a huge impact on the city!</p> <p>I would request the Council consider these issues before making any decision about the future of the scheme.</p>
23.	<p>Dear Councillor,</p> <p>Having been born and bred in Salisbury I have seen a once busy and vibrant city slowly decline to nothing short of a ghost town.</p> <p>The instalment of the recent 'people friendly' traffic reducing scheme to the city was a complete disaster, particularly for the local shops which depend on pass through footfall to survive.</p> <p>If people cannot readily access the shops without hindrance they will obviously take their custom elsewhere, such as Southampton, Andover or Winchester all of which are roughly half an hour away, time that is spent on trying to get to a car park in Salisbury with the filtering in place.</p> <p>To get this great city back on its feet it will need all the help it can get, but that HAS to come from the top.</p> <p>The permanent removal of the ETRO scheme and the ill thought out cycle lanes which as I see is only used by perhaps as many as 3 cyclists per day would be a step in the right direction.</p> <p>The real problem is the vastly expensive business rates that are charged for the shop premises, these NEED to be lowered to attract more business to want to be established here.</p> <p>There's no point making the city shopper safe if there's nothing to come here for.</p> <p>We've already lost two of the great meeting places for young people, the bus station and also the Burger King restaurant, something I think has to do with the rates for such a premium shop space.</p> <p>This city cannot survive on elderly residential properties which now seem to be taking over but on making the city an attractive business proposition for anyone wishing to set up trading here.</p> <p>Please don't waste this opportunity to rebuild this city back to its former glory, remove the people friendly scheme one and for all and get Salisbury vibrant again.</p>
24.	<p>As a City Resident, I've noticed that since the lifting of the LTZ, the Car Parks are 75% full,</p>

	<p>the Shops are healthily busy, and the 'light" Traffic has flowed freely through the City as always, The Cycle lanes are still completely EMPTY. So the question has to be asked, What was all that about!!! 😊 To Clarify: "If it's not broke, don't fix it!"</p>
25.	<p>Dear Councillors,</p> <p>I am writing to strongly urge you to support the reintroduction of PFS in 2021.</p> <p>In your wards there will be people suffering from heart disease, strokes or dementia whose conditions are almost certainly linked to high air pollution, which it is predicted will kill more people than Covid this year. On these grounds alone it would be worth pursuing PFS, but there are the added benefits of reducing carbon emissions and making the city centre a place where residents and visitors want to spend more time- -and where they can socially-distance more easily in our narrow streets.</p> <p>I am also concerned that, if you turn down this opportunity, the money from central government will not be available again. In the hard times which are coming, it may be hard to justify losing a potential grant of a further £1.3 million.</p> <p>I do hope that you will back this scheme which does not, after all, prevent anyone driving into Salisbury, but just seeks to make it a better experience when they get there!</p>
26.	<p>I like to foremost say thanks for standing with the residents on the LTZ measures recently in Salisbury City centre. They were appalling and unsightly, just plainly ill-advised for that time.</p> <p>I've been in contact with Philip Whitehead Leader of Wiltshire Council and found it to be like talking to a brick wall. I've attached my email correspondence with him but feel that he's just very condescending and will soon try to force the LTZ measures again soon.</p> <p>I've tried to see if there's a possibility to get some formation on a rethink but he seems to be dead set on what he did was perfect for Salisbury. The measures he pushed out were disastrous and devastating to every business in Salisbury City centre. It's just a reason why Wiltshire Council just wants Salisbury to die off into a ghost town. This is disgustingly disgraceful behaviour displayed by Wiltshire Council and Salisbury needs to fight harder to get the right funding for what's needed for Salisbury.</p> <p>I gave an exceptional suggestion for LTZ but not his way and still have the city centre as it is with minor disruption. It'll work with the shops of Salisbury and help with pedestrianisation of Salisbury City centre. I talk to John Glen MP via email often but he's a busy person so doesn't get time to reply to me.</p> <p>The suggestion is implemented in several large cities across the world especially in the UK.</p> <p>My suggestion as follows;</p> <p>To raise the whole of Salisbury City centre to 1 level. Just the main roads not car parks. Put in either brickwork on the ground, cobble stones or the marble in market square maybe even British marble as its hard wearing. Just cut thick groves into the marble to help with braking etc.</p> <p>The idea of having deliveries taxis buses etc. into the city centre only was a great idea. The raised areas of Salisbury is for only these vehicles 24/7. All emergency vehicles are permitted to use city centre as well.</p> <p>Restriction of 15mph throughout Salisbury City centre only exception is for emergency vehicles and whether they are attending an emergency.</p>

The car parks in Salisbury can too be altered to accommodate Salisbury as well. All park & rides are for visiting Salisbury. The car parks in Salisbury can be designated for disabled people only and for permit holders. Not to forget that anyone working in Salisbury City centre then the car parks are for them to use. The multi storey car parks can then be dismantled down and create a pick up and drop off points for shopping.

A set building in Salisbury can be used for a locker based system. Some places have done it and been very successful with it. The lockers can be used for storing shopping whilst in Salisbury to save carrying it around. The building can have a security guard system and CCTV, 24/7. Each locker is payable for £1 per locker and in each locker can be a guide to Salisbury and quick summary of Salisbury. Each locker will be key and card system to unlock the locker. The card is an identification device that is needed to get a locker. Every key card needs registration for everyone using it like a guest book system. Their age name address contact details. The guest book can also have a special effect to allow 1 person out of 1000 to get a locker system for free when they visit Salisbury next. Then also a pick up system to help collect the shopping at the building.

We also received:

Hi all,

I've tried to speak to Cllr Whitehead on an occasion but his decision was he's pushing for the LTZ no matter what. His decision was made up and the pure stupidity of its going to happen mentality was present.

The 4 week of the LTZ showed cleared information that it was working (Cllr Whitehead) has said. Enough evidence collected in those 4 weeks apparently which is absolutely nonsense and even Highways England has said that's nonsense.

I've passed a suggestion over to Philip Whitehead about a more beneficial LTZ but again his arrogance dominated. The communication level is filtered with Philip Whitehead and the LTZ his way or not at all.

Salisbury needs a BYPASS not a LTZ.

Salisbury is a medieval city and constantly subjecting the city to decision making by set individuals.

Wiltshire Council has lost sight to Salisbury and has no concern about what they do in the city centre.

Salisbury isn't Trowbridge or Melksham where Wiltshire Council has dumped millions of pounds for their benefit whilst ignoring Salisbury.

2018 was the year that Wiltshire Council gave up fully with Salisbury. Forcing the LTZ out without consultation was a clear sign of neglect to Salisbury and her residents including businesses.

I strongly recommend a LTZ like Southampton has got in place as it'll protect Salisbury's heritage areas and look less unsightly. As Wiltshire Council won't listen to Salisbury businesses or to Salisbury residents then they will squander the money elsewhere.

Fix our roads properly.

Give us the bypass needed for the last decade or more.

Stop penalising Salisbury by Wiltshire Council greed.

Actually consult Salisbury businesses and its residents.

Repair and replace road signs across Salisbury.

Remove broken phone boxes.

Build a police station for Salisbury.

Give Salisbury what it needs and not what you feel it deserves.

Salisbury City Council I urge you don't fall backwards stand with your residents.

Extinction Rebellion is a greedy approach to destroy Salisbury and its tourism. A clue in its name Extinction it means to wipe it out fully.

John Glen MP I urge you to stand your ground say NO.

Until Philip Whitehead actually listens to everyone who lives and works in Salisbury then the answer is NO.

I rather Salisbury be riddled with potholes than Philip Whitehead look at LTZ measures. Oh wait it already is getting that way, with badly trained individuals that just fill potholes with junk basically.

The cycle lanes are too big and for a cycle lane to be practical it must go on both sides of the road. The bollards are useless and actually causing more harm than good.

Salisbury isn't a dumping ground for lousy measures to be forced in.

It has to tie in with the city centres medieval appearance the reason why we attract so much tourism. Wiltshire Council needs to actually do what is needed before pushing anything out first. Monitor traffic for at least 6 months flowing into Salisbury City centre. Assess whether it's a lot or not based on other places of high tourism, no sorry low tourism as Wiltshire Council demands tourists to burn a hole in their pocket in Salisbury. The findings or evidence of the 6 months monitoring must be released to all residents of Salisbury including businesses. Then a few sets of LTZ measures to choose from that Salisbury feels more appropriate for Salisbury. Then go forward with the majority vote and thank everyone who had their say on the matter.

It's called consultation Wiltshire Council. You ask 1st not 2nd, Salisbury would welcome a LTZ but not this way. The LTZ measures in Southampton are astonishing and they work beautifully whilst protecting the shops etc. It would work 100% better than your LTZ vision Philip Whitehead and it would look more appealing. It would protect our shopping tourists and shopping from Salisbury people itself.

Southampton's LTZ measures are as follows;

Heighten up all the roads to path level.

Reduce speed limit to lower than the regulated limit. 20mph to 15mph.

Increase street lighting by 100%.

Only public transport, taxis, deliveries, coaches, motorcycles including push bikes in the city centre.

	<p>The city centre is marked by the road being higher than the normal road. The LTZ would be clearly seen being a few cm's higher it'll appear as a speed ramp.</p> <p>During markets, fairs and carnivals no traffic allowed through the city centre.</p> <p>Increase the amount of pedestrian crossings in the city centre 100%.</p> <p>That LTZ measure is more acceptable and cheaper to do which also protects Salisbury heritage areas.</p> <p>No LTZ until Salisbury businesses and residents have an opinion on the LTZ.</p>
27.	<p><u>To Whom It May Concern.</u></p> <p>I vehemently object to the reinstatement of the LTZ in Salisbury.</p> <p>It is/was based on very poor planning, flawed science, and poor implementation and effectively zero public consultation.</p> <p>There are simply not enough other streets in Salisbury for traffic to use safely, efficiently, and in a genuinely pollution-reducing manner to make the LTZ viable in the absence of much needed major improvements to the existing arterial roads, the inner ring road, or the construction of a proper bypass.</p> <p>It is totally unrealistic and utterly impractical to expect cycling, walking, or public transport to replace motor vehicles for the majority of journeys in and around Salisbury.</p> <p>Park &amp; Ride buses, for example, are not a particularly suitable mode of transport for families to use, and/or those carrying bulky or heavy items, or lots of bags, as well as the fact that they have to sit in the same long queues as the rest of Salisbury's traffic, a major deficiency that has been overlooked by the planners and the Councils right from their inception.</p> <p>The LTZ was/is also bad for most businesses in the town centre, preventing a great many potential shoppers from making quick, convenient, and efficient visits in order to make essential purchases and even impulse buys, particularly by dropping off and picking up of people carrying shopping, or in times of inclement weather, or for their personal safety when it's dark, especially those with even minor walking difficulties.</p> <p>It only encourages shoppers to do so elsewhere or online, it's derisory and unprovable to claim that it will stimulate more footfall in the town centre, and even more derisory to quote the alleged success of such schemes in much larger cities like Bristol and other bigger or better laid-out cities and towns.</p> <p>Contrary to the council's claims, the LTZ actually discourages retail businesses from investing in new premises in Salisbury, or keeping open existing, expensive, already floundering shops, take-aways, and banks, for example.</p> <p>There needs to be far more research, planning, legitimate climate and pollution science, and substantial investment in correcting the poorly conceived and totally inadequate existing through-road system in Salisbury before any attempt at an effective LTZ can ever work.</p>
28.	<p>Dear Salisbury City Council,</p> <p>Please consider my comments below at the upcoming full council meeting regarding people friendly streets.</p> <p>I object to the no through traffic/ETRO approach for Salisbury. My belief is the challenges</p>

	<p>facing Salisbury roads will only be relieved by the construction of a bypass.</p> <p>Below are my concerns re the previous 'People Friendly Streets' implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk to pedestrians/disabled has not been significantly reduced. The current scheme allows buses, residents, deliveries, taxis, disabled, cyclists all to pass through freely. The roads, whilst slightly quieter, now suffer from some – especially taxis &amp; deliveries – driving far more aggressively. The risk to pedestrians has not been reduced, and this would only be achievable with full pedestrianisation. Risk of a high-speed collision appears to have been increased.</li> <li>• Signage – signage is all very small and unclear, but could clearly be easily remedied.</li> <li>• Additional distance resulting in more pollution – a significant number of residents live within the A36 ring road, but not within the experimental area. These residents thus don't have permits, and have to travel on a limited number of streets to gain access to the A36 to in turn drive long distances along it to leave the city.</li> <li>• Congestion on A36 near Southampton Road increased – traffic near this roundabout is even worse, with no viable alternative. This dissuades visitors to the city.</li> <li>• Night-time safety – reduced traffic flows within Salisbury centre makes the streets less busy. This makes lone walkers even more vulnerable to attack or harassment, due to the quietness of the roads.</li> </ul>
29.	<p>Please do don't ruin this city by reinstalling the LTZ and the ridiculous cycle lanes. If you do business will suffer, the majority of residents will be angry and the tailbacks and traffic pollution will be worse than before due to funnelled standing traffic or be switched to the already clogged 20 year out of date ring road. With all the new electric and very clean petrol engine vehicles coming through this will eradicate the problem in due time. It seems to me the people making these decisions don't live in Salisbury, if they did then they know how ridiculous this idea is. I do not support this preposterous idea!</p>
30.	<p>Dear council</p> <p>We believe that the re-introduction of the LTZ at this time is wrong as businesses need to recover. When the LTZ was in place there was still significant traffic travelling down Exeter St, New St and beyond and the Ring Road was gridlocked at certain times of the day. People will not want to come and shop in Salisbury if they know that it will take them longer to travel into the City. In some cases, they will probably choose Southampton or even Andover as that has a better transport infrastructure</p> <p>Due to the location of Churchfield heavy lorries will always have to come into the City via Exeter Street because the 2 bridges are Victorian and too low for today's lorries</p> <p>We as a B&amp;B have a small number of guests in normal times who have knocked on our door looking for a room as they could stop opposite (Not possible now because of the Cycle Lane) If the traffic is bad on the ring road they will just go on their journey and not stop as the signs on the ring road were not friendly.</p> <p>When the LTZ was in place before lockdown 2, Catherine street was deserted but after it was removed the Charity Shops were busy as people could drop off and buy goods from those shops.</p> <p>When the LTZ was in place many of the back streets which were already a Rat Run became more important to drivers who were trying to get from one side to the other.</p> <p>So, in my opinion, the LTZ made the traffic problem worse not better for this city. When you</p>

	<p>have cars in long queues and moving slowly you have more pollution not less.</p> <p>We are a "City in the Countryside" and due to the fact that we have water meadows on 2 sides that stop Salisbury from flooding it is going need a lot of planning before the LTZ should be reinstated</p> <p>I hope some of this makes sense to you</p>
31.	<p><u>Item 9. Salisbury People Friendly Streets 2021</u></p> <p>I understand that Salisbury City Council will be meeting on Monday (14 December) to discuss Salisbury People Friendly Streets and to consider and determine whether the City Council supports the introduction in 2021 of a People Friendly Streets Experimental Traffic Regulation Order, in accordance with the Central Area Framework report recommendations.</p> <p>I would like to make a statement to the meeting setting out my views on Salisbury People Friendly Streets and item 9 on the agenda.</p> <p>I have seen PFS in operation while using Salisbury city centre as a long-term resident (of New Bridge Road), shopper, car driver, and pedestrian.</p> <p>I would like Councillors to support the motion to introduce the People Friendly Streets/Salisbury ETRO in 2021.</p> <p>I am strongly in favour of People Friendly Salisbury and the Low Traffic Zone as it seems, to me, likely to make Salisbury a more pleasant place to shop and work in, because of its benefits to pedestrians, families with children, people with disabilities and tourists.</p> <p>My experience of PFS is that it made Salisbury safer and much easier for families with children, the elderly, and the disabled to cross roads and get around the city centre and it made shopping a more pleasant experience. Next summer, it would be lovely to sit outside of Boston Tea Party enjoying a coffee without having to put up with the noise of, and pollution from, vehicles idling their engines in New Canal as they wait for the traffic lights to change. I'm sure many visitors and tourists would feel the same. I mention I am a car driver. I do use my car regularly and cannot say I have been inconvenienced by PFS. In the past I have used the city centre as a short-cut to avoid jams on Churchill Way but have come to realise that doing that is to the detriment of Salisbury as it detracts from the pleasure of shopping in and walking around Salisbury, and this type of through traffic just makes it more difficult for buses, taxis, delivery vans, the disabled etc. to get around.</p> <p>A recent Wiltshire Council Press Release sets out the improvements to air quality and reduction in traffic volumes noted during the recent, brief, introduction of PFS. I feel sure these benefits will outweigh any short term problems with implementation and it is really disappointing that the experiment has been terminated without, as far as I can see, any evidence of adverse effects and dismissal of the benefits already apparent.</p> <p>I am looking for, and expecting, the Council to adopt an evidence-based approach when it makes its decisions. I believe the Council should reinstate PFS, monitor its effects – beneficial and adverse – in a subjective manner, and reach a considered decision at the end of a suitable trial period.</p> <p>A Climate Emergency has been declared by both Wiltshire Council and Salisbury City Council and any measures, such as PFS, which seek to address this must be supported.</p>

	<p>I see that Cllr Wayman hopes that the SWLEP will still look favourably on Salisbury's bid for £1.3m of funding for improvements in the city, including cycling facilities, new bus shelters, Shopmobility improvements, an electric car club vehicle, enhanced public seating areas and improved signage. This suggests PFS still has some life in it if it can be revived soon.</p> <p>Current initiatives including the CAF, Neighbourhood Plan and River Park proposal promise an exciting and vibrant destiny for Salisbury if its citizens can embrace change and look to the future. PFS seems an integral part of this optimistic view and I urge you to back it.</p>
32.	<p>I'm just writing to give feedback on the 'people friendly streets' and cycle lanes that were recently introduced and then removed in our lovely city.</p> <p>I'm totally against these new initiatives. The traffic through Salisbury was been pushed onto the small back streets and also it has caused chaos on the 'ring road' which was busy enough before it was introduced. Even during the recent lockdown with fewer cars it was choked with cars. Increased emissions all around the ring road which already have high levels of emissions. The 'clean air' of the market Square was still full of the fumes from buses and taxis and all those vehicles who had permits. I cancelled my autistic daughter's tutoring from a firm based in the market square as I was unable to drop my daughter nearby so impacting on their business.</p> <p>I regularly walk my dog around Salisbury and surprised to see no one using the cycle lanes...so why have them? The other morning I saw Bishop Wordsworth students cycling on the pavements and again no one in the cycle lanes all the way through town in peak rush hour. I cannot see how this is an improvement as it's just moving the traffic problems elsewhere. There is an existing cycle route through the cathedral and I really don't think anyone looked at the impact that it would have on the rest of town and the roads that are now taking the strain. Novichock, lockdown, shop closures and now the LTZ yet another reason to not to come to Salisbury.</p>
33.	<p>I am delighted that there will be an extraordinary meeting of Salisbury City Council to discuss the future of People Friendly Salisbury. I am totally against the suspension of the project and look forward to an open and transparent discussion. I have tried to email my councillors, but cannot get through. Yours faithfully</p>
34.	<p>I would like my point of view to be noted at the City Council meeting on Monday evening, 14th December.</p> <p>I live just off Catherine Street, which was in the LTZ. My first point about the scheme was its appalling preparation. I don't just mean being made aware, through a thorough consultation, but that Trowbridge are made aware exactly what Salisbury streets are like! For example, my neighbour, Mr Southon of Southon's furniture shop was told by Trowbridge to direct his delivery lorries to come off St Mark's roundabout, come along Escourt Road, down Bourne Hill, turn left into Rolleston Street and carry on along Brown Street, Park in the car park and wheel the furniture to the shop! That means all the pollution which this scheme is to reduce is just pushed a few streets further out! Let alone the impossibility of large lorries navigating our medieval streets!</p> <p>I am very concerned about the ability of our shops still being able to trade, knowing the huge number of empty shops in Salisbury already! I want Salisbury to thrive, not become a ghost town. We have far too much to offer to let that happen.</p> <p>On a personal level getting our permits to drive to our home was beyond difficult, starting with County Hall telling us we didn't live where we do! When told we pay council tax for our home we were told we had been missed off the data base! That's before I tried to get one for my car - only one permit per household! So how do my husband and get to our different</p>

	<p>places of work?  This is my home, I trained as a teacher here and have been teaching in and around the city for 40+ years and I love it. I don't want it to wither and die because of this badly thought out scheme.  Please listen to the people who are adversely effected by it!  Thank you</p>
35.	<p>Please, please don't bring it back,  Sensible ring roads we definitely lack.  Please don't cut off our town roads,  So inconvenient for our heavy loads.  Let's bring the life back to our city,  It was once so bustling and pretty.  The LTZ just adds to the pain,  At home we will have to remain.  Let's all get our heads together,  To find a solution that will suit forever.  We can sort the issue's in a different way,  So we all have harmony at the end of the day.</p>
36.	<p>Please do <u>not</u> reinstate the LTZ in Salisbury. The city struggled with the volume of traffic already on the ring road and the LTZ pushed drivers to use other roads (in residential areas) as a "rat run" to avoid the ring road. I believe the system was not thought out at all, nor was the implementation of cycle lanes with bollards! This is also bad for local businesses. Since the LTZ has been paused, there has been a heavier footfall within the city even though parking charges are still extortionate.</p> <p>The Southampton road side of ring road is what needs to be looked at. Locals use the road to go to Tesco, B&amp;Q etc. as well as larger vehicles heading for the M27. Yes, the Southampton Road is flood plains but surely a "fly over" could be put in place to take the bulk of the traffic to from the Southampton Road to the dual carriageway which starts by the Alderbury turnoff. Do not say it can't be built on considering there are new residential properties being built further down the Southampton Road! If the Stonehenge Tunnel can be approved, then so can a flyover on the Southampton Road!</p> <p>Yours, a very fed up resident of Salisbury.</p>
37.	<p>I understand there is a meeting tomorrow to discuss potentially reimplementing the LTZ scheme and wanted to highlight a couple of issues in case they have not been raised.</p> <p>I live on Gigant Street which is just outside the area which was pedestrianised. During the short time the scheme was in place, I had terrible problems with increased traffic on my road. I was unable to park outside my own house during the entire period. This raises safety concerns for me and as a result I immediately looked in to selling my home and leaving Salisbury. I do not feel safe parking at night 3 or 4 streets away and walking alone in the</p>

	<p>dark.</p> <p>Residents parking has already been reduced with the Exeter Street cycle lane and with people not being able to easily park in the centre or not having applied for a permit if they were entitled to, I saw many many people I did not recognise parking on my street in the evenings and walking away showing they were not going to a property on Gigant Street.</p> <p>Another issue was increased traffic on my road, often above the speed limit making it far more dangerous. It is a narrow road without room for two cars to pass each other in most places so having twice as many cars and people speeding down it was a complete nightmare.</p> <p>When the scheme was first introduced there were roadworks in various places around the ring road which meant that to get from Devizes Road to my home where my partner was very unwell at the time took me 40 minutes at around 11pm. Obviously I know this is not an everyday occurrence but it was very distressing for me and I feel this sort of thing should be taken in to consideration.</p> <p>I hope it is not too late for this to be passed on. Apologies for any typos etc. as I am having to write this on my mobile phone.</p> <p>With thanks and kind regards</p>
38.	<p>Hi, as a family living in Salisbury (Elm Grove Road) I just wanted to say that we would really like to give the People Friendly Streets experiment a proper try. We sometimes drive a car, we sometimes ride bicycles, including a specialist disability tandem as my wife is a wheelchair user, and we sometimes walk into town (pushing a wheelchair). Whichever way it's always nicer if we're not breathing in as much pollution and there isn't as much engine noise.</p> <p>We need to see if everyone likes it over a proper period of time, ideally including a time when we're not worried about Covid.</p>
39.	<p>People Friendly Streets Experimental Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>As a person who lives in the centre of Salisbury I am requesting that this pollution curbing project be allowed to continue. Salisbury Citizens have a right to breathe and not be poisoned by carbon monoxide fumes. I understand that this does cause some difficulties but fresh air must be a priority for the council.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention.</p>
40.	<p>There is no need for people to drive through Salisbury City Centre and we must give a fair trial to the Traffic Free Zone experiment. As it will contribute to a safer more friendly and comfortable place for people to use, shop and visit.</p> <p>Please let's see it through.</p>
41.	<p>I would like to express my strong support for a new initiative to reduce motorised traffic and improve pedestrian facilities in the centre of Salisbury.</p> <p>During the recent experimental scheme which sadly was prematurely halted we had the opportunity to enjoy walking in the City without the constant noise and threat from motor vehicles. Sadly because of Covid restrictions too few people had the opportunity to enjoy the experience. I have no doubt that had it been allowed to continue more people would have come into the centres and City shops and business would have seen an improvement in trade.</p>

	<p>A second and arguably more important benefit is improvement in air quality which would ensue to the benefit of the health of all.</p> <p>Please do not allow a small minority of outspoken individuals concerned about their own short term convenience stand in the way of this important initiative.</p>
42.	<p>Dear Clerk</p> <p>I gather that there is a meeting on Monday regarding the reaction of the city Council to the Decision of WCC to suspend the Traffic Zone. I would like to submit the following statement for this meeting:</p> <p>“As a local business owner and employer of around 40 staff at our food packaging factory on Churchfields I am thought it would be helpful submit a statement. Our business has been on the estate for 20 years and is one of those that are the rump of what is left of manufacturing in this area. Churchfields is a busy estate and even now has very few empty properties, with new businesses continuing to open. These are a mixture of both Business to Business suppliers such as ourselves, trade counters and merchants, retail such as garages and showrooms, car hire, and other business and service companies. All of these businesses rely on both access from customers and also from incoming and outgoing delivery vehicles. It is I believe the perfect compliment in spirit and activity to the City Centre. The closure to through traffic in the City centre was felt here on Churchfields, due to the very noticeable additional traffic passing in Churchfields Road, much adding to the congestion as staff and customers and delivery vehicles wanted to access and depart from the Estate. This was at a time when there would have been expected to be the least amount of traffic due to the Lockdowns etc. It would have become impossible in the summer in normal times, as well as putting even more pressure on minor routes nearby, and elsewhere around the City.</p> <p>I have taken a keen interest in the People Friendly Salisbury Project and I can understand there will be disappointment from those who genuinely believed that it presented an opportunity for the City. However as a very regular driver through the city, as well visiting the market and the bank every week, I have to say that the decision to stop this Scheme has come as a huge relief to me and many other persons who care for the commercial viability and vitality of the City.</p> <p>Stopping the passage of traffic through the City was like an economic noose. Salisbury is a market town, which gets its living and life from local people using it. It is not a shopping destination, that could prosper just through the economic effect of visitors purely drawn to the semi-pedestrian environment, which due to the buses, Taxis and delivery vehicles was never to be able to work as a pedestrian area anyway. Tourist are a bonus and spend a lot of money, but most of the shops, offices, restaurants, salons cater for local people. Its is these very people that the Scheme was driving away. It was the older less mobile relative who you dropped in New canal, or the Boxes of Bric a Brac to the charity shops in Catherine Street that were important to local people. They wanted to be able to stop and collect a takeaway meal or to drop of a mother and child safely. Most residents like the choice of being able to drive through the town, and to see and feel part of this. We like to see the Christmas lights and the shop window displays, the activities in the Market square. It makes us want to stop and shop. This scheme meant none of these things could happen. It threatened to turn the town centre into a Ghost Town once the shops were shut with no passing traffic, and I believe less safe for pedestrians as well without the passing traffic, as well as killing the evening trade for the restaurants and takeaways still trying to open.</p>

	<p>Unless there is a proper solution to the A36 and the impact on other parts of the local road network, and a full and comprehensive, democratic consultation with all stakeholders and users, and a proper economic impact assessment done, I do not think it should even be considered to reintroduce this scheme”.</p>
<p>43.</p>	<p>I am just writing to you as I would like to voice my huge support for People Friendly Streets. As someone who regularly uses the independent traders in town, the idea of being able to get into town and then walk around in a much quieter, cleaner and more pleasant environment is very very appealing to me. As someone who suffers with severe asthma, the period of time that People Friendly Streets ran for was amazing. The air quality was noticeably better and my asthma was triggered much less while I was shopping. I also found it much nicer to do my shopping. I could cross to Old George Mall easily from Market Place as well as head to Tesco having been to the market. It just made life so much easier.</p> <p>During the People Friendly Streets scheme, I had a visit from my father. He is, sadly, terminally ill and is disabled and often uses a wheelchair. He found being in town much nicer. Crossing the streets was easier and he felt under a lot less pressure. Also, he has commented before that being at wheelchair level means that he is closer to the ground and the pollution coming from cars. It was much nicer for him to be in town without sitting amongst all of the pollution coming from the cars - especially on Catherine Street. The disabled parking bays were also much easier to access (and the permit wasn't a problem to get).</p> <p>People Friendly Streets is important for the health and wellbeing of our City and our businesses. It was approved by the public at the initial consultation and it seems like it has now been suspended based on a vocal Facebook group and a survey conducted by Salisbury BID where only 72 out of their 500 members responded. Even Salisbury BID only asked for it to be suspended until the New Year. The democratic process and the consultation has already happened and happened before the scheme started, the least we need to do now is let the scheme run so that the data can be collected and modifications can be made if needed.</p> <p>Please support the return of the scheme in early 2021.</p>
<p>44.</p>	<p>I understand that there is to be a meeting to discuss the People Friendly Scheme <u>on 14 December</u>.</p> <p>I urge you to pay attention to the amount of objection from Salisbury residents and that this scheme should remain suspended for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>I have a husband who has a life limiting illness and our lives have been make particularly difficult by this scheme, getting into town for shopping, prescriptions and drs appointments.</p> <p>The COVID situation has also greatly affected our businesses and shops in the city. They need all our support at the moment and some stability, rather than trying this scheme out, which appears to have made the situation worse.</p> <p>I would also express concern at the way that this scheme was brought in. There seemed to be very little consultation and many residents, including myself, had no idea that this was taking place. I am also most unhappy that decisions about our city are being made and taken by councillors who don not even live in Salisbury.</p> <p>Please respect your residents wishes when you are discussing this <u>on 14th December</u>.</p>

45.	<p>Please accept this as my point of view in relation to the consultation meeting on Monday 14th.</p> <p>Salisbury is a struggling town. The novicok poisonings sent the city into a downward spiral which local people are working hard to bring us out of. Unfortunately, the low traffic zones started to ruin any chance we had of pulling ourselves back.</p> <p>The plans simply made traffic around the ring roads a lot worse. This puts people off coming into the town itself.</p> <p>I have lived in Salisbury for 10 years and previously lived in West Sussex. I had family who loved in Somerset and therefore drove the 3 hour journey quite regularly. Salisbury was in the middle and would have proved a perfect stopping point in the journey. However due to the appalling traffic we always made a conscious decision to either stop before or just after Salisbury and just get through this town as quickly as possible.</p> <p>I hate to think how many others find the same and we are missing out on bringing people into the city for just this reason. The road network needs a complete over haul on the outskirts before an LTZ should even be considered.</p> <p>Many thanks for taking the time to read and for taking my comments on board.</p>
46.	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I would just like to express my concern over the possibility of the re-introduction of LTZ and Cycle Lanes.</p> <p>Salisbury is in decline and yes the Pandemic has had a big impact on trade and footfall in and around the shopping centres but to think that introducing this ridiculous scheme will all of a sudden encourage people to start shopping in the City again is fallacy.</p> <p>The Councils need to look at the real reasons, Business Rates, rents, BID Payments etc. etc., all being far to high and deterring potential businesses from coming to the City. The short time the LTZ was in place illustrated how detrimental it was to businesses and the surrounding roads. The cycle lanes are not only empty of cyclists but create congestion and delays and in some parts are actually dangerous.</p> <p>Could you please convey my opposition to the proposed schemes at the meeting on 14th December 2020.</p>
47.	<p>Dear Ms Child,</p> <p>I live close to Salisbury</p> <p>I understand that there is yet another move at a meeting planned for the 14th December to reintroduce the traffic restrictions in Salisbury City Centre.</p> <p>I wish to register, once again, my formal complaint regarding the "People Friendly Streets" traffic measures in Salisbury (having previously written to WCC).</p> <p>Please take this as a formal objection to its reintroduction. The meeting of the 14th December will not benefit from any better consultation than the original scheme on which consultation was woefully inadequate, a perspective that I understand has been properly communicated to the Council by our local MP, and the business community of which I am a</p>

	<p>part.</p> <p>It is a fundamentally flawed concept which, over its short introduction earlier in the year, drove widespread and visceral hatred across our City, both within our community and beyond. It served to further distance the relationship between Salisbury residents and Wiltshire County Council giving substance to those who would argue that we are governed from afar, by those who have little understanding or empathy for the well-being of our City.</p> <p>The basis of my personal opposition, views that I think are shared by many, is as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presumption that this will create air quality improvements is ill founded; it has simply moved and, due to increased congestion, increased the issue.</li> <li>• The measures will substantially damage business within the City Centre at a time that businesses are coping with the effects of Covid 19 and the legacy impacts of the Novichok attacks.</li> <li>• The measures are promoted on the basis of safety, where no fundamental safety issue exist.</li> <li>• The measures have conversely potentially increased safety issues and certainly air quality issues on surrounding streets which are unsuitable for the increased levels of traffic.</li> <li>• The measures have caused substantial increases in congestion and pollution on the Salisbury Ring Road.</li> <li>• The measures were not fully and properly consulted.</li> <li>• The measures are imposed on Salisbury by those who do not reside in nor represent the City.</li> <li>• The requirement for an 18 month trial period is excessive in the extreme.</li> <li>• The need for cycle lanes is utterly unproven. during the time when the people friendly streets were in operation there was almost no use of the cycle lanes by bicycles, and there is almost no use of the cycle racks in the centre of town.</li> </ul> <p>In making these observations I state that I am a Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers, a former Director of Transport for London, a Fellow of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, a local business Director and a certified HM Treasury (IPA) Projects High Risk Reviewer. I have worked in infrastructure for over 35 years and I have led multi billion £ transport programmes, and still work actively in this sector.</p> <p>Clearly many of us living in the area (for varying reasons) are frankly outraged by this remote imposition and are determined to continue to effectively organise to ensure that these ruinous measures are not re-introduced.</p> <p>We are additionally motivated to ensure that those responsible for this initiative are properly brought to account for the wasteful expenditure of public money at a time when our City required, and should have expected, support to be prioritised in other areas. This is nothing less than a negligent misappropriation of funds with utterly tragic consequences.</p>
48.	<p>Hi</p> <p>I would like to express my opinion strongly for re-instating the People Friendly Street trial. For the short time it was in place I noticed a marked improvement in the experience of being in central Salisbury. I am convinced that in the long term this improved environment will encourage visitors and shoppers to Salisbury.</p>

	I do hope the council will reconsider and re-instate the trial.
49.	<p>To whom it may concern.</p> <p>I understand there will be a meeting on Monday 14th December reference the ETRO/LTZ and a ban on the through traffic, I would like to comment that this will never work until a bypass had been built. During the previous implemented period I witnessed a jugenaut reversing up Castle Street where I live. It had driven down to the bus gate and realised he couldn't drive through so spent a hour reversing back to the roundabout. In the current situation this rediculous scheme is not viable,dangerous and someone will get injured.</p> <p>During the previous trial period I must say there was no noticeable improvement to the volumn of traffic using Castle Street. The worst problem that should be resolved is the lack of parking for residents and speeding vehicles including the buses.</p>
50.	<p>Evening,</p> <p>I understand that there is a meeting to discuss the People Friendly Streets tomorrow.</p> <p>This is an email to confirm that I feel that this scheme will cause no end of chaos on the ring roads around Salisbury. The Southampton road and A36 needs to be sorted out first before any such scheme is created. Please note, I do not approve of this scheme being given the go ahead.</p>
51.	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I'm writing to you to express my objections to the LTZ though Salisbury city centre. In my opinion it will be the final nail in the coffin for are wonderful city. During the period when the LTZ was in place the footfall within the town fell which I saw for myself. It will also be a disaster for local businesses who have problems getting deliveries. This has been expressed by several businesses in town already. If the council approves this scheme I think a lot more businesses will be forced to close leaving even more empty shop units to add to the ones already empty.</p> <p>If that happens the council will get there way of a LTZ as no one will visit the city which in tune means no footfall meaning the council has completely shot itself in the foot. Which the opposite to what the council hopes to achieve.</p>
52.	<p>Dear Salisbury City Councillors</p> <p>I am writing to the Council with regards to the Salisbury City Council extraordinary meeting to discuss reintroduction of the Salisbury Friendly Streets in 2021.</p> <p>In my opinion the People Friendly Salisbury ETRO whilst very admirable in its intentions to make the streets more people friendly and reduce road pollution, was introduced at the wrong time in the middle of the Covid pandemic and without properly considering it's wider effects. It had an immediate detrimental affect on small businesses in the city centre such as Southons in Catherine St who could no longer park to unload near to their businesses, and on people living in neighbouring streets such in Rollestone St as vehicles diverted down other streets in the city centre. .</p> <p>Also driving my daughter to South Wilts Grammar School on the morning of 21st October, I noticed the immediate impact the introduction of the city centre road restrictions had on the A36 Salisbury ring road traffic with queuing traffic all the way down from St Marks roundabout to the Wiltshire College roundabout and a big increase in queuing traffic on all the approaches to the Castle Rd roundabout. This continued each morning until the start of the second lockdown.</p>

	<p>I therefore ask that you as SCC councillors petition Wiltshire Council (WC) for this to go back for further and wider consultation with the general public and with local businesses before supporting it being reintroduced, and at an appropriate time, with a proper assessment of its wider impact on the city, including the A36 trunk road and other peripheral roads.</p>
53.	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>Please remove the ugly &amp; dangerous bollards that have been installed in our beautiful city's streets. Not only are they ugly but they are dangerous too, especially if emergency services need to get through over take .</p> <p>It would of been nice to have been consulted about this before the council wasted tax payers money</p> <p>Oh whilst I think of it please could you look at getting a Lush store &amp; a Primark ( old BHS site would be perfect for primark ) in the town centre , Debenhams would be perfect for a John Lewis . This would hopefully bring in the youngsters to the town &amp; following them the adults will follow. Let's make our city great again. Perhaps just charging all business small rent and rates for the first couple of years so they can find their feet as I'm sure a little bit of rent and rates is better than nothing at all in the councils funds</p> <p>Oh and a big ice rink in the cathedral grounds opposite the big main doors at the end of the nave</p>
54.	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I'd just like to pass on my support for the People Friendly Streets Scheme. I think it's a good idea and that it just needs some adaptation, not scrapping completely.</p> <p>I hope that the scheme is reinstated so that it has a chance to be tested properly.</p>
55.	<p>I am writing to ask you to support the reintroduction of the people friendly Salisbury ETRO at your extraordinary meeting <a href="#">on 14th December</a>.</p> <p>I have lived in a village to the south of Salisbury for many years. My husband grew up in the city where his family ran a business for over 100 years. We have brought up our four children here, so feel a great sense of belonging in Salisbury.</p> <p>Salisbury city centre will be a far pleasanter environment for local residents and tourists alike, once everyone is used to the LTZ. When it was introduced, I really enjoyed walking around the centre with less traffic noise and pollution, and along with many others who love our beautiful city, am looking forward to the further benefits and plans still to come.</p> <p>The issue of the climate emergency needs immediate action today, and the council has a responsibility to us all now, and for future generations, to address this issue. This plan to encourage people to walk or cycle into the city centre or use the park and ride, is a great step in the right direction. We all need to change our life styles in order to address climate change. I am planning on using an electric bike to get to the city when possible. I know many others who are looking at ways of changing old habits! I know that Salisbury City Council has declared a climate emergency, and has vowed to cut pollution in our city by 2022, so to abandon this scheme completely would be a complete contradiction to your stated aims.</p> <p>Those who are using the city centre roads as a rat run to avoid the ring road, are doing nothing to help businesses as they are not stopping to use the shops. I witnessed this today</p>

	<p>when I arrived in town to visit the arts market at about four thirty. The traffic tearing down Catherine Street was endless and I had to wait quite some time as I needed to cross the road twice to get to different shops. As I was wearing a mask, I was very aware of all the fumes as they seemed to build up inside it, making them far more noticeable.</p> <p>There has been a huge amount of negativity for the scheme on social media, much of it based on ignorance of the facts and not helped by factual inaccuracies in the local press. The scheme is unfairly being blamed for the difficulties faced by businesses. Shops were already closing before Covid, due to the changing shopping habits of people nationwide. And of course, footfall dramatically decreased because of the lockdown. All the car parks are still accessible under the scheme, as they were before, and there is no reason why shoppers can't access the town centre as they used to. People are always averse to change. In time, I'm sure this scheme will help to revitalise our city centre and make it a far more pleasant environment for shopping and leisure activities benefiting businesses, tourists and local residents.</p> <p>Obviously some aspects of the scheme may need adjusting, which is why it was to run as an eighteen month experiment. I will be watching with interest on the 14th in the hope that you make the right decision and support bringing back people friendly Salisbury in 2021.</p>
56.	<p>Dear sir or madam,</p> <p>I am the owner of a business on Fisherton Street. We were within the LTZ zone and our business has already been dramatically affected by the LTZ zone closure in the city centre. More than half of our customers are walk in customers into the store. This means that customers that drive into town form a large sum of our revenue every day. However due to the LTZ zone closure in town centre, our customers couldn't drive to charcoal grill to pick up their food.</p> <p>We've asked many of our customers and they said that they prefer to go elsewhere because they don't want to pay for parking to just pick up fast food.</p> <p>We have already had significant reduction in our sales at charcoal grill and would not like the LTZ zone to come back at all. I have already had to say to numerous previously when we had the zone in town centre that I'll have to pay for my supplies later.</p> <p>If LTZ zone comes into place again, my business will not survive at all from the last experience. Fisherton Street is a very nice Street and I'd regret for my business to shut and for there to be more vacant shops in town centre. But looking at my calculations, my business will not survive when this scheme comes into place again, especially after the fall in sales we experienced from Covid-19.</p> <p>I have the previous business and customer signatures that we got for the removal of this zone.</p> <p>I really do hope you take my comments seriously.</p>
57.	<p>Good evening,</p> <p>I am emailing to voice our concerns regarding the People Friendly Scheme. We are about to sign a five year lease on a property in Salisbury bringing an independent pet store into one of the many vacant large units.</p> <p>Our store is highly reliant on passing traffic and the ability to utilise kerbside collection, and without this we would quickly see a decline in trade as more people head to Southampton</p>

	<p>road or out of town for their convenience.</p> <p>We have put negotiations on hold for the shop lease until a decision is made <u>on the 14th December</u>. If the people friendly scheme is renewed then I can confidently say that will force our hand to bench all plans until the decision makers see a decline in Salisbury business and remove it once again.</p> <p>The money in my opinion would be put to better use if used as an incentive for businesses to open, with breaks potentially in the extortionate business rates, or localised grants ect, this would help our city get back on our feet instead of choking it.</p>
58.	<p>Please may my points be raised at the meeting on Monday:</p> <p>Salisbury is a major city now with huge housing projects in the making.</p> <p>We have suffered a lot over the past few years with the Salisbury Poisonings and now COVID. The town has lost its heart to high rates for the shops and crazy money being wasted on LTZ.</p> <p>Salisbury deserves more!</p> <p>Our ring road is clogged up and pollution is shocking.</p> <p>Stop sucking the life out of our City.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
59.	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am writing with regards to the planned pedestrianisation of Salisbury.</p> <p>This is a very important initiative not only to bring back more people and tourists into the city centre and to support businesses, but to improve the quality of the air in the centre.</p> <p>The air quality has fallen below WHO recommended levels and as I have a number of friends with respiratory diseases who visit the city, this is a concern to me.</p> <p>You might have heard of a recent case where air pollution was attributed to the death of a child in London.</p> <p>If people with respiratory conditions die as a result of the air pollution levels in the city, then Salisbury City Council is likely to be held responsible for not doing enough to reduce these levels.</p>
60.	<p>Please make my views known to the council at the meeting discussing People Friendly Salisbury</p> <p>I strongly object to the re-instatement of the LTZ in any way resembling its current form.</p> <p>I am 100% for the reduction in traffic in Salisbury if it is possible to answer such a complex question so simply.</p> <p>However the last scheme appeared to be based on poor planning and little consultation.</p> <p>The implementation was poor too-did people know driving in to Salisbury you could still access the car parks-it didn't look like it.</p>

	<p>The signs notifying drivers fell down (eh Wyndham road) and could not be read.</p> <p>It was said that business supported it-I volunteer at a charity shop in Catherine Street-donations became non-existent and foot fall fell.</p> <p>Why, given that there were dispensations for driving through town, were all the loading bays and parking coned off? So if you were disabled or had a large donation to make you could not park outside to drop it off?</p> <p>We specifically moved to a house within the ring road so we could walk to everything in town-I realise that this is a privilege but also a compromise-no off street parking, smaller properties etc. Living here you realise that the streets in Salisbury are simply not designed for additional traffic to use them in an attempt to create a LTZ elsewhere. The pollution is just as bad and simply moved from once place to another.</p> <p>I can't see a solution until the reliance on car use is reduced-granting planning permission for properties that people want to live in with space to swing a cat in re-developed city sights rather than single unit retirement flats might help.</p> <p>Far more research, investment and planning needs to happen before any new LTZ could work successfully</p>
61.	<p>I am incensed at the early closure of the traffic restriction zone. What an absolute waste of public money. The trial should have been allowed to run it's course. The scheme should be reinstated using Salisbury council money. It's apparent Salisbury bid and the leader of the council and the council have no regard of the health of Salisbury residents.</p>
62.	<p>I would like to register my objection to any proposal to reintroduce the LTZ.</p> <p>Both the LTZ and the cycle bollards have proven disastrous for Salisbury and its residents. They are not wanted by the vast majority of people who joined the Facebook page 'SOS - Save Our Salisbury'.</p> <p>At a time when many towns and cities are removing such impositions, Salisbury would look somewhat stupid for maintaining both.</p> <p>It has been proven that there has been no overall reduction in emissions since the introduction of both.</p>
63.	<p>Please could I advise that I am in favour of the Salisbury Low Traffic Zone.</p> <p>I expect that the council realises that it may need a little adjusting such as making it operational from say 9.30 a.m. until 6p.m. and make it easier to obtain disabled exemption.</p> <p>I have been told that goods delivery vehicles have also been having problems.</p> <p>I am sure that these difficulties can be overcome. Other towns may be able to offer advice.</p> <p>The ring road in a clockwise direction may not be any worse as traffic should be able to get less traffic coming up from Exeter Street meaning the roundabout less busy for traffic on the ring road.</p> <p>Only a full test will tell.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
64.	<p>I'd like to express my concerns regarding the ETRO/LOW TRAFFIC ZONE/BAN ON THROUGH TRAFFIC in Salisbury.</p> <p>I understand that the last trial was during a lockdown and therefore may not have been a</p>

	<p>true reflection of its impact on the footfall in the city centre, however I do feel that not enough was done to assess the impact on local businesses.</p> <p>Sadly, we are suffering from a failing city centre in terms of people shopping with us, and shops managing to stay open and viable.</p> <p>I have put that down to the large city centre employers relocating over the past few years leading to people commuting to work out of town, myself included and therefore reducing lunchtime and afterwork spending. I make a conscious effort to spend my money locally, but Salisbury's success can't solely be based on personal actions. We're a commuter town without the benefits of the thriving centres of Basingstoke, Winchester etc which have faster train lines and a good mix of high street chains and small businesses.</p> <p>More needs to be done to tempt people into town at the weekends, or work from home during the week.</p> <p>Restructuring access to be able to nip into town for an hour isn't the solution, or if it is a full impact assessment needs to be conducted with mitigations for the risks identified. I don't know that these measures should be, but hopefully someone does.</p>
65.	<p>Hello</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt;</li> <li>&gt; I have been advised that you are the correct person to contact regarding the low traffic zone.</li> <li>&gt; I am a resident of Albany Road and I walk most days into town along Endless Street.</li> <li>&gt; There was a noticeable increase in traffic on Scots Lane from Castle Street during the trial.</li> <li>&gt; Some cars are travelling very fast along Scots Lane and braking quickly for the junction. Visibility here is not good looking left up towards Belle Vue Road, so by the time they see a pedestrian they're very close to the line, if there are cars parked up towards Endell Vets they can't always see cars coming south along Endless Street either.</li> <li>&gt; I really think this is a potential hazard for pedestrians and other road users on Endless Street.</li> <li>&gt;</li> <li>&gt; Thank you for considering my feedback.</li> </ul>
66.	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>Although I live in a village from the area surrounding Salisbury city centre I come into the city on a nearly daily basis. Surely the way forward is to cut air pollution in the city centre rather than perpetuate it and to that end the current decision to remove the experiment is a backward step. Salisbury Council should follow the example of Wiltshire Council and be innovative in improving our environment rather than living in the past.</p>
67.	<p>I believe there is a meeting tonight regarding the above. My comments refer to the cycle lanes. Salisbury is a medieval city. There is not room for them on the narrow streets and the posts look ugly amongst the beautiful buildings. The lanes are invariably empty since cyclists prefer pavements. Particularly since the police and council prefer to wear blinkers rather than take action against cyclists on pavements that are not designated cycle paths.</p>
68.	<p>Personally the only points I would make would be to scrap the cycling lanes, hardly anyone uses them.</p> <p>I would use for example a pavement on the left hand side of a road for cycling only and the left hand pavement for walkers only or vice versa depending on the layout of the road system to which would be the best option for each side.</p>

	<p>You can pedestrian the centre if you so wish, but I think it doesn't really warrant it. What is more important is a bypass for Salisbury. Long overdue.</p>
<p>69.</p>	<p>Wiltshire Council declared a climate emergency in 2019 and this was endorsed by Salisbury City Council.</p> <p>There have been 2 consultations on the Central Area Framework, one on People Friendly Streets and the Low Traffic Zone and one on the Neighbourhood Plan in late 2019 and early 2020. These were widely publicised and information was available in printed and electronic form. There is no reason for anyone to say they weren't consulted, nor to propose a further consultation that will be costly and who can say it will be any more representative than any of the others.</p> <p>Salisbury City Council strongly supported all aspects of the Central Area Framework, the first step of which was reducing city centre traffic, in their response to the consultation.</p> <p>The ETRO provides for modifications in response to comments during implementation. This was clearly communicated in printed and electronic form.</p> <p>There is clear leadership from government that emissions must be reduced, and active travel become the norm. The status quo is not an option. If we can't take the first step towards safer conditions for pedestrians and cyclists and clean air for everyone, there is little hope of achieving the government's aims. All of us need to play a part, yes that means you, me and them. It is no use sitting in a traffic jam, complaining about the traffic, it's you!</p> <p>From the fuss that ensued after the introduction of the LTZ, anyone would have thought that the car parks had closed or been moved at least 5 miles further away from the city centre. No, the shops were open, the car parks were open, easier to get to because through traffic had ceased, anyone whose journey was essential or a blue badge holder could get a permit and their journeys were also easier and quicker. The increased space and calmness was welcomed by pedestrians who could talk to one another without raising their voices and socially distance without risking an accident. Let's not forget that when we park our bikes or cars or get off the bus we are all pedestrians, and also remember that over 30% of residents within the ring road have no car.</p> <p>I would like to hope that this debate will be approached with the facts and future of Salisbury in mind rather than loudly expressed assertions not backed up with any evidence. This quote is from the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders, not a noticeably "green" organisation, last week,</p> <p>"I think, absolutely, we need to look at all methods to reduce the impact of road transport"</p> <p>I love People Friendly Streets!</p>
<p>70.</p>	<p>To whom this may concern.</p> <p>The introduction of the people friendly streets is not a scheme which is reducing the number of cars on the road in the city centre. The scheme is not fit for purpose as cars are now using the surrounding side streets</p> <p>To transverse the city centre resulting in more traffic on the narrow side streets, the scheme is making things worse as it is increasing more idle time in vehicles resulting in increased pollution in residential streets.</p> <p>These drivers often break the speed limit during off peak hours on the narrow street making it dangerous for pedestrians and traffic calming measures need to be introduced to make</p>

	<p>the surrounding streets people friendly and it would be better to consider city residents views on this scheme. Action needs to be taken to reduce the cars using the surrounding residential streets with traffic calming measures introduced.</p>
71.	<p>Hello,</p> <p>For a variety of reasons, including statistics that show people friendly streets are good for a city's economy, and the improvement of air quality, I fully support the people friendly streets project.</p>
72.	<p>Please see the Attached statement from the Salisbury Green Party on People Friendly Streets for the EGM.</p>
73.	<p>What problem was the introduction of the LTZ trying to solve?</p> <p>If it was high pollution in the city centre then removing traffic from the city centre only moves the pollution problem elsewhere.</p> <p>If it was making the city centre somewhere pedestrians would enjoy walking around then the poor, uneven pavements and lack of drop kerbs have to be sorted first.</p> <p>The proposal was not 'proper' pedestrianisation as buses, taxis and some cars were still using the city centre streets. Pedestrians still had to look carefully when crossing the roads</p> <p>Where did the designers think the traffic would go? The A36 is already often at a standstill causing pollution for those living near the road. More cars and lorries using the road will create even more pollution in those areas.</p> <p>Rat-runs were created including traffic using the listed Milford bridge which will eventually be damaged by the increased traffic.</p> <p>Covid 19 restrictions have limited traffic generally with more people working from home. Any statistics used as evidence will need to be collected once the country is back working properly which is unlikely to be until 2022.</p> <p>We, as city centre dwellers, were not aware of any consultation. It seemed that Wiltshire CC imposed the LTZ on the city of Salisbury without thinking through the consequences of stopping traffic using particular roads.</p> <p>Salisbury needs a proper bypass which through traffic can use, not the current ring road built in the 1960s.</p>
74.	<p>Dear Annie, I would like to ask a question on People Friendly Streets at Monday's meeting.</p> <p>I would like to ask the Councillors to reinstate the scheme (though potentially with a bit more thought for business delivery/disabled access) and a bit more information for the public on why we need to try such schemes). My question is: 'how can the councillors determine whether this would be bad for business unless we actually try it and then collect the data'? Surely, as an experimental scheme this is exactly the point. If it doesn't work, the data will prove that. Can the councillors please show that they will back science and properly collected information rather than be swayed by uninformed opinion (which is all any of us have in the absence of the much-needed results).</p> <p>Could you also please tell me how to go about attending the meeting? Thank you</p>

75.	<p>Dear sir</p> <p>I note with much surprise there is to be a meeting regarding the possibility of reinstating the LTZ</p> <p>It cannot be stated strongly enough that the scheme cannot possibly function satisfactorily without a bypass.</p> <p>The scheme did not reduce pollution but merely moved it to different parts of town.</p> <p>I sincerely hope the council takes the sensible decision to suspend the LTZ until Salisbury has a bypass, thus preventing additional hardship to shops and residents.</p> <p>Season's greetings and best wishes</p>
76.	<p>Dear Salisbury City Council,</p> <p>May I say that I am absolutely devastated that People Friendly Salisbury project has been suspended indefinitely. Wiltshire Council (WC) declared a Climate Emergency in 2019 which was endorsed and fully supported by Salisbury City Council. Wiltshire Council have been working with the residents in Salisbury to improve the city centre from a sustainable perspective, since the 1990's, with the aim of increasing attractiveness for retail as well as improving air quality and prioritising pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>There was a wide consultation process that was well-advertised in the local newspaper, radio stations and on lamp posts across the city by WC who consulted with residents in Salisbury on the "Central Area Framework". There was overwhelming supported by the majority of respondents (~70%) and the planning committee of the City Council strongly supported the CAF (24/022020) to prioritise for pedestrians and cyclists. Monitoring data indicated that &gt;50% of the vehicles passing through the city centre did not stop, did not contribute to the commerce of the city centre and were only contributing significantly to the pollution in the city centre. The People Friendly Salisbury (PFS) project is the first stage in implementing the Central Area Framework. This involved installing bus gates, preventing non-essential through traffic, hence making it easier for those that drive into the city to park when they wanted to shop. All the car parks were open and there was no impediment to their access. In addition, there were major benefits for the disabled with easier access to disabled bays with fewer non-disabled drivers blocking access. Salisbury Reds and taxi drivers were fully supportive of PFS as the buses and taxis also had easier access and were not delayed in traffic. However, when the PFS project was implemented there was backlash from drivers who could no longer drive straight through the city and there has been a very vociferous and noisy Facebook group who demanded that it was their right to drive through the centre and who maintained that they had not been consulted and that WC were imposing PFS on the city.</p> <p>This is clearly wrong for a number of reasons as pointed out above. There was wide consultation and the public had spoken - they wanted to prioritise our city for pedestrians. These traffic reduction measures have clearly worked in other cities where reduced traffic has significantly led to increased footfall and increased income for shops.</p> <p>As it stands, our democracy is being undermined by a small number of residents who have no thought for anyone but themselves and their ability to drive through the city. They are confusing traffic problems on the A36 ring road with what is happening in the city. The A36 is the responsibility of Highways England who have been working with WC to monitor traffic flows. Those against the PFS project unfortunately include a number of our Councillors</p>

	<p>who seem to be more concerned by the impact on their re-election than on the long-term sustainability of the city and its commerce.</p> <p>There seems to be some short-term memory problems and short sightedness by those opposing PFS including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The Novichok incident in Salisbury resulted in long term reputation damage and loss of income estimated to be £Millions.</li> <li>· This country is still in a pandemic and pedestrians need space for social distancing – a reduction in traffic fulfils the requirement for additional space on our narrow city pavements to keep people safe until sufficient residents have been vaccinated.</li> <li>· This country is in an obesity epidemic and active travel makes a significant contribution the health and fitness of all our communities</li> <li>· Vulnerable road users need protection from vehicle accidents and vehicle pollution - 25% of residents across Salisbury (33% in inner city wards) do not have a car and those with disabilities are less likely to have a car.</li> <li>· Indefinitely suspending PFS may mean that the funds that were identified for the PFS project may be lost if that that expenditure had to be undertaken within a specific time period e.g., by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021)</li> <li>· There will be a negative impact on additional funding for the city e.g., from the SWLEP. Is the city council willing to sacrifice this investment in our city?</li> <li>· The outcome of the “High Streets Bid” (£25M) may be negatively impact (and which calls for traffic reduction in Fisherton St – will we have to go through all this again if that bid is successful?</li> </ul> <p>The City Council must support the PFS project for the sake of the future of the city, its shops and its residents. Our city centres are changing, and we must make bold decisions. It is time for the City Council to take a stand and reinforce the support to WC for PFS. Our Councillors will be judged by their decision tonight for a decision NOT to support PFS may cost our city £Millions of pounds of investment which will go elsewhere.</p>
77.	<p>Please find attached my written statement ahead of Salisbury City Council's extraordinary meeting on Monday.</p> <p>This statement is due to be read out by a member of SOS - Save Our Salisbury as I am unable to attend the meeting myself, but I am sending it here just in case you also need it directly from me.</p>
78.	<p>So far anecdotal evidence and personal experience confirm this low traffic zone has not worked well for several people.</p> <p>Lock down has not been the optimum time to introduce new traffic plans as traffic flow is less</p> <p>There are very few vibrant shops in Salisbury centre. If people can drive through to see what is still available that will be a positive.</p> <p>The low traffic zone has hugely impacted on the ring road where there have been long queues not just at start and end of the working day.</p> <p>Rat runs have been observed along Scots Lane Rolleston St and Brown St</p>

	<p>If Salisbury eventually has a bypass more people will use the ring road and it follows there will be less traffic in the town centre so restrictions may not be needed.</p> <p>Regards cycling through town Salisbury is geared up to supporting elderly citizens who are unlikely to take up cycling as most routes in Salisbury involve hills.</p>
79.	<p>I'd just like to register my support for this scheme which I believe should be given a fair trial.</p> <p>More consultation has been called for but Salisbury has been talking about traffic management for the last 25 years.</p> <p>There has been numerous positive suggestions but no action on the ground.</p> <p>Hopefully common sense will prevail and the scheme will be re-instated soon.</p>
80.	<p>Good morning</p> <p>The People Friendly Scheme should be trialled over the Summer holidays, as it was the case with the one way system in the Cathedral close. Maybe have the system implemented every summer?</p> <p>The impact on tourism will be important with coaches full of tourists. The locals will be more inclined to walk and cycle to town, therefore spending their money locally.</p> <p>The park and ride should be subsidized, so that families can afford it.</p>
81.	<p>This is a summary of an article in the Guardian yesterday and sums up the situation:-</p> <p>There is <a href="#">growing evidence</a> that exposure to toxic air increases the risks from Covid-19 and the authors of the study say their findings underscore the need for local councils to do more to reduce car use and improve air quality by prioritising walking and cycling.</p> <p>“City leaders can reduce the threat of air pollution, but it will take political will,” said Carter. <b>“Discouraging car usage will be unpopular in the short term but, if coupled with the necessary improvements to public transport, the long-term benefits to public health and the economy will be huge and our cities will become better places to live in. Now is not the time for politicians to delay on this.”</b></p> <p>Since the pandemic hit, many local authorities <a href="#">have tried to encourage walking and cycling</a> by building cycle lanes and creating low-traffic neighbourhoods to stop drivers “rat-running” through residential areas.</p> <p>But these efforts have faced <a href="#">vocal opposition</a> from the pro-car lobby and some disgruntled drivers. Some councils have already backed down, <a href="#">pulling up new cycle lanes</a>, while others <a href="#">shelved long-term plans</a> to install low-emission zones, arguing that pollution levels had already fallen due to the lockdown.</p> <p><b><u>Cumulative pollution from London traffic may have led to girl's death</u></b></p> <p>But Hubert Thieriot, from the Centre for Research on Energy and Clean Air, said the new study highlighted <b>the need for local leaders across the country to step up their efforts to limit the use of private cars</b> as the country emerged from lockdown restrictions.</p> <p>“The role of transportation in UK cities’ air pollution has become apparent to everyone during the Covid-related lockdowns,” Thieriot said. “That shared awareness offers policymakers a historical chance to implement bold transportation policies.”</p>
82.	<p>To Salisbury City Council:</p> <p>I wish to make a statement to urge Salisbury City Council to reinstate the People Friendly Streets scheme at the earliest opportunity.</p>

	<p>There was a marked improvement in air quality, safety from traffic (I am a cyclist) and noise reduction during the period when it was in place.</p> <p>I feel that the timing was unfortunate when fewer people were going to the town owing to Covid restrictions, giving possibly a false impression of the footfall. A change like this will take time to assess. Any new scheme attracts considerable criticism, as I'm sure the council are aware, before its benefits can be demonstrated. Pedestrianisation of the High Street has proved to be of great benefit, and the market square experience is hugely improved without car parking.</p> <p>Let us not forget that through traffic makes up 80% of the total vehicles passing through the centre of the city.</p>
83.	<p>I live in Rampart Road. Rat run for trying to avoid the traffic on the ring road. Before you can make the centre pedestrianised you have to change the A36 / Southampton Road, I can see the traffic stuck outside my house - on the ring road which used to be mostly one lane not moving now it's often 2 lanes, and outside my house in Rampart Road there are so many times in the day when cars come head to head with cars stuck behind them, drivers often get out of their cars to argue about who needs to reverse. The road desperately needs to be one way or widened. The pillars on the new cycle lanes are not needed and causing havoc near st Ann's gate etc., keep the cycle lanes but use them like Laverstock which seems to work well.</p> <p>I have also complained bitterly that there is not enough signage of the very low bridge to in into Culver Street car park from the ring road. I have photos of vehicles that have tried to get under with devastating results. Half way under the bridge the road goes up and the bridge gets lower, so vans / Motorhome's etc. get partly under then lose the top of the vehicle. I have been told by Wiltshire Council / Highways that there is no money to put anything at the site of the bridge.</p>
84.	<p>Dear Salisbury City Councillors,</p> <p>I will attempt to put into words my absolute horror that the ETRO scheme caused in stress by its ill thought out impact on those attempting to live in an experimental laboratory.</p> <p>Salisbury is a market town which has by virtue a Cathedral but it remains a market town in design. I worked and ran business in the centre for about 25 years and now am at Britford Farm Shop. I understand that traffic volume has increased dramatically but blanket bans are not the answer!</p> <p>The city has no suburban boroughs or significant housing estates of any great size coupled with a higher than average demographic of the retired age which consequently require personal transport to the shops.</p> <p>The ring road network around the City is inadequate to deal with the volume requiring its' use and the route through the centre is a VITAL route for residents, if you put everything on the ring road in normal times it will be at a standstill and businesses or residents seeking access to their properties in a sensible and timely manner suffered greatly. Living in Harnham I was faced with the infuriation of having to drive around the ring road to get to the church fields as the tailback in Exeter Street was awful, this added both to time, fuel burned/pollution and expense. For those having to do this daily the stress was terrible.</p> <p>I have duties in the City centre Parish church, I took a permit straight away and it was fortunate as the following night I had a call out to the fire alarm. Many people use the churches in the centre for a great multitude of reasons and they cannot be expected to take</p>

	<p>up monthly permits</p> <p>To carry out their voluntary acts of goodwill and service to the community, these effects were negated due to the trial in lockdown but remain a very real concern indeed to me. The same applies to charity shops and other such organisations relying on volunteers and donations of stock.</p> <p>Park and ride is a great resource and if it were priced below the centre car park prices would attract greater use, I myself used it several times during the etro scheme very satisfactorily but it prices out many, I wonder how many of the retired bus pass holders know they can use it for free also?</p> <p>Salisbury is a living place, its roads do not lend themselves to closure as the only city centre primary routes are those wide enough for essential vehicles to pass through safely.</p> <p>The cycle lanes I realise are a different act of vandalism on which I have commented in the survey but do by their very presence ruin the appearance and flow/function of the City infrastructure completely unwantedly.</p> <p>I thank you for considering my deep concerns.</p>
85.	<p>Please could you make my views known to the council at the meeting discussing People Friendly Salisbury</p> <p>I very much object to the re-instatement of the LTZ in any way that resembles its previous formulation.</p> <p><b>However, please note that I am completely in favour of reducing unnecessary traffic movements in and around Salisbury City and the reduction in air pollution (but not its mere transfer from one set of roads to another).</b></p> <p>This ambition however, needs a far better researched and consulted upon scheme and plan than the failed LTZ introduced hastily by WCC and Salisbury City Council simply to take advantage of central government funding for these schemes during the COVID pandemic. It also requires improvements to the A36 congestion and bad planning of that “ring road”.</p> <p>The traffic counts relied upon by WCC were clearly significantly affected by the pandemic and restrictions on travel which were observable before the LTZ was introduced. No traffic counts were made in roads not within the LTZ to measure the dispersal of traffic to other, mainly residential streets around the LTZ such as Wyndham Road, St. Edmunds Church Street and Tollgate Road for example. Similarly no comparative air quality data was recorded by the respective Councils to assess the redistribution of pollution from the city centre commercial streets to surrounding residential ones and the properties close to the increasingly clogged A36 inner road</p> <p>The consultation exercises were lamentably poor. The first element relied upon by WCC to justify the detail of the LTZ as introduced was simply a poll of residents asking them broad questions about whether they would like to see less traffic in the city, better air quality etc. The second element contained such a poorly drawn plan of the city street with clear errors about the location of “gates” and the ability of traffic to exit e.g. Chipper Lane into Castle Street without passing through the LTZ Gate. People could not understand the detail of the proposal from that consultation exercise which was a bare consultation relying almost exclusively on web sites and social media – not appropriate given the age distribution in Salisbury (and failing to consider the Councils’ statutory equality duty)</p>

	<p>The implementation was similarly poor with dreadful signage which was confusing and often invisible. Many visitors did not realise that it was still possible to reach the inner city car parks and the Wyndham road signage fell over and was not replaced so no-one could read it.</p> <p>I have seen claims from WCC and others that business supported it. I volunteer at a charity shop in Catherine Street where I both conduct PAT testing and collect and deliver heavy items of electrical goods and furniture. I applied for an was granted a permit to drive through the LTZ for this reason but then I discovered all the parking bays in Catherine Street were needlessly coned off making deliveries and collections both dangerous and difficult since the one loading bay was frequently occupied and very distant from the shop I volunteer at. Talking to the manager of that shop and indeed witnessing the evidence on a daily basis it is clear that footfall and takings were substantially down. Donations of anything other than small bags of light products completely dried up, Given that charity chops appear to be just about the only commercial properties still operating in Salisbury apart from a few food and supermarket chains I am astounded that the effects of this LTZ on the commercial heart of the city and the operations of those shops had not been properly assessed before its introduction.</p> <p>Finally, if WCC and SCC actually spent properly on the quality and maintenance of the pavements in the city then those with limited mobility, relying upon electric buggies, wheelchairs, and strollers would be able to get about safely. The introduction of the LTZ did nothing to help them – reducing traffic movements through the city did not improve their quality of life in terms of walking into the city centre since they are still navigating very badly broken pavement with poor quality paving stones often broken when they were laid and inadequate width footpaths for their needs e.g. Scots Lane at the junction with Castle Street.</p> <p>We moved to a house within the ring road so that we could walk to everything in town. This is both a privilege but also a compromise. There is little or no off street parking, smaller properties, traffic generated through our streets by the decision to move the police to Bourne Hall to make way for the clearly likely to fail UTC on Wilton Road (another bad decision by local politicians and Council with the wholly predictable results we are now living with). However, living within the A36 road means it is abundantly clear that these residential streets are not designed for nor capable of absorbing the additional traffic diverted onto them when the poorly designed LTZ was in force.</p> <p>The pollution is just as bad and was simply moved from once place to another.</p>
86.	<p>Dear Salisbury City Council,</p> <p>Please find attached my statement regarding the People Friendly Streets scheme that was recently suspended.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
87.	<p>Dear members of Salisbury City Council,</p> <p>I live in a village eight miles from Salisbury but visit the city regularly. I am writing to add my support for the return of your People Friendly Streets scheme.</p> <p>In a report published only yesterday, 10th December, by the Centre for Cities think tank, we learn that urban air pollution is worse than ever, exceeding pre-Covid levels in cities across</p>

	<p>the country. We cannot continue to allow the further toxification of our air, causing thousands of deaths in the UK every year. In addition to the issue of air pollution, it is clear that we also need an urgent reduction in our carbon dioxide emissions and therefore we must find ways to encourage walking, cycling and public transport. As emissions continue to rise, there is no time to lose on this. How proud we could be of our city, if we became part of the green recovery, rather than part of the problem. This is an opportunity for Salisbury to take a step forward and lead the way on a vital issue. Many cities will be taking this step in the coming years - there is no choice. Why not lead, rather than follow?</p>
88.	<p>Dear Annie</p> <p>As a local resident of Salisbury, I just wanted to say that I am in favour of the People Friendly scheme being re-instated in the New Year.</p> <p>The air quality was so much better during lockdown and it made the streets quieter and safer for our shoppers.</p> <p>It was such a shame that it was introduced just before the second lockdown which did not really give it a fair chance to prove its worth.</p>
89.	<p>I would like to register my support for People Friendly Streets in Salisbury. I believe that on health and environmental grounds we need traffic reduced in the city centre and encouragement for cycling and walking where possible. I also think that the experience of meeting and shopping in Salisbury could be enhanced where traffic is reduced or eliminated -- as it is in the High Street, which is an attractive area for shopping, listening to music, and pavement eateries.</p> <p>I believe that not enough consultation was undertaken before the experimental implementation in November to reassure the legitimate concerns of all parties, and I hope that in future it could be carried out better.</p> <p>I understand that the cycle lanes are a separate measure. I feel much safer on my bicycle on Exeter Street now. Although not many cyclists use the lanes, it will take time for confidence and usage and the switch to cycling to take place, and this measure should be given time to gain popularity.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>
90.	<p>Dear sir/madam,</p> <p>I'm writing in regarding of the disastrous people friendly scheme. Please don't do it. Salisbury suffers as it is. When we moved here 10 years ago from Dorset it was a beautiful city full of life and people. Now most of the shops are empty buildings, parking charges are crazy and the people friendly scheme definitely didn't help. It was still full of buses, lorries, vans etc. so the air pollution couldn't have improved that much... The city was dead otherwise. No people. Businesses suffer as it is (my husband owns one in town so I know!!).</p> <p>Let's try and rebuild our beautiful city, let's bring the businesses back, let's bring the people back, let's listen to the local people first before you implement these ideas. Now it's definitely not a good time!??</p>
91.	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I have noticed in the press that there is a chance to comment on Salisbury's proposed reintroduction of the LTZ zone. I do not actually live in the town – but I went to school in Salisbury schools continuously from age 3 – 17, as did both my sisters and my father. My sister taught in Salisbury schools for 30 years. It is our local town.</p> <p>I saw the town reduced to a ghost town with the last LTZ zoning: I have never seen it look</p>

	<p>so drab, washed out and depressed. Even the charity shops and coffee shops, which seem to make up the bulk of the retail, were bedraggled. I knew that this is also a result of C19 and extremely high rates and parking charges.</p> <p>However, last Saturday, my wife and daughter went shopping and the town had a little of its old glow back, and the traders seemed to have slightly regained the will to live.</p> <p>As for three cycle lanes – unsafe and a complete disaster. When at university, my daughter cycled on cycle lanes from Hounslow to Acton every day. They were marked in the road, no bollards, and were wide enough for two bikes to pass. It was signed clearly that there are times when a vehicle may have to dip into them in an emergency. Those horrors in Salisbury are a bad joke, especially in Exeter Street.</p>
92.	<p>Just a quick email to say that I am in support of the People Friendly Street in Salisbury.</p>
93.	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am writing to express my dismay that the traffic calming scheme might be brought back again. The centre of Salisbury's traffic does not need calming. The town needs the traffic to bring the shoppers in so they don't go to alternate towns to shop. Our town is like a ghost town already - why would you want to discourage people from coming in? (And as for those dangerous new cycle lane bollards - completely unnecessary and just another hazard. Cyclists going to Harnham use the Close, not Exeter Street!) I was in Henley on Thames last weekend and it was thriving. No empty shops at all, lots of people around. Obviously Salisbury has had more than its fair share of trials with Novichok as well as Covid but it's very distressing to see how it has suffered, and keeping cars out will only make it worse. Not to mention the added congestion on our already overstretched ring road. Please make alternative arrangements to help central Salisbury recover. Lower rates for shop owners would surely help? Not this I'll-advised and badly thought out scheme for sure.</p>
94.	<p>I am writing to express my support for Experimental Traffic Regulation Order and People friendly Streets (Salisbury). During the recently truncated trial period, we were able to gain a glimpse of how our city might develop in the absence of so many private motor vehicles permitted to travel through the centre. As both cyclist and pedestrian, I enjoyed a sense of both safety and a feeling of calm as I went about my daily business in town.</p> <p>No doubt you are well aware of the multiple benefits available in towns and cities that put in place similar schemes, and all the evidence points to there being substantially increased footfall for city centre businesses. We have all seen support in the press and wider media for improved safety, health benefits, reduced air pollution, lack of congestion and that intangible factor we like to call 'well-being'.</p> <p>I might add that the opposition from their online petition seems to be a relatively small proportion of the local population that has orchestrated an irresponsible campaign against improving the quality of life in Salisbury. Their main 'objection' seems to be from a fear of increased traffic displaced to the ring road. While such arguments seem based in fear rather than in research, I recall a serious traffic jam along Churchill Way to the A36 roundabout around lunchtime two days <i>after the ETRO was lifted</i>. Anecdotal I know, but a telling observation!</p> <p>I trust that both the City Council and Wiltshire Council will persist with PFS for Salisbury and that at some time, I imagine with the support of many (including John Glen MP) improvements for shoppers, visitors, tourists, businesses and many more will be realised.</p>

95.	<p>To the City Clerk</p> <p>I am very much in favour of a Low Traffic Zone in Salisbury City Centre. I do think there should be a full consultation process with local residents and businesses consulted.</p>
96.	<p>As a City Resident, I've noticed that since the lifting of the LTZ, the Car Parks are 75% full, the Shops are healthily busy, and the 'light" Traffic has flowed freely through the City as always, The Cycle lanes are still completely EMPTY. So the question has to be asked, What was all that about!!! 😊 To Clarify: "If it's not broke, don't fix it!"</p> <p>As a Salisbury resident I support this initiative and hope it will be reintroduced in 2021. After consultation from the business community, walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>Salisbury was the FIRST planned city and it should be at the forefront of any change in transport and lifestyle.</p>