

TISBURY PARISH COUNCIL
POTENTIAL PURCHASE OF JOHNSON'S FIELD
 Notes of the Meeting held on Tuesday 14th September 2010
 at 7:30pm in the Hinton Hall, Tisbury.

- 10.09.16 **Present:** P.Cnllrs P. Duffy (Chairman), D. Carroll (Vice-Chairman), Mrs J. Amos, Mrs P. Chave, Miss F. Corp, R. Dearden and M. McGrath - 7.
 Also in attendance: WCnllrs R. Beattie and T. Deane; WTP.Cnllrs Mrs I. Lacey, R Platts & Mrs G Matthews; Mrs S. Harry (Clerk); 83 named individuals and up to 30 others for a part of the meeting.
Apologies received and accepted: J. Berkley-Matthews (RFO), P. Coopman and D. Boxall; Brig. Gen. and Mrs H. Bowen. WTPC Chairman G Flower
- 10.09.17 The Chairman welcomed all present and introduced the topic for consideration in the overall context of Wiltshire Council's proposed car parking charges or potential transfer of responsibility for the Nadder Close Car Park to Tisbury PC.
 The Chairman further commented upon:
- a. the previous consultations undertaken in the village with respect to parking issues, notably TISVIS parish plan and subsequent surveys by Wiltshire Council
 - b. the report produced by WSP Consultant, commissioned by TAPCAP
 - c. issues relating to building on the land, other land use and flood plain considerations,
 - d. indicative figures and cost per household for various scenarios,
 - e. the station parking problem and how the field purchase could help,
 - f. the consequences of the PC not proceeding with the purchase, and finally
 - g. Ione Lacey summarised the information in the WSP consultants' report.
- 10.09.18 Members of the public were then asked for their views; these being summarised as follows:
- a. Why should the residents of Tisbury fund additional parking for those living outside the village?
 - b. Who benefits from purchase of the field? The village already has:
 - i. plenty of amenity areas and walks, especially with the prospect of the KGVth field becoming available when the Plymouth Brethren vacate the school, and
 - ii. a football field on the LRG.
 - c. What would happen if the land was bought by others and not for benefit of the village?
 - d. Could village benefactors buy the land on behalf of the village?
 - e. The Parmiter site/ land to the north of the railway line would be a more logical site to buy for parking, although the costs of providing a footbridge would need to be borne.
 - f. Johnson's Field was not worth the supposed asking price of £40,000.
 - g. Costs of car park construction would be impractical for the village to bear.
 - h. Provision of additional parking would encourage more cars.
 - i. The PC should liaise more with SWT, although it was acknowledged that the length of the remaining franchise limited their co-operation. SWT could be lobbied to provide free parking on their land, or at least reduced charges - but this would be against company policy. However, the prospect of increased free parking within the village would mean less parking at the station car park and thus loss of revenue as some rail users just don't want to pay for parking.
 - j. Purchase of the field would enable the visual approach to the village to be enhanced, but no parking should be allowed.
 - k. A rationalization of sports facilities within the village to the Nadder Hall complex

would free up the LRG for parking, with the added advantage that this field is already owned by the PC. The football and bowls clubs could be re-located up to the Nadder Hall complex; especially if the school building becomes available through 'the buy-back option'. A number of those present did think however, that the heart of the village would be lost if this happened, although this was not explored in more detail.

- l. It was proposed (somewhat with tongue in cheek) that a 'Park and Ride' site could be established near the Nadder Hall complex with TISBUS transferring passengers.
- m. There needs to be a recognition that numbers of cars parking in the village will increase, so there needs to be a resolution of the parking difficulties - potentially with parking restrictions and controls. The potential for residents' parking permits should be explored, although any controls would see an increase in costs to the village via enforcement.
- n. The introduction of double yellow lines in the area around the station car park would force commuters to use the SWT car park or move the problem to another area. Temporary restrictions could be used to assess the likely effects.
- o. Tisbury is a major village in the AONB with the river an ecological corridor and the biodiversity must be retained and enhanced, potentially by planting trees in the first instance.
- p. It was acknowledged that rail users probably do use the High Street.
- q. The PC should aim to provide simple car parking facilities with due regard for the environment, challenging the EA with respect to their various onerous conditions.
- r. The PC should consider extending the current Nadder Close car park, although it was noted that this land would only become available if planning permission was given for land adjacent to The Avenue.

10.09.19 A number of related issues were also raised:

- a. Feedback from the current owners of Johnson's field was not in favour of the land being used solely for car parking.
- b. A number of potential grants had been identified to help any purchase, although ongoing costs were unlikely to be funded.
- c. West Tisbury PC needed to be involved in any potential schemes.
- d. The impact of housing schemes needed to be assessed, e.g. Hindon Lane and the current building east of Shaftesbury.
- e. SWT were predicting 40 additional cars per day over the next 10 years in any event.
- f. Alternative parking for the TISBUS vehicles needed to be found as these vehicles were causing problems in current residential car parking areas.
- g. Other car parks, such as that of the Hinton Hall, were not available for general parking.
- h. Driveway rentals could be explored as an option. (this proposal was also somewhat frivolous)

10.09.20 A series of 'straw poll' votes were taken to determine the mood of those present:

- a. All present agreed that there was a problem with commuter car parking that needs to be addressed.
- b. c.50% of those present agreed that there was a more generalised parking problem in Tisbury village.

- c. 13 people thought that Tisbury PC should buy Johnson's Field for parking.
- d. No-one was in favour of Tisbury PC buying Johnson's Field for amenity use (no parking).
- e. 32 people were in favour of Tisbury PC buying Johnson's Field for shared parking and amenity use.
- f. 25 people did not think that Tisbury PC should buy the field at all.

10.09.21 The Chairman summarised the evening's discussion by thanking all those present for their views and stressing that before any further action was taken, there would need to be a full understanding of:

- a. the potential for other sites for use as additional parking, eg. an extension to the Nadder Close car park / South West trains land,
- b. costs involved for purchase and subsequent development and maintenance of any site for parking,
- c. potential implications for charging for parking spaces, and
- d. expanded use of parking restrictions throughout the village.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 9:20pm.