

Individual Decision

The attached report will be taken as
Individual Portfolio Member Decision on:

Friday, 28th June, 2013

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member(s)	Page No.
ID2607	Parking Review Amendment 13	Councillor Pamela Bale	1 - 30



This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Parking Review Amendment 13
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	28 June 2013
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2607

Purpose of Report: To inform the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision of the responses received during the statutory consultation on the review and introduction of waiting restrictions within various towns and villages (Aldermaston, Bradfield, Burghfield, Chieveley, Compton, Greenham, Holybrook/Calcot, Hungerford, Kintbury, Lambourn, Mortimer, Newbury, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Shaw, Speen, Stockcross, Thatcham, Theale, Tilehurst, Wickham, Woolhampton and Yattendon) and to seek approval of officer recommendations.

Recommended Action: That the Executive Member for Highways, Transport (Operations), Emergency Planning, Newbury Vision resolves to approve the recommendations as set out in Section 5 of this report.

Reason for decision to be taken: To enable Parking Review Amendment 13 to be progressed to implementation.

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation:

- Plan Nos: J27, K69, L67, L68, L70, L72, M66, M69, U75, V76, X55, AE67, AE68, AJ69, AJ78, AJ79, AJ80, AK70, AK71, AK77, AL70, AL71, AL73, AL75, AL76, AL77, AL78, AL79, AM47, AM68, AM69, AM70, AM71, AM72, AM76, AN47, AN71, AN72, AN77, AQ75, AR75, AS74, AT72, AT73, AT74, AU73, AU74, AV24, AV71, AV76, AW73, AW76, AW77, AX74, AX76, AY74, AY75, AY76, BC44, BD45, BH75, BH76, BJ81, BL59, BO86, BO87, BS37, BS38, BT59, BU37, BV59, BV74, BV75, BW73, BW75, BW84, BY37, BY49, BY68, BY69, BY85, BZ68, BZ69, BZ85, CB56 and CC60.
- Residents Parking Policy and Guidance Report dated 12th August 2004.
- Responses received during statutory consultation.

Portfolio Member Details	
Name & Telephone No.:	Councillor Pamela Bale - Tel (0118) 9842980
E-mail Address:	pbale@westberks.gov.uk

Contact Officer Details	
Name:	Andrew Garratt
Job Title:	Principal Traffic & Road Safety Engineer
Tel. No.:	01635 519491
E-mail Address:	agarratt@westberks.gov.uk

Implications

- Policy:** The consultation is in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
- Financial:** The Statutory Consultation and advertisement procedure and implementation of the physical works will be funded from the approved Capital Programme.
- Personnel:** None arising from this report.
- Legal/Procurement:** The Sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order will be undertaken by Legal Services.
- Property:** None arising from this report.
- Risk Management:** None arising from this report.

Is this item relevant to equality?	Please tick relevant boxes	Yes	No
Does the policy affect service users, employees or the wider community and:			
• Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Is it a major policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Will the policy have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Does the policy relate to an area with known inequalities?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Outcome (Where one or more 'Yes' boxes are ticked, the item is relevant to equality)			
Relevant to equality - Complete an EIA available at www.westberks.gov.uk/eia			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality			<input type="checkbox"/>

Consultation Responses

Members:

Leader of Council: Councillor Gordon Lundie - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Overview & Scrutiny Management Commission Chairman: Councillor Brian Bedwell - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Ward Members: Councillors Jeff Beck, David Betts, Roger Croft, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, Roger Hunneman, Mike Johnston, Geoff Mayes and Ieuan Tuck support the recommendations.

Councillor Virginia von Celsing commented that this has been a difficult issue to resolve, with lots of strong views and not always straightforward, but that on balance the suggestion of a revised plan for the yellow lines in Yattendon seems to be a good half way measure.

To date no response has been received from Councillors David Allen, Peter Argyle, Brian Bedwell, Howard Bairstow, Dominic Boeck, Jeff Brooks, Paul Bryant, Hilary Cole, Richard Crumly, Sheila Ellisan, Marcus Franks, David Goff, Manohar Gopal, Paul Hewer, John Horton, Carol Jackson-Doerge, Graham Jones, Tony Linden, Mollie Lock, Royce Longton, Gordon Lundie, Alan Macro, Gwen Mason, Tim Metcalfe, Joe Mooney, Irene Neill, Graham Pask, David Rendel, Andrew Rowles, Anthony Stanfeld, Julian Swift-Hook, Tony Vickers, Quentin Webb or Emma Webster. However any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Councillor Keith Woodhams - see Opposition Spokesman comments.

Opposition Spokesperson: Councillor Keith Woodhams concurs with the comments received from residents of Herons Way and does not support the recommendation for this road.

Local Stakeholders: N/A

Officers Consulted: Mark Edwards, Mark Cole, Alex Drysdale

Trade Union: N/A

Is this item subject to call-in?	Yes: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No: <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	------------------------------

Supporting Information

1. Background

- 1.1 The West Berkshire Clear Streets Strategy is the basis on which the main towns and villages have been formally reviewed. Any new parking concerns that are raised at individual locations across the district are now investigated within a district-wide parking scheme rather than having to wait until a specific town or area is being reviewed.
- 1.2 Parking Review Amendment 13 investigated various sites where parking has been expressed as a concern and it also included recently adopted roads where parking issues have been identified.
- 1.3 Following investigation into the parking issues the Ward Members and Parish/Town Councils affected were consulted for any further comments to the parking proposals. The consultation resulted in some minor changes to the proposals which were then progressed to statutory consultation.
- 1.4 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 29 November and 20 December 2012.

2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period 144 responses had been received, including a 14 signature petition objecting to the proposals for West End Road in Mortimer.
- 2.2 No objections were received in respect of the proposals for Aldermaston, Bradfield, Chieveley, Compton, Holybrook/Calcot, Pangbourne, Stockcross, Theale, Tilehurst or Woolhampton.
- 2.3 Responses were received from Aldermaston, Compton, Kintbury and Welford & Wickham Parish Councils indicating either support or no objections. Burghfield and Greenham Parish Councils responded with comments on the proposal.
- 2.4 23 responses were received on the proposal for Newport Road, Newbury, including one from the board of governors at St Joseph's Catholic Primary School. Only one of the responses indicated support for the proposals.
- 2.5 22 responses were received on the proposals for Rectory Close in Newbury, including one from the Residents Group Committee. Only two of the responses indicated support for the proposals.
- 2.6 20 responses were received on the proposal for Kintbury High Street. Only the Parish Council supported the proposal.
- 2.7 The remaining responses to the consultation were in smaller numbers objecting to various proposals across the whole scheme.
- 2.8 A summary of all the comments received during the statutory consultation, together with officer comments, is provided in Appendix A to this report.

3. Equalities Impact Assessment Outcomes

- 3.1 Local Residents - The main aim of this item is to propose introduction of parking restrictions in various locations to address road safety concerns, verge damage, vehicle obstruction issues and provide parking for residents.
- 3.2 Improved road safety - Better visibility at road junctions by preventing vehicles parking too close.
- 3.3 Child Pedestrians - Improved road safety on approaches to those schools included within this scheme. Restricting or prohibiting parking will make a safer environment and enable vulnerable pedestrians to be seen by passing traffic.
- 3.4 Persons with less mobility - Improved road safety and footway obstruction issues addressed at specific locations. Prohibiting parking at junctions including within the scheme will ensure dropped kerbs are not obstructed for the disabled or visually impaired.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 Requests for additional restrictions cannot be made without going through the full statutory consultation process again, but requests resulting in a relaxation to a proposed restriction can be accommodated by amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) prior to its Sealing.
- 4.2 Having carefully considered the responses to the consultation the following adjustments would address the comments received and they could be introduced without the need for the re-advertisement of the TRO:
 - (i) The proposal to introduce a length of No Waiting 'At Any Time' on the north side of Birch Road in Burghfield is reduced so that it extends for approximately 15 metres from its junction with School Lane.
 - (ii) The proposal to introduce a length of No Waiting 'At Any Time' on Pingewood Road North in Burghfield is reduced so that it extends for approximately 20 metres south of its junction with Burghfield Road on both sides.
 - (iii) The proposal to amend the current No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm restriction on High Street, Kintbury, to a No Waiting Mon-Fri 9am-5pm is omitted from the final scheme.
 - (iv) The proposal to introduce a 2 Hour Limited Waiting restriction, No Return within 4 Hours, Mon-Sat 8am-6pm on West End Road, Mortimer, is omitted from the final scheme.
 - (v) The proposal to introduce 'Permit Holders Only' on Angel Court, Newbury, is amended to a 2 Hour Limited Waiting restriction, No Return within 4 Hours Mon-Sat 8am-6pm (Permit Holders Exempt).
 - (vi) The proposal to introduce No Waiting 'At Any Time' on Crawford Place, Newbury, is omitted from the final scheme.

- (vii) The proposal to introduce No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-9am and 2.30pm-4pm on Maple Crescent and Dolman Road, Newbury, is omitted from the final scheme.
- (viii) The proposal to introduce No Waiting 'At Any Time' at the junction of Oaken Grove and Longacre, Newbury, is omitted from the final scheme.
- (ix) The proposal to introduce No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm and No Waiting Mon-Fri 9am-5pm on Rectory Close, Newbury, is omitted from the final scheme.
- (x) The proposed extension to the No Waiting 'At Any Time' on Purley Village, Purley-on-Thames, is amended to only extend for approximately 22 metres west of the lane leading to Home Farm.
- (xi) The proposed No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-9.30am and 2.30pm-4pm on Digby Road, Speen, is omitted from the final scheme.
- (xii) The proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' on Glebelands, Thatcham, is omitted from the final scheme.
- (xiii) The proposed No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm on the south side of Urquhart Road, Thatcham, is omitted from the final scheme.
- (xiv) The proposed No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-9.30am & 2.30pm-4pm on Welford Road, Wickham, is amended to No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-9.30am.
- (xv) The proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' on the south side of Yattendon Lane, Yattendon, opposite The Old Rectory is reduced so that it only extends for approximately 20 metres east of the boundary of Church Corner and Isaacs.

4.3 Due to the nature of parking schemes it can sometimes be difficult to accurately anticipate the consequences of change, such as where any displaced parking may occur. Therefore the parking restrictions will need to be monitored to determine their effectiveness and should any amendments be required these can be introduced as part of the review process, subject to the standard consultation procedure.

4.4 During the period of the circulation of the draft report to Members, Yattendon Parish Council highlighted that Yattendon Estates were in discussion with the school regarding proposals to increase the parking within the school grounds. As this proposal was in the early stages of design there is no certainty that it will be approved or implemented and therefore for the purposes of this parking review these proposals have been discounted. If the proposals are subsequently approved and they make a significant impact on the parking availability on Yattendon Lane then any on-street parking restrictions, if implemented, can be reviewed as part of a future parking scheme and adjusted if appropriate.

4.5 As part of members comments on the Draft Report, Councillor Keith Woodhams responded that he concurred with the comments received from residents of Herons Way and does not support the recommendation for this road. Officers have previously visited Herons Way with Councillor Woodhams and local police officers to observe the parking problems particularly at the beginning and end of the school

day where residents were concerned about obstruction and general road safety issues associated with the number of vehicles entering Herons Way. It is considered that the proposed restrictions will address many of these concerns and given that only two residents objected during the consultation period, it is assumed that the majority of residents either support the proposals or have no strong views on the issue. It is therefore recommended that the proposals are introduced as advertised.

5. Recommendations

- 5.1 That the revisions to the proposed restrictions as detailed in Section 4.2 of this report be approved.
- 5.2 That the remaining proposed restrictions be introduced as advertised.
- 5.3 That the parking scheme be monitored so that any parking displacement can be addressed as part of a future review.
- 5.4 That the respondents to the statutory consultation be informed accordingly.

Appendices

Appendix A - Summary of Comments to Statutory Consultation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
ALDERMASTON COMMENTS - (Plan BJ 81)		
3	Responses were received in support of the proposals from Aldermaston Parish Council, the Headteacher at Aldermaston C of E Primary School and the Board of Governors for the school. The Parish Council requested that the road markings be introduced in accordance with regulations for environmentally sensitive areas.	Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.
BURGHFIELD COMMON COMMENTS		
2	<p><u>Birch Road and Boldrewood: (Plan BV74 & BV75)</u></p> <p>Resident of Birch Road supports the proposals but would like them to be slightly adjusted to allow visitors or delivery vehicles to park to the front of their property.</p> <p>Resident of Boldrewood does not consider the restrictions to be sufficient and would like them extended into this road to prevent parking for the school.</p>	<p>The parking proposal will introduce No Waiting 'At Any Time' restrictions as junction protection on Birch Road, Boldrewood, Jordans Lane and School Lane. The restrictions are for road safety reasons in an area close to two schools and will protect new dropped kerbs introduced as part of a footway improvement scheme and ensure they are not obstructed by parked vehicles. There is capacity to shorten the proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' on the north side of Birch Road without seriously compromising road safety, which would satisfy the resident's concerns.</p> <p>Additional restrictions cannot be considered as part of this scheme. Boldrewood can however be reviewed as part of a future parking scheme if appropriate.</p> <p>In view of the comments received the following amendment is recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction on the north side of Birch Road be adjusted so that it only extends for a distance of approximately 15 metres from its junction with School Lane. • The remaining No Waiting 'At Any Time' proposals for this area be introduced as advertised.
1	Burghfield Parish Council requested that the junction of School Road and Clayhill Road be included within this scheme.	Additional restrictions for the areas not part of the proposal will be investigated as part of a future parking scheme and restrictions recommended if appropriate.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
1	<p><u>Pingewood Road North: (Plan CC60)</u></p> <p>Local business owner requested that the proposal be adjusted so that some on-street parking is retained, as the off-street car park for the business is often full at peak periods and parking for passing trade is required.</p>	<p>The parking proposal will introduce a No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction as junction protection. This is a busy junction used by a relatively large number of HGVs for local businesses. Vehicles parking close to the junction were causing obstruction and encroaching onto the swept path for large vehicles. Road safety concerns can however still be met if the proposal is adjusted, as requested by the local business owner.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction is reduced to only extend for approximately 20 metres south of the junction on both sides.</p>
CHIEVELEY COMMENTS – (Plan AM47 & AN47)		
1	Resident supports the proposals but wants other areas of Chieveley to also be considered for parking restrictions.	<p>Additional restrictions for the areas not part of the proposal will be investigated as part of a future parking scheme and restrictions recommended if appropriate.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
COMPTON COMMENTS – (Plan AV24)		
2	Compton Parish Council and the Business Manager for The Downs School both supported the proposals.	Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.
GREENHAM COMMENTS – (Plan AQ75)		
1	Greenham Parish Council suggested that the No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction for Hambridge Lane should only be introduced on one side of the road as the carriageway was wide enough to accommodate opposing LGV traffic plus a parked car. They were also concerned that too severe a restriction would result in indiscriminate parking elsewhere within the business estate and may also increase traffic speeds due to the lack of on-street parking.	<p>Parking restrictions have been requested by the police and VOSA as inconsiderate parking by local businesses is causing a regular obstruction problem for vehicles trying to access the HGV Testing Centre at the eastern end of Hambridge Lane. The proposals will prevent parking on one side of the road as the Parish Council have requested, but will also prevent vehicles parking close to business unit entrances on the other side, as this is also causing problems for HGVs turning. Some on-street parking will be retained on one side which can act as a form of traffic calming and traffic speeds should not be greatly affected.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
		Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.
HUNGERFORD COMMENTS – (Plan L70)		
1	<p>The Chair of Governors for Hungerford Primary School objected to the proposals for South View as they have insufficient parking within their grounds and some of the staff park in that road.</p>	<p>The proposals for South View are to address a reported problem with vehicles parking on the footway on the north side and close to the junction. It will not prohibit parking on the south side (adjacent to the school fence between the two vehicle entrances) and therefore school staff and other road users will continue to be able to park there.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
KINTBURY COMMENTS – (Plan U75)		
20	<p>Vehicles should continue to be prohibited from parking on High Street opposite the junction with The Croft on this very narrow road so that access to the properties is retained and to prevent a repeat of the obstruction which used to occur. Deliveries, including oil and gas tanker deliveries, take place on a Saturday as well as throughout the week and therefore the Saturday restriction should remain.</p> <p>Timed deliveries are usually not an option and the 8am-6pm restriction should remain to allow for possible early morning/late evening deliveries by large vehicles needing turning space.</p> <p>Residents of Titcombe Way objected to the proposed change on road safety grounds as visibility at the junction with High Street would be impaired if vehicles were permitted to park close to Titcombe Way entrance on Saturdays, or at peak times when they were entering or leaving their homes and when traffic on High Street is at its busiest.</p> <p>Kintbury Parish Council supported the proposal however 19 local residents objected to the change.</p>	<p>This proposal was requested by a resident of High Street and endorsed by the Parish Council and would allow residents to park on a Saturday and provide longer overnight parking. It was also proposed to shorten the restriction by approximately one car length to improve on-street parking for residents in this congested area.</p> <p>Given the number of objections it is recommended that the proposals are omitted from the final scheme.</p>
LAMBOURN COMMENTS – (Plan J27)		

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
5	<p>Residents of Newbury Street have no option but to park in Foxbury or Tubbs Farm Close as Newbury Street is too narrow for parking without obstructing through traffic. 6 of the properties have no off-street parking, but the majority are owners of multiple vehicles and need to be able to park. If No Waiting 'At Any Time' is introduced there will be nowhere for residents to safely park and they may be forced to park on Newbury Street.</p> <p>Parking in the area of the proposed restrictions does not endanger or inconvenience pedestrians or road users and the proposals are not justified. The lay-by in Foxbury is too small for the number of cars in the area and that is why vehicles park close to the junction.</p> <p>The parking requirements of Newbury Street residents are not being considered when we have previously been told that "parking will always be available in Foxbury".</p> <p>The grass verge and trees in Foxbury should be removed and the area converted to echelon parking.</p> <p>The garages at the end of Foxbury should be demolished as they are too small for modern cars and this would create more space for all.</p> <p>It is a waste of funds to paint the lines and a waste of time to enforce it.</p>	<p>The proposal for Foxbury and Tubbs Farm Close is to introduce No Waiting 'At Any Time' only at the junctions with Newbury Street to prevent vehicles parking within the first 10 metres, as there is a reported road safety concern when vehicles regularly park in these locations. The vehicles also reportedly park on the footway near the junction and this can obstruct pedestrian users, including parents with buggies or the disabled.</p> <p>Vehicles should not be parking close to the junction and these proposals will reinforce Rule 243 of The Highway Code, but there will still be significant areas of on-street parking remaining within Foxbury and Tubbs Farm Close which could continue to be used.</p> <p>Conversion of grass verges to on-street parking, including removal of trees, requires significant funds and is not something that that can be considered as part of this parking scheme. The garages in Foxbury are privately owned and this parking scheme could not consider their removal.</p> <p>It is considered that some of the objections may be based on a misinterpretation of the Street Notice, which may have implied that the whole of Foxbury and Tubbs Farm Close would be subject to restrictions. The Street Notice did however clearly state "along PARTS of the roads listed".</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
MORTIMER COMMENTS – (Plan BW84)		
4 (including a 14 signature petition)	<p>There is never a problem with parking in the lay-by on West End Road as the staff for the businesses park around the back in Aborn Parade and many of the residents are away during the day so there is always plenty of parking available. The restriction is unnecessary and will create friction between residents and the businesses.</p> <p>The types of businesses in Aborn Parade do not rely on 'passing trade' as they mainly operate an appointment based system and so the restriction is not required. In some cases two hours may not be long enough for visitors to those types of businesses anyway.</p>	<p>A restriction to help the businesses attract passing trade had been requested after Mortimer was last formally reviewed. From observation during the public consultation it does however seem that there is parking available throughout the day and the comment that the majority of the businesses are appointment based rather than relying on passing trade is a valid one.</p> <p>Given the number of objections and site observations during the consultation it is recommended that the proposals are omitted from the final scheme.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	The parking has worked well for many years, suiting both residents and businesses and the change is unnecessary.	
NEWBURY COMMENTS		
3	<p><u>Angel Court: (Plan AM71 & AM72)</u></p> <p>The residents of Angel Court do not want further parking restrictions and do not support permit parking.</p> <p>There is insufficient parking to cater for local residents and introducing permit restrictions will not alleviate the problem as there would be more applications than the parking bay would provide.</p> <p>Object to having to purchase a permit for visitor parking or having nowhere for our visitors to park if these restrictions are introduced. Pelican Lane car park is too far away for them to walk</p> <p>Most of the space on Angel Court is used by residents of Corporation Cottages and the permit proposition will only exacerbate the matter as they will then start parking in Angel Court private spaces.</p> <p>The grass verges in Angel Court should be removed to allow on-street parking.</p>	<p>It had previously been requested by a resident that the remaining area of unrestricted parking be converted to a form of 'permit parking', similar to that found in Pelican Lane for the benefit of local residents who had difficulty parking close to their property.</p> <p>Local parking pressure in Angel Court is made worse due to residents of Corporation Cottages not fully utilising their car park area. A parking restriction with an exemption for permit holders would remove long term parking and provide a space for visitors or permit holders in the area.</p> <p>Conversion of grass verges to on-street parking requires significant funds and is not something that that can be considered as part of this parking scheme.</p> <p>In view of the objections received the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed 'Permit Holders Only' restriction be adjusted to a Limited Waiting 2 Hours No Return Within 4 Hours Mon-Sat 8am-6pm (Permit Holders Exempt). This would reflect the existing restriction in place within two parking bays on the adjacent residential road (Pelican Lane). • The No Waiting 'At Any Time' is retained as advertised, as this is an amendment to the parking plans only, as the restriction is already in place on-street.
2	<p><u>Buckingham Road: (Plan AK77)</u></p> <p>Visibility at the new junction of Coopers Place and Buckingham Road is very poor due to cars parking close and the proposals do not go far enough to improve this and are inadequate to prevent accidents.</p> <p>The proposed amendments would restrict parking for visitors and make no difference</p>	<p>Parking space is at a premium on this part of Buckingham Road and the new housing development has removed some of the unrestricted space that was available due to the new driveways that have been introduced. The proposals will provide a minimum of protection at the Coopers Place junction, but extending it further would impact on other local residents' ability to park. Kew Cottages is also located on this part of the road and</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>for residents. The current restrictions are sufficient to accommodate parking requirements in Buckingham Road.</p> <p>The proposal to shorten the double yellow line at the junction with Fifth Road will make the problems worse.</p> <p>The new properties all have their own parking spaces so there shouldn't be an increase in demand for on-street parking from new residents. More permit parking spaces are not required.</p>	<p>their entrance onto Buckingham Road is between two unprotected parking bays which has not caused significant problems for residents.</p> <p>There will still be some unrestricted parking available for visitors or non-permit holders on Buckingham Road and Fifth Road.</p> <p>Adjusting the length of double yellow at the Fifth Road junction will provide slightly more parking space but will still ensure the junction is protected.</p> <p>All 12 residents of Shrewsbury Terrace petitioned for an extension to the permit parking spaces as they were experiencing problems caused by increased number of residents in the area and that is why this proposal was submitted.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
5	<p><u>Crawford Place: (Plan AL73)</u></p> <p>The 3 on-street unrestricted parking spaces are vital for visitors and residents and the removal of this facility is not justified just because the bin lorry was obstructed once by a poorly parked car, which has not occurred since. Residents are careful with their parking and making use of this space.</p> <p>Only a few residents have off-road parking and restricting the space further will cause considerable inconvenience for all.</p>	<p>This restriction was requested by a resident of Crawford Place who reported obstruction problems caused by inconsiderate parking. On-street parking is very limited and it is agreed that it's removal would have a significant impact on residents.</p> <p>Given the number of objections it is recommended that the proposals are omitted from the final scheme.</p>
3	<p><u>Cleveland Grove: (Plan AL73)</u></p> <p>The proposal will address the access problems bin lorries have in this road but should not extend any further than necessary as parking is limited for residents.</p> <p>Agree with the proposal but it should be adjusted on the north side so that it ends at the boundary wall of No 17/18. The problem only occurs on the south side.</p> <p>The parking is made worse by local office workers avoiding paying for car parks and if this is introduced they will start to park in resident car parks.</p>	<p>Waste Services have reported a regular obstruction problem on Cleveland Grove. The proposals will extend the existing restrictions to a point which will ensure refuse vehicles can negotiate the bend unobstructed.</p> <p>If only one side was treated it is highly likely that the parking would transfer to the north side to the front of No 19 Cleveland Grove and the obstruction concerns would continue. If the restriction extended only to the boundary of No 17/18, the bend in the road would not be protected and vehicles could potentially park there and continue to</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>obstruct the road, or the south grass verge would be driven over with potential for damage.</p> <p>Residents could prevent use of their private parking areas if parking by non-residents became a problem.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
<p>6 (including from the Head teacher and Chair of Governors)</p>	<p>Maple Crescent: (Plan AM70 & AM71)</p> <p>1. The remodelling project for Winchcombe School included within the design a proposal for formal 'Drop Off' points in the new lay-bys. This has not been included within this proposal. The proposal is based on the old school footprint of the Junior and Infant School and takes no account of the new layout and entrance and should not be introduced without further discussion with the school and board of governors.</p> <p>2. 50% of parents live out of the school catchment and have no alternative but to drive to school. The proposals may force parents to park in nearby streets and there is no proposal to prevent parking on the bend of Maple Crescent/Almond Avenue which may introduce a road safety risk due to limited visibility.</p> <p>3. The proposals do not take into consideration the construction of the new care home on the sold off land of the old school site.</p> <p>4. This is a busy school but parking by parents is a short term problem and does not justify severe restrictions, as these will also be in place during school holidays and will prevent residents and their visitors being able to use the road during summer and Easter holidays.</p> <p>This will make the road less safe as residents will have to cross the road when they previously didn't need to and residents will be forced onto the opposite side of the road to park along with the parents dropping and picking up their children from school.</p> <p>The council should be trying to help residents and not make it even harder to live close to a school. Not everyone has a garage or driveway.</p>	<p>1. There is no provision within current regulations to reserve lay-bys as 'drop off' points on the public highway. If they were marked as such they could not be enforced and nothing could prevent local residents from parking in them.</p> <p>The new school entrance has already been taken into account, as the repositioning of the 'School Keep Clear' marking was amended under the previous Parking Review Amendment 11 carried out during March 2012.</p> <p>2. Some parents may have to drive to school but they do not all need to park outside the school where there are high number of vulnerable pedestrians. They could park in adjacent roads at suitable locations and walk as this may be more appropriate.</p> <p>3. The new care home should have no impact on on-street parking, however it is proposed to remove the current 'School Keep Clear' marking from the site of the former school entrance as it no longer serves a purpose.</p> <p>4. Parking cannot take place on both sides of the road without causing obstruction. The proposals would prevent parking on the property side of the road during peak periods, which would ensure resident's driveways were not obstructed by parents and would also ensure that children could be dropped off/picked up from the school side without the need to cross the road.</p> <p>In view of the objections received the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'School Keep Clear' restriction at the former school entrance (opposite

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>No 2-8 Maple Crescent) be removed from street as advertised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction at the new car park entrance to the school (opposite No 16/18 Maple Crescent) and at the junction with Cherry Close be introduced as advertised. • The proposed No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-9.30am and 2.30pm-4pm restriction in the area of the school, including Maple Crescent and Dolman Road, be omitted from the final scheme. • Further consultation is undertaken with the school and local residents to seek to resolve the ongoing parking concerns, for inclusion of amended proposals within the next parking review of the area.
23	<p><u>Newport Road: (Plan AN71 & AN72)</u></p> <p>One respondent supported the proposals.</p> <p>The proposals will create a significant Health & Safety hazard to the children and parents accessing the school for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The restrictions will prevent parents parking on Newport Road to drop off/collect their children and they will be forced to park in locations which may result in them crossing or walking along the A4 to access the school. This is unsafe for children due to the number of HGVs and the high volume of fast moving vehicles. Increasing the numbers of pedestrians in this area is dangerous, irresponsible and liable to lead to a serious accident 2. Parking on Newport Road has a traffic calming effect at the times when large numbers of child pedestrians are in the vicinity of the school. Removing parking by the introduction of restrictions will increase traffic speeds, increase the road safety risk and remove the barrier between moving traffic and pedestrians that parked cars provides. 3. Parked cars prevent children running out into the road. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There will continue to be lengths of Newport Road and other adjacent roads which will be available for parents to park on and these are entirely practical and safe. Some spaces will remain close to the school while other parking areas will be available within a short walk from the school. If parents have to walk along, or cross the A4 it should not present a problem or road safety concern. The A4 has wide footways that provide a safe environment for pedestrians and there is a signal controlled crossing area which should be used to cross the road safely. 2. It is accepted that parked vehicles can have a traffic calming effect, however the proposals will not prevent all parking on Newport Road and so there should not be a significant change in traffic speeds if the proposals are implemented. The proposals will restrict parking on both sides, as this causes an obstruction on a relatively busy local distributor road for the large residential estate. 3. Parked cars can be a visibility obstruction for pedestrians, especially children, crossing the road and their removal would improve safety. 4. Our Road Safety Officers are able to provide education packages to the school if there is a concern about the safety of children crossing roads. Many of the children will

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>4. Children are unpredictable near roads and may cross into the road without looking. The Council should not assume that users will safely use the formal pedestrian crossings on the A4, especially as many users will be primary school children or their younger siblings. The danger of the A4 was emphasised by the serious injury to a school pupil during 2012 who was involved in a traffic accident while crossing the road.</p> <p>5. The Council has a duty to ensure that access for children to the school is safe and this should have higher priority than the interests of local residents whose homes are affected by parking for only one hour per day.</p> <p>6. When the traffic signals are on red, the queue of traffic on Newport Road waiting to exit onto the A4 will obstruct the road and this will prevent vehicles entering Newport Road and may result in vehicles stacking on the A4 and causing further obstruction for all traffic.</p> <p>7. The proposals will just result in parking displacement and then parents having to complete their journey on foot at greater risk to their children.</p> <p>8. The proposals do not take into account the actions of children with Special Educational Needs, which make up 16% of the school pupils and how unpredictable they can be near roads.</p> <p>9. Removing parked cars will result in a clear run to the traffic lights onto the A4 and this will encourage drivers to accelerate through the section nearest the school before the lights change.</p> <p>10. The alternative areas for parking are not practical or safe for children to walk from. Local roads are full to capacity with resident's parking, or too narrow for additional parking and St Josephs Church car park is too small and too far for parents to use. This car park also presents dangers to pedestrians and vehicle users and may not be available due to funerals or other church services.</p> <p>11. If restrictions are to be introduced they should be on the east side so that vehicles</p>	<p>however be accompanied by an adult and they should be in control of school children and their younger siblings. The incident referred to involved a child crossing the A4 in a location over 400 metres from the school, very close to a signal controlled crossing, but this was not used.</p> <p>5. The Council has to take a balanced view regarding the potential conflict between residents and parents parking for the school but will always address road safety concerns where appropriate.</p> <p>6. The proposal to prevent parking on one side of Newport Road, close to the traffic signals, will address the current problem of obstruction and remove the potential for vehicles to stack back onto the A4.</p> <p>7. If displacement was to occur it should be to areas that are more appropriate for parking and will involve a short walk as part of addressing the congestion close to the school gates, but this should present no greater risk to pedestrians.</p> <p>8. Parents of SEN children should be aware of how their children react near traffic, whether they are walking to school or just using the footway at any other time and should be in control if there is a serious concern.</p> <p>9. A complaint that has previously been made is that inconsiderate drivers already approach the lights at inappropriate speed. Removing parked cars should improve visibility and road safety for all road users.</p> <p>10. Adjacent roads are not full to capacity and could accept additional parking in appropriate locations. This may be inconvenient for parents as there may be a short additional walk to complete their journey but many of the school pupils already walk to school and the proposals will improve safety in the immediate area of the school entrance for all road users. The church car park is a suitable area to use but it is accepted that there may be times when it is unavailable due to church services.</p> <p>11. All of the properties on the west side have off-street parking available. There are a number on the east side that have no alternative apart from parking on-street and this influenced which side of the road the restriction was proposed for.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>can park on the west side and children do not have to cross the road.</p> <p>12. Commencing parking restrictions from 8am unfairly penalises parents who drop children early to school for the Link Club and any restriction should not come into effect until 8.30am.</p> <p>13. Residents should accept the parking that occurs as they will have bought their properties knowing there was a school in the road and any congestion is not long-term.</p> <p>14. The proposals will put the school at a particular disadvantage when compared to other schools facing similar restrictions, because the school is a Catholic Primary School with a wider catchment than other local schools and the pupils do not therefore live within walking distance.</p> <p>15. The restrictions will discourage future selection of the school by prospective Catholic parents if they are unable to commute and send their children to the school safely. This will impact on one of the school's primary missions of attracting Catholic children across the entire catchment area.</p> <p>16. The proposals are too severe to address a minor and short-lived inconvenience and as the existing restrictions already receive very limited enforcement it is questionable whether additional restrictions would be of value.</p> <p>17. Any restriction should apply to both sides of the road or to neither, but to apply on one side only would be unfair to residents on that side of the road.</p> <p>18. The proposals should not be introduced, but a 20mph speed limit, traffic calming, zebra crossing and pedestrian guard-rail should be introduced instead.</p> <p>19. The proposals are a form of religious discrimination against the Catholic nature of the school and would be in breach of Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights. WBC should be seeking to protect minority religious schools, not working against them.</p>	<p>12. Before 8.30 there is already a significant level of traffic leaving the Walton Way area to join the A4. The proposed restriction commences from 8am to remove the obstruction that on-street parking causes for local residents.</p> <p>13. Residents would be aware of the school close to their property and many residents do accept some parking inconvenience caused by the school, but it is now much larger in size, with a far higher proportion of pupils being driven to school than in previous years and the traffic levels have increased as a consequence. Residents have asked for some parking controls to be introduced and this is why traffic management measures have been proposed.</p> <p>14. The latest school travel survey results indicate that nearly 70% of pupils live within 1 mile of the school and so walking or cycling to school is feasible for a considerable proportion of pupils. We offer a number of ways of supporting and encouraging walking to school that could be implemented should the proposals be implemented such as Go Kinetic, Road Safety Days, Safer Steps pedestrian training for year 3's and Park and Stride.</p> <p>15. The proposals will not prevent all parking near the school and should not have a significant impact on whether Catholic families will be able to commute to school or choose to send their children there. St Joseph's may have a different catchment than some schools but there are still a considerable number of pupils that walk, cycle or scooter to school from the immediate area and we must ensure that they are able to do this in a safe environment. The school should also be trying to encourage an increase in these numbers and be looking at the wider road safety concerns that are being considered under this proposed scheme.</p> <p>16. Parking in Newport Road was the subject of a meeting held in the school during March 2012 with local residents and there is a local concern which residents want to be addressed. All schools across the district face similar problems at exactly the same peak times. Our Enforcement Team do patrol every school on a rota, but it is not possible to provide a continual presence every day. It is however anticipated that the proposed restrictions will be respected by the majority of road users and will be of value. Those who choose to ignore the restrictions will not know when enforcement will</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>take place.</p> <p>17. Residents of one side of a road will always be inconvenienced in a small way when restrictions are only proposed on one side, but it is not always necessary to introduce restrictions on both sides to address traffic problems and they should not be omitted just because they might be considered unfair. Residents on the west side have off-street parking available and some properties on the east side have none.</p> <p>18. Other traffic management measures could be considered as part of a separate scheme if appropriate, but the main concerns relate to inappropriate parking and these would not be addressed by 20mph speed limits or traffic calming without formal parking restrictions in place.</p> <p>19. The proposals consider road safety issues on the public highway. Whether the school is religious or secular does not form any part in the reasoning for the introduction of parking restrictions. There is no form of religious discrimination either intended or accidental within this parking proposal.</p> <p>Having carefully considered the objections it is still recommended that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
9	<p><u>Oaken Grove / Longacre: (Plan AJ78)</u></p> <p>The proposal will only result in the vehicles parking further along Longacre where they would cause even more of a problem for refuse vehicles and a road safety risk due to the slight bend and narrow road.</p> <p>There should be no change as vehicles can be prosecuted by the police if they cause an obstruction by parking close to the junction. The restriction is unnecessary, will only create further friction between residents and may make things worse.</p> <p>The problem is the large number of vehicles owned by one property and there is not enough on-street parking available to accommodate them all.</p> <p>On-street parking slows traffic down and provided they do not park right up to the</p>	<p>It is accepted that there is a risk that vehicles would just displace further along Longacre rather than park in Oaken Grove if the proposal was implemented.</p> <p>Given the number of objections it is recommended that the proposals are omitted from the final scheme.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>junction there is not a problem. The restriction has been proposed because the bin lorry could not enter the road when its rear steer was inoperative. This should not be a reason for a parking restriction.</p>	
1	<p><u>Old College Road: (Plan AL71)</u></p> <p>The proposals will be inconvenient for loading/unloading the car near our house and will restrict parking for visitors and commercial vehicles using this section for delivery of goods to residents.</p>	<p>Loading/unloading by residents or deliveries by commercial vehicles will be made easier by these proposals as vehicles will no longer be parking as they currently do in this length and causing an obstruction. Loading and unloading, both for commercial vehicles and private, would be permitted on this No Waiting restriction provided the vehicle was moved after loading/unloading was completed.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
22	<p><u>Rectory Close: (Plan AL76 & AL77)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two residents were in support of the proposals, however thought they should be for both sides of the road and be in operation in the evenings and weekends to allow access by emergency services. Leaving parts of Rectory Close unrestricted will not resolve the parking and obstruction problems in this road. 2. The proposal to extend the double yellow lines at the junction with Pound Street are supported by the majority of respondents. 3. Many of these 1930's properties in Rectory Close only have parking for one car on the driveway, as the attached garages are not big enough to fit modern vehicles and so on-street parking must be retained. There are insufficient off-street parking spaces for all cars owned by residents and the proposals will put too much strain on the remaining on-street space and may result in conflict and bad feeling between neighbours competing for reduced parking space. 4. The restrictions for the turning circle are unnecessary and not wanted as all residents in this area need to be able to park on-street and they currently do this without causing an obstruction to any other residents or visitors to the close. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preventing parking on both sides or during the evening is not necessary and would overly inconvenience residents or their visitors. If residents park on both sides in the evening it is their responsibility to ensure they do not cause an obstruction. Preventing parking on one side only during the day will ensure that obstruction does not occur for large vehicles, including refuse vehicles, delivery vehicles or the emergency services. 2. The extension to the double yellow lines at the junction will increase the area available for vehicles waiting to join Pound Street from Rectory Close and will improve safety. 3. It is accepted that some garages may no longer be suitable for large modern vehicles and this restricts parking availability for residents, so some on-street parking should be retained. The proposals do however allow for on-street parking on one side. 4. The turning circle has been constructed with the specific intention of providing an area for large vehicles to turn rather than having to reverse along the live carriageway. Residents may want to use the area for parking but there are more suitable locations within Rectory Close that could be used.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>5. The majority of the proposed restrictions are unnecessary and will be detrimental to Rectory Close. The problems for this road have been overstated and misrepresented and if the restrictions are implemented they will introduce problems to Rectory Close that do not currently exist.</p> <p>6. Rectory Close is a desirable residential location and the proposals will force more residents to turn their front gardens into parking spaces, to the detriment of the local environment and local property prices.</p> <p>7. The proposals have been put forward by a Residents Committee which does not represent the views of the Close, as there has only been one meeting and this had minimal interest or attendance from residents and is under-represented from certain areas of the Close.</p> <p>8. The proposals submitted by the Residents Committee have not been considered and incorporated into the proposals. The resident's feedback was mixed in terms of course of action but this proposal is much more restrictive than any of the residents' suggestions. These proposals are a compromise of the differing results from the informal survey undertaken by the Residents Committee but this has led to a scheme which satisfies nobody. The problems are too diverse to be solved with one measure.</p> <p>9. If vehicles just parked on one side it would encourage drivers to speed, increase the risk of accidents and would be unfair on those residents who would be unable to park directly outside their house while others would have no restriction outside their homes.</p> <p>10. Parts of Rectory Close are used by the Mosque in Pound Street during Friday prayers. This has caused problems in the past but an approach has been made to the Mosque and parking has been more considerate recently. The proposals are very draconian for this one hour weekly occurrence.</p> <p>11. The construction of Fairfield House has increased the number of cars using on-street parking throughout the day, as there are insufficient parking spaces within the development and the proposed restrictions will further increase parking pressure on</p>	<p>5. An informal survey undertaken by the Rectory Close Resident's Committee during 2011 indicated that the majority of residents recognised there was a parking problem in their road. There was however no definitive solution or consensus identified by residents on their preferred method to address the issue.</p> <p>6. It is accepted that some residents may choose to convert front gardens to parking spaces if parking restrictions were introduced, but that is something they could do already and should not necessarily affect property prices.</p> <p>7. The Residents' Committee should normally represent the views of the majority of residents, but it is accepted that not all residents want to participate. The survey they organised did however achieve a 60% response rate from Rectory Close residents and so gives a good representation of views.</p> <p>8. Parking restrictions in many residential roads are often a compromise as there can be many differing views from residents on how to resolve problems. The proposals submitted by the Residents Committee were however given due consideration.</p> <p>9. Residents of one side of a road will always be inconvenienced in a small way when restrictions are only proposed on one side, but they should not be omitted just because they might be considered unfair to one side. As some on-street parking will be retained during the day and will be available on both sides in the evening it is unlikely that there would be any significant increase in vehicle speed on this short residential road.</p> <p>10. Although parking by worshippers at the Mosque have caused problems in the past, the more recognised complaint from residents is that parking by non-resident commuters occurs throughout the week and that is why Mon-Sat restrictions were proposed.</p> <p>11. On-street parking by construction workers during the development of Fairfield House did put pressure on available parking space, but now this is complete there has been no significant increase in the overall level of on-street parking on Rectory Close.</p> <p>12. Converting grass verges to hard standing for vehicles would be a significant cost</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>this road.</p> <p>12. It would be nice to have grass verges but the reality is that there is not enough road space and the grass verge sometimes has to be parked on to provide a parking space, while keeping the carriageway clear of obstruction. Sections of grass verge could however be removed and converted to hard standing parking areas.</p> <p>13. The proposal to introduce trees in the grass verge is objected to as these will eventually cause damage to pavement, cables and other infrastructure.</p> <p>14. A Residents Permit Zone or permit restriction would solve the parking issues without inconveniencing all residents.</p> <p>15. The refuse contractors should use smaller vehicles if on-street parking is preventing their vehicles accessing the road rather than inconveniencing residents.</p> <p>16. The parking is not a safety issue as the road is a cul-de-sac with low speeds.</p> <p>17. If the restriction is only on one side it will just displace the parked vehicles further along Rectory Close. Any implemented restriction should apply equally to both sides of the road.</p>	<p>and there is no budget available within the parking scheme for that to be considered.</p> <p>13. Introducing trees in specific locations has been considered by the Grounds Maintenance team, but was not possible due to the number and location of underground services.</p> <p>14. A Resident Permit restriction would not be appropriate due to the majority of properties having off-street parking available for one or two vehicles, including garage spaces, as those residents would not be eligible to apply. If the majority of residents wanted a scheme this could be investigated further as part of a subsequent parking scheme.</p> <p>15. Waste Services already use smaller vehicles to access roads where obstruction problems routinely occur, but where vehicles park on both sides this can still cause obstruction, especially for the Recycling vehicle as this is side loading.</p> <p>16. It is accepted that the main concerns raised are in regard to obstruction rather than road safety.</p> <p>17. A restriction on both sides is not necessary to address the obstruction problems raised and would be overly restrictive on residents or their visitors.</p> <p>In view of the level of objection received the following amendment is recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' restrictions within Rectory Close be introduced as advertised. • The proposed No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm and No Waiting Mon-Fri 9am-5pm for Rectory Close be omitted from the final scheme.
<p>PURLEY-ON-THAMES COMMENTS – (Plan BY37)</p>		
<p>2</p>	<p>The proposed restriction on Purley Village should be adjusted to finish at the end of the building and not to the boundary of Cherry Acre as it removes too much on-street</p>	<p>Recommend that the proposed extension to the No Waiting 'At Any Time' on Purley Village is amended to only extend for approximately 22 metres west of the</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	parking. Vehicles will still be able to turn into Home Farm as larger vehicles only approach from the New Hill direction. This has been agreed with Councillor Metcalfe.	lane leading to Home Farm.
SPEEN COMMENTS – (Plan AK70 & AK71)		
2	<p>There is no real school time parking problem in Digby Road as most parents now park in the pub car park on Brummell Road rather than use this road for access. The restriction is not necessary and will only penalise residents who have limited off-street parking.</p> <p>Restrictions are only needed at the junctions</p>	<p>The current landlord of the pub on Brummell Road is happy for the car park to be used by parents. A previous landlord was opposed to such use and introduced charges and enforcement. The proposed restrictions on Brummell Road would prevent the area close to the crossing being used by parents if the situation with the Starting Gate pub car park changed again.</p> <p>From observation during the consultation it is agreed that Digby Road is no longer a particular problem at school peak periods, however vehicles belonging to residents may be parking close to junctions and presenting a road safety concern.</p> <p>In view of the comments received the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-9.30am & 2.30-4pm on Digby Road be omitted from the final scheme. • That the remaining proposals are introduced as advertised
THATCHAM COMMENTS		
2	<p><u>Glebelands:</u> - (Plan AU73 & AU74)</p> <p>There is no requirement for this proposal as vehicles never park at this junction. All staff and visitors to The Childrens Centre are able to park within their car park and there has never been an access problem. The yellow lines are unnecessary and will look unsightly.</p>	<p>From observation during the consultation period and from speaking to staff at The Childrens Centre it appears there is no particular problem at this location that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are omitted from the final scheme.</p>
2	<p><u>Hérons Way:</u> (Plan AS74, AT72, AT73 & AT74)</p> <p>Parking on one side of the road only will make parking worse for residents, as not all</p>	Preventing parking at school peak times on one side will allow easier movement along

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>are able to use their driveways or garages and some residents will be at home during the operational period.</p> <p>Why should residents suffer because of inconsiderate parking by parents. The proposals will inconvenience residents even further than they already are by living near a school</p> <p>Hérons Way should be made Resident Permit Holders Only parking so that parents use the Nature Discovery Centre car park.</p>	<p>this residential cul-de-sac. There will still be areas of unrestricted parking available for those residents unable to use their garages or driveways.</p> <p>As the overwhelming majority of local residents have off-street parking (driveway or garage) able to take one or two cars it would not be an appropriate location for permit parking as many residents would not qualify for a permit. Many parents already do use the Nature Discovery Centre for parking and walk the remaining distance to school.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised. Also see paragraph 4.5 of the main report.</p>
10	<p>Urquhart Road: (Plan AV76, AW76 AW77 & AX76)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One resident fully supported the proposals and one objected to parts of the scheme but wanted the junction protections extended further to improve visibility. 2. Parking is very difficult within the estate and the proposals will mean residents will be unable to park outside their homes as all the roads, including side roads, are already very congested. Vehicles park on the pavements and there is no more space available. Fire engines and other emergency service vehicles would not be able to pass through the gaps that are left. Cars should be allowed to park on Urquhart Road as that has the width to accommodate parking. 3. The Council approved the design of the estate and should have made allowance for residents and visitor parking. To now impose restrictions on the residents seems counterproductive to addressing the real issue. These parking restrictions will impact on house prices if buyers are unable to park near their homes. 4. Bus timetables should be amended to account for the possible delays on Urquhart Road rather than to introduce parking restrictions to speed up the service. If there have been delays on the service and complaints from the operators it is likely caused by congestion at the Station Road level crossing rather than by parking within the estate. 5. The proposals will not stop rail commuters from using the estate roads for free parking. They will just move further along the road and continue to cause problems. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed junction protection is the minimum considered necessary, but recognises that parking within the housing development is at a premium and further extension is not necessary at this stage. 2. On-street parking will still be available, however Urquhart Road is used by a regular bus service and it has been reported that parked vehicles routinely cause obstruction problems for these services. Removing parking from specific locations on Urquhart Road will address obstruction issues for buses and also ensure emergency services vehicles can gain access to the main route. 3. The housing development underwent numerous changes during the planning approval and construction phase and Government guidelines allowed developers to provide minimal parking. However if on-street parking is presenting a danger or causing an obstruction it is the responsibility of the local authority to address this issue now that the road is adopted onto the public highway network. 4. Delays to the bus service can occur at any point along a route but there is a regular obstruction at the build-outs on Urquhart Road and at the bus stops, as parked vehicles can prevent buses accessing raised kerb areas for passengers. 5. If displacement was to occur it should be to areas that are more appropriate for parking. Improving parking facilities at the railway station is not something that can be

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>Parking at Thatcham railway station should be improved instead as this will result in fewer commuters using the area.</p> <p>6. Signs could be put up around the estate to warn off rail commuters from using the area. These might not be able to be enforced but should deter some from using the area and reduce congestion.</p> <p>7. Removing the parking will result in an increase in traffic speeds and will increase the likelihood of an accident occurring. They should not be introduced unless alternative parking areas have been provided.</p> <p>8. Residents with disabilities will face real difficulties as the proposals will just make parking even more difficult.</p> <p>9. The proposed restriction should be amended to No Waiting Mon-Fri 9am-5pm as the problem with parked cars is not so bad in the evening or weekends and would allow residents to park outside their homes. Alternatively it should be amended to a 2 hour Limited Waiting restriction with exemption for permit holders. Imposing a restriction on the Saturday is a step too far and will significantly impact on residents. Although the bus service operates on a Saturday the on-street parking near the junction with Station Road does not seriously impact on this service and the parking restriction is unnecessary.</p> <p>10. The proposal does not include any double yellow protection of the shared entrance for the residents of 12-16 Urquhart Road, nor any on the north side opposite the junction with Artillery Drive. By allowing vehicles to park in these locations after 6pm it would cause a visibility obstruction and remove a useful area for vehicles to pull in if there is two-way traffic.</p> <p>11. The grass verge and wide footways could be converted to parking areas to remove the on-street parking and reduce congestion.</p> <p>12. The proposal should include additional restrictions on Station Road to avoid displacement onto that busy road.</p>	<p>considered as part of this scheme.</p> <p>6. Traffic signs placed on the public highway must conform to strict regulations defined by DfT and we cannot provide signs that warn off rail commuters without enforcement.</p> <p>7. It is accepted that parked cars can act as a form of traffic calming, however they can also obstruct forward visibility or impede two way traffic movement on Urquhart Road and present a hazard for other drivers.</p> <p>8. Disabled residents would be able to park on yellow lines for a maximum of three hours where appropriate, but the restrictions are also ensuring that dropped kerbs at junctions are not obstructed by parked vehicles as this presents a problem for the disabled and visually impaired.</p> <p>9. The bus service operates on a Saturday and so the proposed restriction is Mon-Sat. Urquhart Road is the single point of access to this large housing development of approximately 800 properties and the junction with Station Road has high numbers of traffic movements at peak periods. Vehicles parking close to this junction present an obstruction to all traffic, including buses and private vehicles.</p> <p>10. It is not the responsibility of the local authority to protect every private entrance, however the entrance to No 12-16 Urquhart Road is within the length of proposed single yellow line and this should ensure that obstruction does not occur and visibility is good for vehicles joining the road during the day. Due to the width of Urquhart Road vehicles parking opposite the junction with Artillery Drive should not present a problem during the evening..</p> <p>11. There is no budget available within the parking scheme to convert grass verges or footways to hard-standing areas for vehicles.</p> <p>12. If there is displacement onto Station Road and this causes a road safety concern it can be investigated as part of a subsequent parking scheme when the area is next subject to a parking review.</p> <p>13. Agree.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>13. If restrictions are to be introduced they should be the absolute minimum to ensure safe passage while retaining as much existing parking as possible.</p>	<p>In view of the objections received the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm on the south side of Urquhart Road between Station Road and Horne Road be omitted from the final scheme. • That the remaining proposals are introduced as advertised.
<p>WICKHAM COMMENTS – (Plan X55)</p>		
<p>8</p>	<p>One resident commented that they fully supported the proposals. The Parish Council were also generally supportive.</p> <p>Three parents at the school wrote indicating that they did not object to the proposals but commented that there was no proposal for alternative parking areas included within the scheme for those parents who have no choice but to park on local roads.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Headteacher at Welford & Wickham Primary School requested that the restriction be adjusted so that it only applies during the morning as the school staff would not be able to supervise the afternoon ‘Kiss & Drop’ area. 2. Many parents use the time before and after school to speak to school staff and therefore often park for 10 to 20 minutes twice a day during term time and these proposals will impact on that. 3. Parents are encouraged to use the pub car park or the layby on the B4000 but do not like to park there because of the speed of vehicles travelling on the B4000. 4. Objection to continuation of restrictions on east side of St Swithins Close up to the hammer-head outside No 7. The restriction should instead go across the front of No 3 St Swithins Close. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This proposal would prohibit waiting between 8am-9.30am and 2.30pm-4pm, Mon-Fri. Whilst ‘waiting’ is prohibited by this proposal, drivers are permitted to stop on single yellow lines to allow passengers to board or exit a vehicle and this restriction will help facilitate a ‘Kiss & Drop’ area in the morning which the school have indicated they want to operate. The proposed restriction for the afternoon period can be omitted if school staff are not on hand to supervise the area but if the afternoon parking causes a problem it can be reviewed in a subsequent parking scheme. 2. The areas close to the school and at junctions, where the number of vulnerable child pedestrian movements is at it’s highest and road safety could be compromised by inconsiderate parking, will be treated with parking restrictions but there will still be significant lengths of Welford Road that will not have waiting restrictions applied and can be used by parents for parking. The only change may be that parents not using the ‘Kiss & Drop’ area may have a very small distance further to walk. 3. The B4000 is subject to a 40mph speed limit through the village. Parents may have concerns about vehicle speeds but there is a footway from both the pub and the layby and pedestrians do not come into conflict with passing traffic. 4. The issue of parking in St Swithins Close has been covered in separate correspondence with the local resident and the proposal best addresses the problems that have been raised. Providing a restriction to the front of No 3 may help very easy egress from No 5, but if the turning head is left unrestricted the resident at No 3 could be obstructed if vehicles parked opposite their driveway. The proposal for a continuous restriction from the junction up to the turning head will ensure that residents at both No

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>3 and No 5 St Swithins Close are able to exit their driveway with a minor manoeuvre when necessary, if a vehicle is parked to the front of No 3.</p> <p>Alternative off-street areas for school parking continue to be investigated by the Parish Council but nothing has been approved as yet.</p> <p>In view of the comments received the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-9.30am & 2.30-4pm be amended to No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-9.30am in order to facilitate the 'Kiss and Drop'. • That the remaining proposals are introduced as advertised
YATTENDON COMMENTS – (Plan BC44 & BD45)		
<p>3</p> <p>Further comments were received from the Parish Council and Head teacher after the close of consultation period.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is a blanket approach across the District as opposed to looking at each case on an individual basis. 2. Parking outside the school has occurred for 40 years without a problem and the restriction is not necessary when there is nowhere else in the village to park if people attend events at the church or at the school. 3. Yattendon Estates Ltd owns the majority of properties in the village and object to parking restrictions in a Conservation Area and AONB, as yellow lines would seem an inappropriate visual intrusion in this village location. 4. The current 'Kiss and Drop' facility operated by the school works well and there is no reason to change. 5. HGVs only operate once a year from the Estate in the run-up to Christmas and this should not be seen as presenting a serious problem to other road users. Disruption for traffic twice a day is a price all seem happy to pay. 6. Four alternative Options were presented by Yattendon Estates which should be given further consideration prior to any decision to introduce double yellow lines. The 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no blanket approach to treating parking concerns, as each situation is different and support from local residents can vary greatly, which can influence whether restrictions are introduced. 2. Parking outside the school was identified as a concern in the 2005 Parish Plan and the 2011 Parish Plan Refresh and that is why it has been investigated. There has been a significant rise in the numbers of pupils who now travel to school by car and an increase in the number of pupils attending this school. This has resulted in more cars parked close to the school in recent years. With the general increase in the level of traffic using Yattendon Lane this can regularly lead to obstruction outside the school. The proposals will not remove all parking from Yattendon Lane and there are alternative, more appropriate locations available for parking within the village. 3. Yattendon Estates Ltd may own many of the properties in the village, but as the highways authority it is the remit of West Berkshire Council to address road safety concerns on the public highway. Regulations permit use of road markings which reduce the visual impact in environmentally sensitive areas. Use of the No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction ensures that there would be no requirement for additional signs or posts to be erected to support a time operational restriction and so the visual impact is limited further.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>options included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the cricket club car park for afternoon parking, with the Estate installing an internal footpath leading to the school. • A proposal to extend the footway on Yattendon Lane to the entrance to the sewage works where parking could be provided. • Allowing the field directly opposite the school to be used as a parking area. This would be expensive and may require planning permission. • Allowing the field opposite the Old Rectory to be used as a parking area. Similar problem with cost and planning permission. <p>7. The options provide a safer alternative to double yellow lines which will only displace the parking to areas where the road is narrower than outside the school</p> <p>Comment from Yattendon Parish Council after the consultation; They accept the principle of having yellow lines in the village, but not the proposed extent. They also were disappointed by the lack of positive feedback from the Estate and school on the suggested use of the cricket pitch car park. Suggested further meeting to discuss the issues raised.</p> <p>Comment from Headteacher Yattendon CofE Primary School after the consultation: There is an issue with parking outside the school and the school attempt to manage this during the morning drop-off times. After school activity clubs have resulted in fewer parents turning up to school at peak afternoon periods and so there is less of a congestion problem then. The school is looking to increase these clubs and so the situation could improve further.</p> <p>The school understand the concerns the Estates have with introducing yellow lines but argues that the existing 'Keep Clear' zigzag marking is more unsightly than the double yellow lines might be.</p> <p>The school supports the suggested use of the cricket club car park but points out that</p>	<p>4. The current 'Kiss and Drop' area relies on school staff placing traffic cones on Yattendon Lane on a daily basis. This practise is not encouraged as the school could be held liable if an incident was to occur as a result of the cones. Yellow lines would also remove this chore from the school.</p> <p>5. HGV traffic from Yattendon Estates may increase during the build-up to Christmas, but HGVs routinely use Yattendon Lane throughout the year to provide deliveries or service farms and local businesses. When vehicles are parked in the vicinity of the school there can be a line of parked vehicles over 100m long. Due to the restricted width and slight bend in the road drivers may start to overtake the parked vehicles before they can see if there is opposing traffic which has also started to overtake the vehicles. This can result in one of the vehicles having to reverse along the live carriageway to clear the obstruction and there is a road safety concern with allowing this to continue.</p> <p>6. The four alternative proposals put forward by Yattendon Estate Ltd are welcome but some have been considered previously without success. In November 2010 similar on-street parking proposals were consulted on, but were not progressed as the Parish Council then requested that they be held in abeyance pending their enquiries on alternative parking facilities. As the on-street obstruction and road safety concerns are continuing it is appropriate that the highways authority now take action to resolve the issue. The alternative proposals could still be investigated as these could provide an area for vehicles to displace into, subject to approval and appropriate funding being available.</p> <p>7. Yattendon Lane close to the school narrows to approximately 6m and when vehicles are parked at this point two-way traffic is not possible. The two proposed areas of parking restriction will provide an area clear of parked vehicles at locations where numbers of vulnerable pedestrians and their parents routinely cross the road.</p> <p>In view of the comments received the following amendments are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction on the south side of Yattendon Lane opposite The Old Rectory is reduced so that it only extends for approximately 20 metres east of the boundary of Church Corner and

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>without the proposed yellow lines there would be no compulsion for parents to use it and they would continue to park as they do now.</p> <p>The school will continue to encourage parents to park considerately and will give warning to the Parish Council and Yattendon Estates Ltd of events at the school which may result in on-street parking.</p>	<p>issacs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction on the south side of Yattendon lane opposite the school and on the north side fronting The Old Rectory is introduced as advertised. <p>Ward Member (Councillor von Celsing) responded to the Draft Report circulation to Members indicating that this has been a difficult issue to resolve, with lots of strong views and not always straightforward, but that on balance the suggestion of a revised plan for the yellow lines seems to be a good half way measure.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank