

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
NEWBURY COMMENTS		
6	<p><u>Sandleford Lane: (Plan AN82)</u></p> <p>The proposal will just displace the parking into areas of Sandleford Lane where problems will continue and this will do nothing to improve road safety.</p> <p>The location where cars currently park forces traffic to slow down. By preventing vehicles parking here and having it clear of vehicles there will be an increase in traffic speeds, which is already a concern for local residents. Traffic calming measures should be introduced instead.</p> <p>There is some general agreement with the proposal but this scheme will only result in vehicles parking on the opposite side of the road, close to the entrances for Nos 2 & 4 which will severely restrict access and visibility for residents and an increase in traffic speeds due to the visibility obstruction being removed.</p> <p>The proposal is unnecessary as there have been no accidents in almost nine years and it is therefore a waste of money.</p> <p>Residents of Nos 1-21 Sandleford Lane will be seriously inconvenienced by the proposals as these are large properties and there is insufficient parking for them. The grassed area on this bend should instead be removed and converted into a parking facility for residents as this would leave the road clear.</p> <p>The proposals will have a significant negative impact on local residents. One of the respondents runs a business from their property and these restrictions will prevent employees parking nearby. If they cannot park in the area they will have to leave their jobs. This business from a private residential property takes deliveries 3-4 times per week and the vehicles need to be able to park on-street to load and unload. The proposed restrictions will prevent this.</p> <p>People bought houses on this development on the understanding that there was roadside parking and if this is removed it will have a detrimental effect on house prices.</p>	<p>There have been no recorded accidents resulting in personal injury but there was an incident which prompted this area to be considered for measures which resulted in a vehicle mounting the footway and colliding with an adjacent property boundary when it tried to avoid an unsighted vehicle passing parked vehicles that were on the east side of the road and the inside of the bend.</p> <p>This proposal still permits parking in this area but they will instead park on the west side (the outside of the bend). This will address some of the road safety concerns being raised, as forward visibility will be improved due to vehicles not being parked on the inside of the bend and any parked vehicles will provide a form of traffic calming which will help to keep traffic speeds low.</p> <p>There is no funding within this scheme to provide off-street parking facilities or to convert existing grass verges. Residents would have been aware of the limited parking when purchasing their home and it is not the Council's responsibility to provide additional parking.</p> <p>Traffic calming measures, including granite sett rumble strips and a priority working road narrowing, are already in place. Speeding concerns on roads adjacent to the retail park cannot be dealt with through this scheme and should be directed to the police for enforcement.</p> <p>Given the safety concerns expressed about the existing parking situation and the level of local objection it is recommended that the proposal to introduce a No Waiting At Any Time restriction on the east side of Sandleford Lane be amended to No Waiting Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm.</p> <p>Recommend that the remaining proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>If the aim is to improve road safety the developer should be instructed to introduce in full the traffic calming measures which formed part of the original planning approval for the site.</p> <p>The proposal should instead introduce measures to address speeding on Pinchington Lane in the area of the retail park.</p>	
5	<p><u>Henshaw Crescent and Garford Crescent : (Plans AJ79, AJ80, AK79 & AK80)</u></p> <p>The proposal will leave those residents who have no driveway with nowhere to park during the operation times. The roads can become very busy during peak periods but this is only for a short period twice each day and is not that much of a problem.</p> <p>The proposed new areas of No Waiting At Any Time would penalise residents and prevent them from having visitors or deliveries.</p> <p>The proposals will do nothing to reduce the number of parents driving their children to school or using these roads for parking while dropping their children off as not every parent can easily walk to school. The proposals will just make the parking situation worse in these residential roads and cause congestion on Valley Road.</p> <p>Residents should be provided with funding to allow them to have driveways installed as this would reduce the number of residents vehicles parking on-street and allow parents to get in and out of the area quickly.</p> <p>The grass verges should be converted to allow parking as this would remove the current obstruction caused by the parking which results in the damage to verges.</p> <p>The parking by parents does not cause enough of a problem to justify these severe measures.</p> <p>The roads should be made one-way as this would remove the number of times obstruction occurs during the busy periods.</p> <p>More residents should be forced to make better use of their driveways as this is part of</p>	<p>The scheme will only introduce new restrictions to prohibit parking on one side at most locations, so there will still be parking space available for residents during the operational times of the scheme.</p> <p>The proposals are intended to reduce the number of vehicles parking within these residential roads in areas where there can be large numbers of vulnerable child pedestrians. If problems worsen on Valley Road this can be investigated and further measures can be considered in a subsequent scheme if necessary.</p> <p>There is no funding available to provide driveways for private properties at public expense. The damage to grass verge areas is however being investigated and remedial measures are being considered which could potentially be introduced subject to funding as part of a future capital works programme.</p> <p>The congestion at school peak periods is considered to be significant and with both schools increasing in size it is anticipated that the problems will worsen. The proposed measures are therefore considered necessary.</p> <p>A one-way system would not be recommended unless there was significant support from local residents as some residents would likely be more inconvenienced than others. It is however not part of the proposal for this parking scheme.</p> <p>Residents cannot be forced to use their driveways, however by introducing parking restrictions those with driveways are likely to make better use of them.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>the problem.</p> <p>A parent of a child attending John Rankin Infant School sought clarification on the scheme and complained that the proposals should have been sent to the schools so that the information could be passed to parents, as they were unaware of the plans.</p>	
4	<p><u>Speen Lane: (Plan AK72)</u></p> <p>The proposals will severely impact on residents and their visitor's ability to park near their homes. Due to size of properties and layout of driveways residents have to park some cars on-street.</p> <p>The proposal will do nothing to prevent vehicles parking opposite the driveway for No 10 which is the reason why restrictions were requested by residents and access and egress from this property will continue to be a problem for residents and visitors. The proposal should be introduced on the west side of the road instead.</p> <p>Vehicles do not park on the east side of this road and there is therefore no requirement to introduce a restriction to prevent it.</p> <p>There are very few cars that park in this close on a daily basis. We are managing to deal with the parking ourselves quite successfully and there is no requirement to introduce measures which will only exacerbate the problem for residents.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions are a sledgehammer for a nut. The parking in this cul-de-sac does not cause a problem and has not been complained about. The restrictions are unwelcome.</p>	<p>The restrictions were proposed partly as a result of requests from local residents who were concerned about regular displacement of vehicles obstructing the road when avoiding the on-street charging on Old Bath Road. Vehicles parking on both sides of this cul-de-sac could potentially prevent access for large vehicles such as delivery or refuse collection vehicles.</p> <p>Given the level of objection from the small number of properties within this cul-de-sac it is recommended that the proposals are omitted from the final scheme.</p>
5	<p><u>Greenham Road/Eeklo Place: (Plan AM77 & AN77)</u></p> <p>Residents of the properties directly at the junction of that length of Greenham Road leading to Eeklo Place strongly objected to the proposals as they have no alternative other than to park outside their house close to the junction due to the limited availability on the remaining length of this road. The new housing development and regular commuter parking as well as parking for local businesses leaves no other parking</p>	<p>The proposals address a road safety concern associated with vehicles parking very close to junctions. Although the footway at the junction may be wide it was not constructed for use by vehicles and if vehicles continue to drive on this area the owners could potentially face prosecution by the police, as this can endanger pedestrian users and is a traffic offence. It is appreciated the parking situation for adjacent residents may</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>space for long term residents. The area outside the properties is a wide pavement where it is safe to park and unload and this has been used without problem for over 11 years.</p> <p>The proposals will remove up to 8 spaces and this will result in the remaining space being insufficient for local residents.</p> <p>This proposal will only make the situation worse unless a resident permit scheme is introduced.</p> <p>The proposals for Eeklo Place would not be needed if the housing development had been built to the approved site plan.</p> <p>A resident of the new Oakwood Terrace properties sought clarification on the proposal and enquired whether permit parking would be included.</p>	<p>be difficult however the restrictions would extend to the back of highway and therefore would not permit parking in this area.</p> <p>It is accepted that parking space is at a premium in this location and a permit parking scheme can be considered and introduced if it is supported by local residents, but that proposal would have to form part of a subsequent scheme and cannot be considered within this proposal.</p> <p>The proposals introduce formal restrictions in areas where vehicles should not be parking anyway. It is therefore not correct that 8 parking spaces are being removed.</p> <p>Since the new housing development has become occupied there have been increased instances of the footway being fully parked on which prevents use by pedestrians and introduces a road safety concern, which these proposals would address.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised and that the area is considered for a resident permit parking scheme as part of the next review in this area.</p>
1	<p><u>Porchester Road: (Plan AM78)</u></p> <p>Parking is already very limited due to commuters parking on a daily basis and the removal of further spaces will make it more difficult for residents. A better solution would be to introduce resident parking.</p>	<p>The proposal is to extend the current double yellow lines at the junction by around 12 metres (two car lengths) on the south side only. This will provide a safer environment for vehicles trying to access Newtown Road and will address a road safety concern raised by some residents of Porchester Road when vehicles are turning into this road.</p> <p>If the majority of residents indicated they were supportive of permit parking restrictions this could be investigated and considered as part of a future scheme, however the previous consultation in May 2009 held with residents indicated the majority were opposed to such a restriction.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
1	<p><u>Queens Road: (Plan AM76)</u></p> <p>The proposal is not long enough and should instead extend up to the junction with Harbury Court as vehicles park on the north side at this point.</p>	<p>The proposals are intended to prevent vehicles parking very close to the central traffic island at the roundabout junction on Queens Road. If vehicles are parking on the north side up to Harbury Court and causing significant problems this can be investigated as part of a future scheme. In the meantime if this parking is causing an obstruction for pedestrian users this should be reported to the police.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p><u>Chandos Road: (Plan AM80)</u></p> <p>Residents have not been individually notified of these proposals and the Notice provided on-street is inadequate and confusing.</p>	<p>The overall parking scheme covers a large area in streets across the whole district. It is not possible to contact every single resident individually, but by providing Street Notices and advertisements in the local press which direct residents to where further information can be found we are meeting the consultation requirements.</p> <p>The proposal for Chandos Road was requested by the Public Transport team as buses were reported as having problems accessing this road due to vehicles parking close to the junction.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p><u>Stanley Road: (Plan AN76)</u></p> <p>An objection was initially made on the grounds that the proposals for Greenham Road and Kings Road would force commuters to start using Stanley Road which is already congested. However upon further clarification the resident withdrew his objection.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p><u>Faraday Road industrial estate: (Plans AN73 & AN73)</u></p> <p>Councillor Hunneman objected to the proposals and suggested that the Sunday charge should instead be removed from the on-street charging restrictions.</p>	<p>The proposals are intended to prevent vehicles from creating an obstruction for passing traffic when parked on the opposite side of the road to avoid paying for parking on Sundays. The on-street charging scheme is still in it's infancy and it is too soon to consider removing charging from roads within it.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
1	<p><u>Craven Road: (Plan AK75)</u></p> <p>The Council's Transport Services team objected to the removal of the No Waiting At Any Time restriction across the footpath leading to Gloucester Road and instead requested that it be converted to a time restricted Bus Stop Clearway in operation Mon-Sat 07.45am-5.30pm in order to provide a passing place and improved bus stop for mobility-impaired customers.</p>	<p>This proposal is a retrospective action to formally remove the double yellow lines following concerns from the Ward Member and adjacent properties. The double yellow lines were replaced with an access protection marking during July 2014 in advance of this parking scheme consultation.</p> <p>Since this action was taken no further concerns have been expressed until this objection.</p> <p>The introduction of a Bus Stop Clearway at this location would raise similar concerns to those expressed when the double yellow lines were present.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised and that the current access protection marking is retained.</p>
KINTBURY COMMENTS		
4	<p><u>Church Street: (Plan U75)</u></p> <p>A resident of The Croft fully supported the proposals for a No Waiting At Any Time restriction as residents of this cul-de-sac are often blocked in by inconsiderately parked vehicles and have access problems for delivery vehicles, including bin lorries and oil tanker deliveries</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines are too severe a restriction and whilst access to The Croft may be a problem the residents should have realised this was an ongoing problem on purchase of their homes.</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines should be introduced but at a shorter length than advertised as this will restrict parking too severely.</p> <p>The proposed disabled bay will restrict parking too much, in an area where there is very limited parking available for residents. It is also unnecessary as there is a disabled parking bay within the church grounds that can be accessed by Blue Badge Holders.</p>	<p>The proposed double yellow lines will address a regular problem caused by inconsiderate parking and are of a length which will ensure there is adequate swept path for large vehicles requiring access to service local properties.</p> <p>Although The Croft is a private road, it is the only access for several properties and it is considered necessary and appropriate for formal restrictions to be provided on Church Street to prevent obstruction for access to The Croft.</p> <p>At the time of the scheme design and initial request for a disabled parking bay there was no indication that one was already in place within the church grounds. On clarifying this facility was in place a representative for the church was happy for this proposal to be dropped.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposal to introduce a disabled parking bay is omitted from the final scheme and that the No Waiting At Any Time restriction is introduced as advertised.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
BURGHFIELD COMMENTS		
3	<p><u>Hollybush Lane/Reading Road crossroads:</u> (Plan BV77 & BW77)</p> <p>The proposals will prevent parents from safely dropping off children to the Scout Hut as there is insufficient parking within their car park, especially when children for Cubs are being collected at the same time that Scouts are being dropped off. There may be some displacement into Sun Gardens as a result which will not be popular with residents.</p> <p>A new footway should be introduced to allow parking to continue on Hollybush Lane, away from the crossroads, so that users of the Scout Hut do not have to walk on the carriageway.</p> <p>A resident of Sun Gardens supported the proposal but raised concerns about potential displacement into their road and requested that it be made resident only parking.</p> <p>A potential purchaser of a new-build property close to the restriction sought advice on the extent of the proposals and was satisfied once they were explained.</p>	<p>The proposed double yellow lines will still allow drivers to drop off or pick up passengers, which should help at times when the Scout Hut car park is full. If there is some displacement into Sun Gardens as a result of the restriction and this causes significant problems this could be investigated and considered as part of a subsequent scheme.</p> <p>The remit of the parking scheme does not consider improvements such as additional footways. This could however be considered as part of a future improvement scheme for Burghfield, subject to appropriate funding being available.</p> <p>Sun Gardens is not an appropriate location for a permit parking scheme due to the properties all having ample off-street parking available to them. It is part of the public highway and should be available for all road users where possible. If displaced parking causes a problem for residents and driveways are being regularly obstructed residents can apply for an access protection road marking on a recharge basis.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p><u>School Lane:</u> (Plan BV74)</p> <p>The proposals will prevent those parents who have no option other than to drive to school from dropping off children when using a car and will just result in vehicles being parked further away from the school where they may cause more problems.</p> <p>The proposals are heavy handed as the congestion only takes place for a very short period.</p> <p>The proposals were not well advertised and parents would not know about them or have time to respond.</p>	<p>The proposal for School Lane will only prevent parking on one side of the road. This is to address regular obstruction caused by vehicles parking on both sides often resulting in delays to the school buses and other traffic. The single yellow line restriction will however allow drivers to drop off or pick up passengers. If there is some displacement to other areas as a result of the restriction this may be at more suitable locations away from the school vicinity. If this potentially displaced parking was to cause a problem further measures could be investigated and considered as part of a subsequent scheme.</p> <p>The congestion may take place over a short period, but it is during this time that there can be high number of pedestrian movements in the area, with increased road safety</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>risks.</p> <p>The school was notified of the proposals prior to the public consultation taking place so that parents could be notified. Street Notices were however erected on site and adverts placed in the local press which gave parents a 21 day period to respond or seek further information on the proposals if necessary.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
HUNGERFORD COMMENTS		
3	<p><u>Priory Road: (Plan L71)</u></p> <p>The current parking outside the church is not a problem other than on Sundays and could be resolved by encouraging more people to walk or share transport.</p> <p>Visitors to the church will have nowhere to park and this will put pressure on roads in the vicinity.</p> <p>The proposals are a waste of resources and are a political move to embarrass the church.</p> <p>The proposals are supported as vehicles parking outside the church obstruct forward visibility for other road users.</p>	<p>The Council encourages sustainable modes of transport such as walking or car sharing however take-up is dependent on a number of factors and in this situation parking restrictions are considered necessary to address the concerns being raised.</p> <p>There are car parking facilities within the church grounds but if vehicles do park in adjacent roads and cause problems this can be addressed as part of a future scheme if necessary.</p> <p>A site meeting was held with Ward Members and representatives from Hungerford Town Council during the public consultation to discuss the proposals for outside the church. This resulted in amendments to the proposals which were agreed by those in attendance. The proposed changes would still address the road safety concerns, yet would provide an on-street facility outside the main entrance for the church and also provide a form of traffic calming for this location.</p> <p>The amended proposals address road safety concerns and have no political or religious significance.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are amended as follows:</p> <p>A length of No Waiting At Any Time restriction measuring approximately 22 metres in the area fronting the Our Lady of Lourdes church pedestrian entrance be omitted from the scheme so that it can be retained for on-street parking.</p> <p>The proposal for a No Waiting At Any Time restriction on the north side from the</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>junction with Priory Way be shortened so that it extends for 12 metres instead of the length advertised of approximately 24 metres.</p> <p>The remaining lengths are introduced as advertised.</p>
HERMITAGE COMMENTS		
1	<p><u>Orchard Close: (Plan AU47 & AU48)</u></p> <p>This scheme will inconvenience residents of Orchard Close and is unnecessary as vehicles do not currently park on both sides. The main problem is turning at the end of the Close.</p>	<p>The proposals will address and prevent the potential for vehicles to start parking on both sides of Orchard Close, as there may be some displacement into this area as a result of the restrictions proposed for Hampstead Norreys Road. The restrictions would only apply during school peak periods so residents or their visitors should not be greatly inconvenienced. Additionally, access protection road markings will be provided to further highlight private driveways and prevent obstruction.</p> <p>The proposed restriction will apply to part of the turning head which will make this area easier to use for drivers at peak periods.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
NON-SPECIFIC LOCATION COMMENT		
1	<p>Restricting parking on some roads just results in pavement parking on others, which prevents use by pedestrians. Lines should be marked on pavements to show where parking can take place.</p>	<p>Where footway parking occurs and causes significant obstruction, the police should be contacted as they can take action using current legislation. Footways are not constructed as parking locations but there may be situations where vehicles can park half on the road and half on the footway. These locations, which are identified by road markings, have followed statutory consultation procedures and have often required footway strengthening work to allow the parking to take place.</p> <p>No further action necessary.</p>