

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
Enborne comments		
1	Enborne Parish Council indicated that they considered the proposals to be a waste of time as they would not be enforced and would probably be dangerous. They considered that the school should instead be progressing an application to use a field adjacent to the school for parking purposes.	<p>The proposed parking restrictions have been designed to address road safety concerns associated with vehicles parking at the junction opposite the school and will provide an area to the front of school which would be free of parked vehicles and ensure that school children crossing the road into the playing field opposite the school entrance are visible to passing traffic.</p> <p>Once parking restrictions are introduced on site there would be an increased enforcement presence by our Civil Enforcement Officers (CEO), although as with all schools in the district, the enforcement would be intermittent due to limited number of CEOs. With the support of the school however, it is anticipated that the message would be passed to parents on the need to comply and respect the proposed restrictions.</p> <p>The school had previously responded to the Parish Council that they did not wish to take up the offer of the field for parking and it is not clear that planning approval would be given for this change of use in any case.</p>
1	Enborne Parish Council commented on a typographical error on the Street Notice which stated 'Enbourne' rather than 'Enborne' and highlighted that the road fronting the school had been incorrectly named.	Our current method of describing parking restrictions for the final TRO is through use of formal plans which clearly identify locations for parking restrictions, rather than through written description used during the consultation, so this will remove any potential for confusion on location.
1	Enborne school and their Chairman of Governors indicated that they fully supported the proposed restrictions and considered that they would improve road safety in the area of the school.	Comments noted.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Great Shefford comments		
5	<p>Great Shefford Parish Council and four residents of Riverway objected to the proposed waiting restriction in that location, which included the turning head, on the basis that it is a short residential cul-de-sac, there were no road safety concerns with vehicles parking here and concerns associated with displacement into Station Road if the restrictions were to be introduced.</p> <p>Residents also objected to the potential introduction of yellow road markings as being unsightly.</p>	<p>This restriction was specifically requested by a resident of Riverway as they indicated that residents experienced problems due to vehicles owned by a neighbour parking in the turning head and on the footway. Turning areas are designed to assist large vehicles, such as delivery or refuse vehicles, in accessing all properties. They should of course normally remain clear of parked vehicles and we would generally rely on considerate parking by neighbours to ensure that the area continues to be made available. However, if the majority of residents (four out of the seven properties in Riverway) strongly object to the proposals and the location has not been raised as a particular concern by our Waste Service section then it is recommended that this proposal be omitted from the final scheme. If vehicles park on the footway and cause occasional obstruction then it can be addressed through existing legislation and does not require formal parking restrictions to be in place before police can take action.</p>
2	<p>A resident of The Close objected to the proposed disabled parking bay for that location as they considered it to be unfair on the other residents, especially as there are reportedly two other Blue Badge Holders out of the four properties in The Close. Great Shefford Parish Council also thought that this bay would not achieve what the applicant wanted and considered that such a bay may cause friction in The Close.</p> <p>The applicant subsequently contacted the Council and verbally requested that the bay be omitted from the scheme as they did not want to cause a problem with the neighbours. No written confirmation of this withdrawal has been received.</p>	<p>There are only four residential properties in The Close, three of which are understood to have Blue Badge Holder residents (The Adult Social Care team have confirmed that there are currently two Blue Badge Holders in The Close including the applicant, with one other holder who has not yet renewed their badge.)</p> <p>It is recommended that this proposal be omitted from the final scheme.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Hampstead Norreys comments		
5	Hampstead Norreys Parish Council and four residents of Water Street objected to the proposed waiting restrictions and KEEP CLEAR road marking for that location due to concerns over displacement and having no alternative parking available for their properties.	<p>The KEEP CLEAR marking was intended to highlight an area of the main carriageway where parking was causing a problem for passing buses. The residents (two of whom are serving police officers) and the Parish Council have indicated they will monitor the parking locally to ensure that such obstruction no longer occurs.</p> <p>The formal waiting restrictions were proposed to prevent vehicles parking close to the junctions with Water Street. It has since been commented by residents and Parish Council that this is not a regular occurrence.</p> <p>In light of the local objections it is recommended that the proposed waiting restrictions and the KEEP CLEAR marking be omitted from the final scheme. If however the obstruction continues to cause a problem for buses the Council reserves the right to reconsider a KEEP CLEAR road marking, which does not require formal consultation with residents.</p>
Kintbury comments		
2	Two residents objected to the proposed waiting restrictions for High Street on the basis that they were excessive for a location where properties have few, if any, alternative parking facilities available and already experience pressure from parking by visitors to the pub.	<p>The proposed restriction on High Street opposite the entrance to The Croft was intended to address the obstruction problems routinely experienced by large vehicles such as oil tankers and delivery vehicles, as they turned into and out of The Croft. As this is mainly a daytime problem it is recommended that the restriction opposite The Croft be reduced to the minimum length to ensure turning is unimpeded and relaxed to a restriction which operates Monday to Saturday, 8am-6pm.</p> <p>The other location on High Street where an extension to the 'At Any Time' waiting restriction is proposed will address road safety concerns associated with parking close to the junction and will also provide an unloading location for the regular delivery vehicles to the shop. Currently the delivery vehicles often stop in a position which presents an obstruction to passing traffic. It is recommended that this proposed extension is retained in the final scheme.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

1	A representative for the local traders on Church Street indicated that the proposed 30 minute limited waiting was too short a period for shoppers.	Comment noted. It is recommended that the proposed limited waiting period be relaxed to allow 1 hour of limited waiting during the same operational hours.
1	A resident of Church Street objected to the proposals on the basis that they were unclear whether the restrictions applied to the whole, or part of the street and that the restrictions would devalue property.	The proposed limited waiting restrictions are designed to provide short term parking space to encourage passing trade for local shops. The restrictions are primarily fronting the shops rather than the whole street and the objector was contacted and this was clarified. It is not considered that the restrictions will have a detrimental effect on property prices but may in fact have a beneficial effect as they will encourage turnover for the village shops.
1	A resident of Church Street objected to the proposals and made more general comments regarding footway parking obstruction issues and commented that the restrictions would not be enforced. They also requested that resident parking restrictions be introduced to resolve parking by visitors to the canal.	<p>If the proposals are approved there will be routine enforcement by our Civil Enforcement Officers as they could be included as part of the role of enforcement associated with Hungerford. Issues regarding footway parking and obstruction can be dealt with by the police and does not require formal parking restrictions to be in place before they can take action.</p> <p>Resident parking restrictions would not really be appropriate for Church Street but could be considered as part of a future review if the overwhelming majority of residents supported such a scheme. Currently, if there are any parking problems associated with visitors to the canal then they are too few in number to cause serious concerns.</p>
1	Kintbury Parish Council objected to the proposals relating to Church Street, Station Road, High Street and the 30 minute limited waiting restriction on the basis that they did not believe it will be policed.	The limited waiting restrictions have been requested and supported by all of the local traders and it is felt that they will encourage passing trade by providing better parking opportunities and removing long term parking. It has been recommended that the 30 minute restriction be relaxed to allow 1 hour waiting. Regarding enforcement, our Civil Enforcement Officers will be able to routinely patrol the restrictions as they could be included as part of the role of enforcement associated with Hungerford.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Upper Bucklebury comments		
7	<p>Bucklebury Parish Council, the primary school Chair of Governors, a parent governor and four residents of Berrys Road objected to the proposal to introduce waiting restrictions at the junction of Berrys Road and Blacklands Road to prevent parking close to the junction during school peak periods. The objections were based on displacement concerns and concerns relating to additional lines and signs giving an 'urban feel' to the location.</p> <p>An additional Berrys Road resident objected but subsequently withdrew their objection once the reason and the extent of the restriction was explained.</p>	<p>This restriction was proposed to address a low risk road safety concern regarding vehicles parking close to junctions. Given the level of objection from local residents and other parties it is recommended that this proposal be omitted from the final scheme.</p> <p>The 'Considerate Car Use' leaflet has been sent to the school so that they are able to distribute to parents and this will reinforce the message that vehicles should not be parking close to this junction.</p>
Yattendon comments		
1	<p>Yattendon Parish Council requested that the proposals be held in abeyance pending further enquiries by them to provide alternative parking facilities for visitors to the school.</p>	<p>The proposed parking restrictions could be held in abeyance if the restrictions are included within the final Sealed Order but not actually implemented on street. This would enable the restrictions to be introduced at a later date subject to funds being available for this work, following investigations carried out by the Parish Council, without a need to re-advertise the proposals.</p> <p>If however their investigations are successful and they decide that they would not want the parking restrictions to be implemented the restrictions would have to be formally revoked as part of a subsequent parking scheme and removed from the Consolidated Order.</p> <p>Alternatively, if the proposed restrictions are omitted from the final scheme and held in abeyance, it would enable the length and position of the proposed parking restrictions to be reconsidered, following investigations carried out by the Parish Council on whether they have been able to provide suitable alternative parking to remove vehicles from the carriageway and subject to further consultation. This would not impact on the overall progress of the TRO in relation to the other villages within the TRO.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the proposed restrictions be omitted from the Amendment Order.</p>