

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
1	Thames Valley Police have indicated that they have no objection to the proposals.	Comment noted.
1	<p>Newbury Town Council did not indicate whether they were for or against the proposals but did raise the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Request for additional restrictions outside the Post Office in order to keep the turning head clear of parked vehicles, with consideration given to visitors to the Post Office and shop. (ii) Concern that the proposed lengths of unrestricted parking in Catherine Road and Link Road would only displace the commuter vehicles from Howard Road and Chesterfield Road into these areas. (iii) Concern over the position of the limited waiting bay off St Johns Roundabout (iv) Concern that there was no provision of Resident Only parking bays. (v) Request that the proposals be subject to a review after six months of operation to establish and confirm that the scheme is effective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Comments have been considered, however introducing waiting restrictions in addition to those proposed would require re-advertisement of the Order. This length of Old Newtown Road will therefore be considered separately in order to prevent any delay with the implementation of the overall scheme. (ii) This is one of the intentions of the scheme. Link Road and Catherine Road have fewer residential frontages and the majority of properties have adequate off road parking facilities. (iii) The parking bay is off-set sufficiently from the main carriageway so as not to present any visibility or road safety problems. (iv) The majority of residential properties within Zone SW1 and SW2 have adequate off-road parking facilities and it is not considered necessary to restrict the available public highway with anything more than shared use bays. (v) It is intended that all Zones forming the Newbury Parking Strategy will be monitored following implementation and amendments will be considered, following consultation, where necessary.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Appendix A

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
18	Objection to the proposals for Pound Street from businesses within Pound Street or in the close proximity.	A meeting was held with representatives of the businesses concerned, where options were considered so that an agreement could be reached which would satisfy the needs of the residents and the businesses. The businesses demanded satisfactory reassurance that there would still be sufficient limited waiting parking spaces available during the day to not have a detrimental affect on their trade. Despite assurances that the restrictions would be closely monitored and amended if necessary, there was still strong objection to the options presented. The problem of proving whether trade was directly affected by the parking restrictions rather than providing anecdotal evidence was also raised by officers. A compromise was agreed to reduce the length of available permit parking. See paragraph 3.2.
4	Objections to the scheme from residents and non-residents on the basis that long term parking for commuters would be severely restricted within roads of limited residential frontage in the area of the railway station.	Three objections subsequently withdrawn following detailed explanation of the proposals, which are intended to increase the availability of long term parking spaces in the area of the railway station rather than restrict availability. See paragraph 2.2.
2	A two day public exhibition was insufficient for interested parties to view the plans and there was a lack of consultation with non-residents.	Officers conducted extensive public consultation, both statutory and informal, during the scheme design. This included a letter distributed to all residents seeking their views, a public exhibition at the public library to provide a forum to discuss amendments, additional consultation with businesses in Pound Street and residents of Chesterfield Road and Howard Road. Statutory consultation included public advertisement by way of the local press and over 30 street Notices on display within the Zones.

No. of Comments	Comments	Officer Comments
2	The Notice was confusing and contained too much detailed information.	There is a legal requirement to identify the roads and restriction types proposed on a Notice for a Traffic Regulation Order. Where the Order covers an extensive area this may result in a large amount of information being displayed.
1	Comment that the proposals for Howard Road and Chesterfield Road would result in greater vehicle movement during the period in which the restrictions applied and was unnecessary.	Residents of Chesterfield Road and Howard Road were re-consulted to establish their preferred scheme for these particular roads. The majority decision was to proceed with waiting restrictions at junctions only. See paragraph 2.3 and 3.1.
1	Objection to the scheme from resident who does not wish to see any changes to the parking arrangements in their road.	Objection is based on a misunderstanding of the intentions for the road in question, as there are no proposals to introduce restrictions in that particular road.
1	Lack of public transport alternatives for rail users in outlying villages who are, as a result, forced to use their cars to get to the railway station.	The public transport arrangements serving the railway station have not been changed as a result of this proposed scheme. It is however, intended that the scheme will increase the number of parking spaces available near the station for commuters to use.
1	The scheme will impact on public safety due to the lack of spaces near the station and the requirement for commuters to walk greater distances.	This comment is based on a misunderstanding of the proposals in the area of the railway station. It is intended that the scheme will increase the number of parking spaces available for commuters to use and as such this will reduce the distance that some commuters currently walk.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

Appendix A

1	The contact number displayed on the Street Notice was incorrect and would have prevented objections being raised.	Although the telephone number was incorrect, this was only the contact number for individuals requesting further information. The contact name was correct however, so calls were correctly routed. Copies of the plans and draft Order were available at the Council Offices and Newbury Town Hall.
1	Notices do not advise of the proposed implementation date of the restrictions.	This is a Notice of proposals. The implementation date is determined following completion of the statutory consultation process and formal consideration of any comments or objections that are received.
1	Comment regarding traffic management scheme unrelated to these proposals	These comments are not related to the Parking Strategy for Zones SW1 and SW2.
1	Comment regarding road marking scheme for St. John's roundabout.	These comments are not related to the Parking Strategy for Zones SW1 and SW2.
1	Comment on the legality of the Order based on the assumption of a published error on the Notice.	The query is related to standard terminology found on all Notices produced by West Berkshire Council, in that the date is added when the Order is progressed to implementation and Sealed.