

Individual Decision

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

Monday, 30 September, 2013

Ref:	Title	Portfolio Member	Page No.
ID2716	Parking Review Amendment 14	Councillor Pamela Bale	1 - 14



This page is intentionally left blank

Individual Executive Member Decision

Title of Report:	Parking Review Amendment 14
Report to be considered by:	Individual Executive Member Decision
Date on which Decision is to be taken:	30 September 2013
Forward Plan Ref:	ID2716

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 (Greenham, Hungerford, Newbury, Pangbourne, Purley-on-Thames, Stratfield Mortimer, Thatcham) 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 14 to be progressed to implementation.

Other options considered: N/A

Key background documentation:

- Plan Nos: L67(SC1), L68(SC1), AJ77(SC1), AK77(SC1), AN73(SC1), AN82(SC1), AO70(SC1), AO71(SC1), AW76(SC1), AX76(SC1), BS36(SC1), BV83(SC1), BV84(SC1), BX39(SC1), BX40(SC1), BY37(SC1), BY38(SC1), BZ85(SC1), BZ86(SC1), CA85(SC1), CA86(SC1)
- 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 was in accordance with the Council's Consultation procedures.
- Financial:** The implementation of the physical works would be funded from the approved Capital Programme.
- Personnel:** None arising from this report.
- Legal/Procurement:** The Sealing of the Traffic Regulation Order would 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>
Not relevant to equality			<input checked="" 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 verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.
- Ward Members:**
- Councillor Jeff Beck - agrees with the Recommendations as stated under 4.2 (i) and (ii) of the Supporting Information Document. I wish to place on record, the appreciation of both the Local Residents and myself, to Alex Drysdale, for the way in which he has dealt with this Local Problem
- Councillor David Betts - Fully supports the Purley proposal.
- Councillor Mike Johnston - is happy with the proposals within St Johns ward.

Councillor James Podger - good job the sooner this happens the better.

Councillors David Allen, Howard Bairstow, Pamela Bale, Domonic Boeck, Roger Croft, Billy Drummond, Adrian Edwards, David Goff, Paul Hewer, Roger Hunneman, Julian Swift-Hook, Ieuan Tuck, Mollie Lock, Geoff Mayes, Tim Metcalfe - To date no response has been received, however any comments will be verbally reported at the Individual Decision meeting.

Opposition Spokesperson: Councillor Keith Woodhams notes the responses made in the draft Individual Decision report.

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"/>
If not subject to call-in please put a cross in the appropriate box:		
The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council		<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position		<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months		<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision		<input type="checkbox"/>
Report is to note only		<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 14 investigated various sites where parking has been expressed as a safety concern. 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.
- 1.3 The statutory consultation and advertisement of the agreed proposals was undertaken between 25 July and 15 August 2013.

2. Responses to statutory consultation

- 2.1 At the end of the statutory consultation period 69 responses had been received, including a letter of objection with 56 signatures opposed to the proposal for Hungerford High Street.
- 2.2 No objections were received in respect of the proposal for Greenham.
- 2.3 A response was received from Newbury Town Council indicating support for the proposals.
- 2.4 30 responses were received on the proposal for The Street, Stratfield Mortimer. Only one of the responses indicated support for the proposals.
- 2.5 16 objections were received on the proposal for the Pear Tree Lane and Northwood Drive area in Newbury.
- 2.6 12 responses were received on the proposals for St James Close in Pangbourne, with the overwhelming majority of comments from residents of the road. Only one of the responses indicated support for the proposals.
- 2.7 The remaining responses to the consultation were in smaller numbers objecting to various proposals in various roads across the whole scheme. One of the respondents indicated they wanted their comments considered as an objection to this proposal, but all of their comments were in relation to the proposal for on-street charging, for which statutory consultation took place over the same period.
- 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 The proposals will not adversely affect people with particular protected characteristics.

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 significantly compromising road safety and without the need for the re-advertisement of the TRO:
- (i) The proposal to introduce a length of No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm on Pear Tree Lane in Newbury is adjusted so that there is an unrestricted length retained for on-street parking measuring approximately 24 metres rather than the advertised 16 metres between the proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction and the commencement of the No waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm.
 - (ii) The proposal to introduce No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm on Northwood Drive in Newbury is adjusted to a point that terminates approximately 6 metres from the driveway for No 1 Northwood Drive.
- 4.3 The proposal to introduce No Waiting 'At Any Time' in St James Close in Pangbourne was to address verge damage issues and given the number of responses from residents, this should be omitted from the final scheme.
- 4.4 It is considered that the safety benefits of the following proposed restrictions considerably outweigh the issues in the responses to the consultation and that they should be introduced as advertised.
- (i) High Street, Hungerford,
 - (ii) Charnham Street, Hungerford
 - (iii) Enborne Road, Newbury,
 - (iv) Buckingham Road, Newbury
 - (v) Wheelers Green Way, Thatcham
 - (vi) Hazel Road, Purley on Thames
 - (vii) The Street, Mortimer,
 - (viii) Victoria Road, Mortimer,

Details of the responses and officer comments can be found in Appendix A.

- 4.5 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.

5. Recommendations

- 5.1 That the revisions to the proposed restrictions as detailed in Section 4 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.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
HUNGERFORD COMMENTS - (Plan L67 & L68)		
2 (including a 56 signature petition)	<p>A local shop keeper objected to the proposals for the High Street on the basis that he saw no reason to introduce them as vehicles were not breaking the law by parking adjacent to the zebra crossing. The letter of objection was accompanied by a petition with 56 signatures.</p> <p>One resident did not object, but sought clarification on why enforcement could not be undertaken without the need to go through formally introducing parking restrictions.</p>	<p>Unlike waiting restrictions, which apply to the adjacent footway or other areas, the 'Controlled Area' of a zebra crossing is the area within the zig zag road markings and is strictly related to the carriageway. As the vehicle is not causing an obstruction, the objector is correct that there is nothing legally to prevent a vehicle parking on this junction with Church Lane.</p> <p>However it is considered that a vehicle parking in such a location is introducing a road safety concern for pedestrians using the crossing and for this reason parking restrictions covering the junction with Church Lane would be appropriate. Physical measures such as railings or bollards to prevent access are not recommended as this lane can still potentially be used as a vehicular access to the rear of No 9 High Street.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
	<p>A site meeting was held with Councillor Hewer and residents of Bearwater (off Charnham Street) who raised concerns regarding visibility at the junction when vehicles parked in the layby and they were concerned this would be made worse by conversion of the area to a bus stand.</p>	<p>The layby was a recommended site by Hungerford Town Council for use by coach visitors to the town in a move to encourage more tourists. At the site meeting it was pointed out that by reserving the area for use as a 'Bus Stand Only' it would remove the long term parking that took place in the layby on a daily basis. If coaches start parking long term in this location and introduce additional concerns then the restriction in the layby can be considered as part of a future parking scheme.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
NEWBURY COMMENTS		
3	<p><u>Enborne Road:</u> (Plan AJ77 & AK77)</p> <p>Resident of Enborne Road commented on the recently introduced traffic calming scheme and requested that the traffic island outside 104/106 Enborne Road was removed rather than parking restrictions introduced and another resident of Enborne Road requested that the build out near No 118 was replaced with a speed table as the proposed parking restrictions would impact on visitors to his property.</p>	<p>The parking proposals were recommended to address concerns with vehicles parking too close to the new traffic calming features, as this was causing obstruction problems for large vehicles, including buses. It had been reported that occasionally vehicles were passing the wrong side of the islands due to the obstruction and this is illegal as well as introducing a road safety concern. The proposals will restrict parking in the immediate area of the traffic calming areas, but there will still be ample unrestricted parking space</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>Comments were also received asking why the area on Enborne Road opposite the junction with Buckingham Road were not considered as part of this scheme.</p>	<p>on Enborne Road for local residents and their visitors, however this may not be directly outside individual properties of the objectors.</p> <p>The comments relating to the area opposite the junction with Buckingham Road have been noted and will be investigated as part of the next parking scheme in the area.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
<p>1</p>	<p><u>Buckingham Road; (Plan AK77)</u></p> <p>A resident of the new housing development on Buckingham Road (Coopers Place) objected to the proposal to shorten the double yellow lines at the junction with Fifth Road and requested that transit vans and other works vans/vehicles were banned from parking on this road due to the visibility obstruction they caused. They also wanted to prevent vehicles associated with the garage (D&D Motors) from parking in the road. They further objected to the length of the proposed double yellow line at the entrance to Coopers Place as they considered it too short.</p>	<p>The restriction previously in place protected the entrance to part of St Bartholomew's School. This building is no longer in place and due to the new housing development there is increased pressure for residential parking space. The adjustment to the 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction only shortens the restriction by approximately 5 metres and will provide some additional parking for residents without compromising road safety as vehicles will still be prohibited from parking within 15 metres of Fifth Road.</p> <p>D&D Motors has operated on Buckingham Road for many years and the proposals will still allow any road user, including visitors to the garage, to park on this road for up to 2 hours. Preventing vehicles associated with the garage from parking in the road at all would not be appropriate as this would have a negative impact on their business. The restrictions will however favour resident permit holders and provide parking in an area where road space is at a premium.</p> <p>Restrictions cannot be introduced to prevent parking by a type of vehicle such as transit vans or works vehicles. Many large family vehicles, including 4x4s or MPVs can be as large as transit vans and so potentially create the same visibility concerns.</p> <p>The junction protection at Coopers Place is set at a minimum in order to maximise parking space whilst still ensuring that the footway dropped kerbs are protected. It will also provide some improved visibility for vehicles entering Buckingham Road from this junction.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
16	<p><u>Pear Tree Lane and Northwood Drive: (Plan AO70 & AO71)</u></p> <p>Four of the objectors had misunderstood the proposal as they stated that they objected to the introduction of permit holder parking on these roads, however they did indicate they objected to the proposals and wanted to be able to continue to park there.</p> <p>The local businesses do not provide adequate parking for all their staff and there is no option for some employees other than parking in adjacent roads.</p> <p>Vehicles currently parking in these roads do not present a problem and there is little impact on local residents. These proposals will just displace vehicles onto Kiln Road where they will cause even more of a problem for passing traffic, or they will displace further along Pear Tree Lane and Northwood Drive which will impact on residents and introduce a nuisance.</p> <p>Pear Tree Lane is a residential road near a business area and parking by non-residents should be expected. All properties have off road parking so this parking should not present a problem for residents.</p> <p>Two residents of Northwood Drive objected to the proposals as they considered that they would inconvenience residents and their visitors. They also requested that the restriction be adjusted so that it did not front their property access.</p>	<p>The proposals for Pear Tree Lane address a road safety concern associated with parking close to junctions and near the bend. There will still be ample road space available for on-street parking for local businesses if needed. If displacement took place further along Pear Tree Lane this should be to a more appropriate location for parking. If vehicles displaced into Kiln Road and caused further problems this could be investigated as part of a future parking scheme.</p> <p>The proposals for Northwood Drive were intended to address obstruction concerns for large vehicles such as refuse vehicles when parking took place on both sides of the road. It will also address access problems for properties on the length leading from Kiln Road. Preventing parking on one side would ensure clear access for all vehicles.</p> <p>The proposal on Pear Tree Lane can be adjusted slightly to provide some additional parking on the straight section, without compromising road safety.</p> <p>The proposal on Northwood Drive can be adjusted slightly to accommodate the objection by a local resident. This does raise the potential for a non-resident to park in this location but given the position of the property driveway it is likely this would cause an obstruction, which could be enforced.</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-Fri 8am-6pm on Pear Tree Lane is adjusted so that there is an unrestricted length retained for on-street parking measuring approximately 24 metres rather than the advertised 16 metres between the proposed No Waiting 'At Any Time' restriction and the commencement of the No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm. • The proposed No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm on Northwood Drive is adjusted to a point that terminates approximately 6 metres from the driveway for No 1 Northwood Drive. • The remaining proposals be introduced as advertised.

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
THATCHAM COMMENTS – (Plan AW76 & AX76)		
1	<p>A local resident considered the proposals for Wheelers Green Way to just be ‘sticking plaster’ and indicated that as the parking was just a displacement from the Burdwood car park, the removal of the parking charges would address the parking and move vehicles back into the car park. The proposals for Wheelers Green Way do not address the road safety concern when vehicles park on street.</p>	<p>There has been a noticeable increase in on-street parking on Wheelers Green Way since introduction of charging, but parking has taken place for many years at this location without incident when events or services take place at the church. The road width is sufficient to allow on-street parking, but the proposals will prevent vehicles parking too close to junctions. Overly restrictive measure may just displace vehicles into adjacent residential roads which do not have the width to easily accommodate on-street parking.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
PANGBOURNE COMMENTS – (Plan BS36)		
12	<p>The proposals have not been thought through and will simply displace the vehicles further along St James Close and cause nuisance to other residents without addressing the problems for waste vehicles or other large vehicles.</p> <p>The ‘Access Only’ restriction should be strictly enforced and this would address the issue without the need for further parking restrictions. Improvements to the signs should be considered, including putting them on a distinctive background to highlight the restriction in place. Alternatively a ‘No Entry Except Residents’ should be introduced.</p> <p>The proposals are only for one side of the road and vehicles will just park on the other side if the restrictions are introduced, which may introduce visibility problems if they park on the inside of the bends.</p> <p>The parking problems are partly caused by residents who are constantly having house improvements made and trades vehicles are parking in the area during the works. This is however temporary and should not be an excuse to introduce yellow lines.</p> <p>A residents parking scheme for the whole area should be introduced instead to control the parking by non-residents.</p>	<p>The concern in St James Close was that inconsiderate parking near the bends was forcing larger vehicles in particular to mount the grass verges in order to get past and this was causing damage. The proposal would go some way to addressing this issue and if displacement was to occur it is likely that this would be to a more appropriate location.</p> <p>The ‘Access Only’ restriction can only be enforced by the police however this type of restriction can be difficult to enforce due to the number of vehicles that are potentially exempt and the fact that a driver has to be observed driving through the restriction. High-visibility backing for the signs would not be recommended due to the visual intrusion in this residential area. Current legislation does not allow ‘No Entry’ signs to be used for an ‘Except Residents’ restriction.</p> <p>Introducing measures for the inside of the bends was considered prior to the public consultation but the extension to the existing double yellow lines was the preferred option for advertisement.</p> <p>Extending the current residents parking restriction into other areas of St James Close would not be appropriate as the remaining properties all have off-street parking and would therefore not be eligible to apply for a permit. .</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	This proposal is using a sledgehammer to crack a nut.	Given the number of objections from local residents it is recommended that the proposals are omitted from the final scheme.
PURLEY ON THAMES COMMENTS – (Plan BY38)		
2	<p>One resident supported the proposal for Hazel Road but considered that they should be extended and changed to No Waiting 'At Any Time'.</p> <p>One resident objected to the proposal for Hazel Road as they considered the problem to be caused by Purley Park Trust and the CEO of PPT had indicated during the Amendment 11 parking consultation held during November 2011 that they were reviewing parking arrangements for staff on site and hoped that this would reduce or remove all staff parking on Hazel Road.</p> <p>The proposal will just displace vehicles further along Hazel Road.</p>	<p>The proposal was requested by Purley Parish Council following observations and an informal survey undertaken by a parish councillor. The parking restriction would provide a passing place for opposing traffic and the location fronting No 5 Hazel Road has the support of the resident to that property. Extending or introducing a more harsh restriction would impact on local residents unnecessarily.</p> <p>Purley Park Trust will be asked to provide a progress statement regarding the commitment made to improving staff parking within their site.</p> <p>Displacement of vehicles is possible but this is unlikely to cause a significant concern when balanced with the benefits that a passing place would provide.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
STRATFIELD MORTIMER COMMENTS –		
30	<p>The Street: (Plan BZ86, CA85, CA86)</p> <p>1. Ten objections were received using exactly the same letter template raising concerns regarding the potential for displacement of vehicles into Byway 7 if the restrictions are introduced. Parking by rail commuters could be long term and present obstruction concerns for residents, farm vehicles and visitors to the church when parking on both sides. It would also prevent the area being used by dog walkers and parents dropping off/picking up children from the school and there are few alternative locations for school parking.</p> <p>2. The surface of the Byway is already in poor repair due to current parking practise and an increase in vehicle movements using the area for parking will make the surface</p>	<p>1. If vehicles displace into Byway 7 in significant numbers and park long term causing problems this can be investigated by our Rights of Way (ROW) team on whether measures can be introduced to address the concern. However the distance from the railway station may determine whether this will become a preferred site for rail commuters and at this stage it is not considered that parking will be significantly increased.</p> <p>2. The surface of Byway 7 will be improved during this Financial Year by the ROW team and our Highways Maintenance team to ensure damage does not continue and loose surface material does not continue to be washed out onto The Street.</p> <p>3. Measures were proposed for the area between Byway 7 and the junction for Church Farm Barns but during a preliminary consultation the Parish Council requested that</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>worse.</p> <p>3. Allowing on-street parking between Byway 7 and Church Farm Barns will ensure that road safety concerns continue to be present on The Street, as this is close to the blind bend for other traffic and is also opposite the junction for Mortimer Lane which creates a hazard for exit and entry as vehicles travelling towards the centre of Mortimer would be on the wrong side of the road.</p> <p>4. Parking signs should be erected in Byway 7 restricting parking to a maximum of 90 minutes.</p> <p>5. Vehicles should be allowed to park on the straight length of The Street as the road is wide enough for vehicles to pass safely.</p> <p>6. The proposals will just displace vehicles further along The Street into areas where they will present road safety concerns.</p> <p>7. The number of vehicles parking in the area of the school already causes significant problems for through traffic and these proposals will just make things worse.</p> <p>8. The restrictions should not be introduced until alternative parking for school traffic is provided locally as the proposals are just making a bad situation worse.</p> <p>9. On-street parking results in passing traffic moving closer to driveway entrances for local properties which is a road safety concern. Vehicles should be prohibited from parking on the full length of The Street to ensure that residents can safely exit their properties.</p> <p>10. The parking space within the Network Rail car park needs to be increased and the charges dropped or lowered to encourage commuters to use this area rather than park on-street as the car park is currently underused.</p> <p>11. Parking on street slows traffic down and should be retained, otherwise traffic speeds will increase and this will increase road safety concerns near the school.</p>	<p>some element of on-street parking was retained in this area due to the limited parking for school visitors.</p> <p>4. Measures for Byways 7 are being considered by the ROW team but formal parking restrictions will not be introduced as they will not be able to comply with parking legislation as the road surface will not enable road markings to be introduced.</p> <p>5. There has been some misunderstanding of the proposals by some objectors as the proposals do already allow for a length of unrestricted parking between The Cinnamon Tree and the bend on The Street of approximately 75 metres.</p> <p>6. If vehicles displace and cause further problems this can be investigated as part of a future parking review in the area.</p> <p>7. Parking for the school is difficult but our officers will continue to encourage the school to adopt improved School Travel Plans which may reduce the number of vehicles in the vicinity of the school.</p> <p>8. The restrictions have been recommended to address a significant road safety concern where commuters have been parking close to the bend. Delaying the scheme until alternative facilities can be found is not appropriate.</p> <p>9. On-street parking can be accommodated on The Street. Whilst this may be an inconvenience for local residents when exiting their properties it does not necessarily in itself present a road safety concern.</p> <p>10. Our Planning officers are currently in discussion with Network Rail regarding improvements to the car parking for this railway station.</p> <p>11. It is acknowledged that parked vehicles can reduce traffic speeds and on-street parking has been retained in the proposals where it is safe to do so.</p> <p>12. The Council is not obliged to provide on-street parking for commuters. The layby to the east of the roundabout was closed for use due to the damage this was causing to the flood prevention bund and our proposals will not recommend making this area</p>

Summary of comments to Statutory Consultation

No. of Responses	Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>12. If cars are to be prevented from parking on street the Council must come up with alternatives within walking distance of the rail station or open up the layby to the east of the roundabout junction.</p> <p>13. The layby adjacent to the pumping facility has been used as a parking area for many years without problem and vehicles should be allowed to continue to park there.</p> <p>14. If vehicles are to be allowed to park on The Street the position of the centre line should be adjusted, otherwise overtaking vehicles are having to straddle the marking.</p> <p>15. Vehicles parking opposite the entrance for The Cinnamon Tree obstruct access for delivery vehicles and this area has not been treated.</p>	<p>available again.</p> <p>13. The layby for the pumping station includes numerous manhole covers which cannot be accessed in an emergency or for routine servicing and inspection if vehicles are parking in this location and for this reason the parking restrictions have been recommended.</p> <p>14. The centre line marking will not be adjusted as this may just result in moving eastbound traffic even closer to the driveways on the north side, where residents already have a concern.</p> <p>15. The management of The Cinnamon Tree have not raised this as being of a concern to them.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>
1	<p>Victoria Road: (Plan BV83 & BV84)</p> <p>If the restrictions are implemented there will be nowhere for visitors to the surgery to park as their car park is too small.</p>	<p>The proposals only prevent vehicles parking close to the roundabout in the area of the central islands. There will still be ample road space available for parking by visitors to the surgery.</p> <p>Recommend that the proposals are introduced as advertised.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank