

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	ALDERMASTON WHARF (Plans BL74 & BM74) - OBJECTION
1	<p>Thank you for providing advance notice information on Parking Schemes Amendment 35 & 36 and we note the public consultation dates. We are disappointed that no prior consultation with this Parish Council has taken place especially prior to this notice as the Council has had much previous dialogue with WBC on this matter and have discussed it at most meetings for the past five years. However, we will oppose the amendment during the consultation process because: It is the Council's opinion that the proposal will not resolve the road safety issues and will worsen congestion. It makes no provision for displaced vehicle parking. Introducing no waiting on the corner adjacent to the flats and the electricity sub station will displace vehicles further along Mallard Way and cause even greater disruption to residents. Introducing No waiting restrictions on the northern side of Mallard Way will have no impact and has not been an issue in the past. It considers that the only viable solution is to introduce No Waiting restriction on both sides of the road along the entire length of Mallard Way from the junction with Station Road to a point to the east of 1 Mallard Way subject to the following: Alternative parking arrangements for narrowboat users be made since the majority of these are now used as permanent residencies, many of whom park light commercial vehicles, and use all of the available parking along Mallard Way particularly overnight and at weekends causing major disruption to residents in Mallard Way and Heron Way. There is vacant land available, and WBC owned, at the junction of Mallard Way and Station Road, that could be designated for resident parking/permit holders only at minimal cost. The Council further considers that as it is the Canals and Rivers Trust and their licensee of the narrowboat moorings who have caused this problem by dramatically increasing the number and nature of the narrowboat moorings, the Council believes that they should make a significant contribution towards the cost of providing this alternative parking as should Network Rail who, through the introduction of increased parking fees, have displaced vehicles from the historically free car park to on street parking. It should also be noted that alternative parking for narrowboat users was available until the Canals and Rivers Trust was granted planning permission to redevelop the area around Aldermaston Tea Rooms and Wharfside. The Council respectfully requests that it is fully involved in any further consultation on this matter as it has been a major cause of concern for many years and to date no satisfactory resolution proposed. Thanks Beenham Parish Council [Name REDACTED]</p>
2	<p>With regard to Parking Schemes Amendment BL34 and BM34. i am disappointed that no prior consultation with myself or Beenham Parish Council has taken place especially prior to this notice I have had previous dialogue with WBC on this matter and have raised it as a Parish Councillor at most meetings for the past five years. However, I oppose the amendment .because: It is my opinion that the proposal will not resolve the road safety issues and will worsen congestion. It makes no provision for displaced vehicle parking. Introducing no waiting on the corner adjacent to the flats and the electricity sub station will displace vehicles further along Mallard Way and cause even greater disruption to residents. Introducing No waiting restrictions on the northern side of Mallard Way will have no impact and has not been an issue in the past. I suggest that the only viable solution is to introduce No Waiting restriction on both sides of the road along the entire length of Mallard Way from the junction with Station Road to a point to the east of 1 Mallard Way subject to the following: Alternative parking arrangements for narrowboat users be made since the majority of these are now used as permanent residencies, many of whom park light commercial</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>vehicles, and use all of the available parking along Mallard Way particularly overnight and at weekends causing major disruption to residents in Mallard Way and Heron Way. There is vacant land available, and WBC owned, at the junction of Mallard Way and Station Road, that could be designated for resident parking/permit holders only at minimal cost. The Council further considers that as it is the Canals and Rivers Trust and their licensee of the narrowboat moorings who have caused this problem by dramatically increasing the number and nature of the narrowboat moorings, the Council believes that they should make a significant contribution towards the cost of providing this alternative parking as should Network Rail who, through the introduction of increased parking fees, have displaced vehicles from the historically free car park to on street parking. It should also be noted that alternative parking for narrowboat users was available until the Canals and Rivers Trust was granted planning permission to redevelop the area around Aldermaston Tea Rooms and Wharfside. I respectfully request that I am contacted regarding any further consultation on this matter as it has been a major cause of concern for many years and to date no satisfactory resolution proposed.</p>
3	<p>I object to the plan for station road. The parking here does not cause an issue for parking of local residents. It will encourage commuters to use Watson close which will be the nearest rd to park with no restrictions. Watson close is already busy with residents parking because of inadequate parking facilities for the number of houses.</p>
4	<p>I strongly object to the proposal to further restrict stopping and parking in station Rd Padworth. There are currently no issues with the area. I live there. I see the area every day, multiple times a day. I do not want to see additional restrictions forcing cars into other areas. Please actually listen and do not do this.</p>
5	<p>I object to the two Aldermaston proposals (BL74 and BM74). These proposals will have two potential effects. Firstly it will shift many rail commuter cars away from Station Road and into other parts of Aldermaston Wharf, so the inconvenience will just fall onto residents somewhere else. Secondly it will deter other people from using the train service and they will just use their cars for the whole of their journey, which goes against WBC's environmental strategy. We have to recognise that onwards public transport connections to/from Aldermaston station are non-existent and rail users have no option but to drive for the last leg of their journeys. Making driving more difficult does not push them onto more sustainable transit, but leads to increased car use. The current situation on Station Road is stable and the on-street parking serves as a deterrent for traffic cutting through from the A4 to the A340. Any change to this will endanger pedestrians and local drivers. Whilst I have some sympathy for local residents, they have not purchased their houses with the expectation that they can have always available on-street parking. There is a perfectly good car park at Aldermaston Station and this is under-utilised thanks to the excessive parking charges introduced by the operator several years ago, for which car park users get zero benefit and which have caused drivers to park in nearby streets. The obvious solution is for WBC to work with the operator to reduce or eliminate parking charges, allowing rail users to park in an appropriate environment. These proposals may solve some small localised problems but overall provide no benefit for residents of Aldermaston Wharf.</p>
6	<p>I object to the proposals in relation to areas BL74 & BM74 because I consider that there is a strong likelihood that these measures will displace commuter and non-resident parking further into Mallard Way and Heron Way, resulting in a worse situation</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>than we have now as there is very little roadside parking and where that exists, it is already heavily used. (For instance, the area of Mallard Way straight across from the mini roundabout and onwards to where it meets Heron Way forming a T junction.) The dangers in Mallard Way caused by parking on the canal side of the road could be mitigated by traffic calming measures such as speed humps, speed indicator devices and other visual warnings such as 'slow down' signs. Part of the problem is that many drivers drive aggressively and/or too fast past the traffic parked on the canal side of Mallard Way. If everyone took more care, the chances of accidents happening would be reduced without the need to introduce parking regulations which will probably just relocate the problem rather than solving it. Unless Network Rail can be persuaded to make the station car park free or reduce the charge to a nominal amount, we won't really reduce the amount of commuter and non-resident parking in Mallard Way and Station Road. We therefore need to change driver behaviour and if there are funds, introduce some traffic calming measures.</p>
7	<p>Parking restrictions are not required in Station Rd., Padworth for the following reasons; Commuters do not obstruct the parking. Station car park should be free of charge as it used to be. Visitors to the canal should be allowed to park free of charge - free parking has been made pay and display and the access to the canal built across. This proposal has arisen as a result of one resident following an aggressive approach to parking in the area having purchased a house with no drive - they parked 2 vehicles across space for 4, placed notes on people's windscreens, raised this issue at parish meetings, and have now moved. The current residents of the property do not appear to have a problem. We have lived here for 30 years and the parking has never been an issue. The proposal will make life difficult for those visiting the area. West Berks should be encouraging people to visit the area - the canal is a leisure destination and you will discourage visitors. I also would not want friends and family visiting to have to pay to park in the unsecured & prone to vandalism station car park</p>
8	<p>By restricting parking in Station Road and Mallard Way it will only drive those commuters who won't pay the station car parking fees to park further into the residential areas around Aldermaston Wharf. Removing the parking fees at the Aldermaston station car park is clearly the most sensible answer so commuters park safely there - it's not going to be abused as there isn't anything else in the area people would need to park there for. The outcome of the WBC proposed change will simply be more residents frustration and complaints and demands for similar no parking / waiting restrictions across all of the residential roads of Aldermaston Wharf.</p>
9	<p>I oppose the proposed prohibition of parking on Mallard Way because, as a resident who sees the day-to-day reality, parking there does not cause any issues. The area remains safe, accessible, and orderly, and the existing on-street parking is genuinely useful for visitors who would otherwise struggle to find convenient spaces. If Mallard Way parking is removed, I'm concerned that the overflow will spill into the limited, allocated spaces in Lockside Court, creating congestion and unnecessary friction for the residents who rely on those spots. Maintaining the current parking arrangement on Mallard Way is the most practical and least disruptive option for everyone in the community.</p>
10	<p>I am a resident at Lockside Court. I do not see/have any issues regarding the current parking on Mallard Way. If the restrictions were to come in then this would have a significant negative impacts for the following reasons: (1) Family and friends visiting - I</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>have elderly parents who would not be able to park further away, and then walk to my property (2) Parking on Kingfisher Close - the restriction will not eliminate people parking in Aldermaston Wharf. This will just cause people to park further away (for example, Kingfisher Close), and walk over, just moving the so called 'problem', rather than eliminating it. (3) Residents parking at Lockside court - Residents at Lockside Court have two allocated parking spaces. There are occasions where non-residents, park in resident spaces, forcing us to park on Mallard. The proposed restriction would leave residents nowhere to park, creating tensions within the block.</p>
11	<p>This will just result in cars moving further afield to park. Specifically some of the areas in question had paid parking adjacent which is not occupied. The better approach would be to work with car park owners to reduce / remove parking fees and then cars would park in the correct locations removing the street parking that this consultation is looking to solve?</p>
12	<p>Banning cars from one road will move them to the next. The cars parked on the road in Aldermaston are not alongside houses. If this restriction is imposed, they may move to where there are houses, causing congestion and conflict.</p>
13	<p>I understand the need to change parking restrictions at times and welcome the consultation. As a liveaboard boater on the Kennet and Avon I have a regular association with Aldermaston Wharf, mooring at this location for two weeks at a time a few times per year. I also have an understanding of the life style and presence of others who live aboard. At Aldermaston there are a number of people who live aboard, some of whom could be considered as vulnerable. As someone who has lived aboard for 20 years I self identify as part of the GTR community (gypsy, Roma, traveller), a minority group that has protection under the Equalities Act 2010. Others may also consider themselves as part of this community. There are times when friction occurs between those that live locally in houses and those that live aboard. This can include around parking. When the canal was re-opened in the 1980s there were a number of parking places created to enable visitors and users of the canal to enjoy the new facilities. Over time these have been lost. In Aldermaston wharf the car park was lost to housing around 10 years ago, and the local tearoom now regard the car park as theirs and do not welcome non customers using it. There has been a long history locally of some residents in Mallard Way not being supportive of those that live on the canal, sometimes at the end of their gardens. Local canal residents have used Mallard way and Station road for parking for many years, since the estate was built. All the houses in Mallard Way have parking for cars on their drives, so parking in Mallard Way itself does not affect access to parking for residents. The presence of cars parked on the access road does slow traffic / make the road single file, but this enhances safety. I suspect the "campaign" to have parking restrictions applied is more associated with a desire by some residents of Mallard Way to victimise those that live aboard rather than a genuine need to restrict parking. The parking of cars in Station Road also slows traffic, making it less likely to be used as a cut through to avoid the roundabout on the A4 at busy times and making it safer to cross the road to access the station. The parking arrangements seem to work well and whilst this may result in some loss of revenue to the station parking provider, it makes use of public transport more cost effective and therefore encourages use of the train rather than driving. The proposed mid day restriction will affect weekday visitors to the canal - it is common to see cars with canoe roof racks parked in this street in the week. Please can you confirm that you have conducted a Public Sector Equality Duty assessment about these changes</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	and provide me copy? Does it consider the impact on the GTR community? Please re-consider these proposed changes at Padworth / Beenham and ensure that the council is not being used by a small handful of Mallard Way residents to victimise us in the liveboard community.
14	I am only talking about mallard way (aldermaston) here but putting restrictions on on one part will push all the cars to park further on down the road in mallard way and that will be a nightmare- can you please then restrict parking to permits only across the whole street?
15	The cars in station road Aldermaston cause no real problems. They are packed on the road not on the pavement. . If they are banned from parking there, they will park around neighbouring streets. This will cause problems getting in the way of residents.
16	Station road parking in Aldermaston wharf is essential and not causing any problems. It will only cause people to park in residential areas
17	Plan BL74 & BM74 Mallard Way The proposal will not resolve the road safety issues and will worsen congestion. It makes no provision for displaced vehicle parking. Introducing no waiting on the corner adjacent to the flats and the electricity sub station will displace vehicles further along Mallard Way and cause even greater disruption to residents. Introducing No waiting restrictions on the northern side of Mallard Way will have no impact and has not been an issue in the past. It considers that the only viable solution is to introduce No Waiting restriction on both sides of the road along the entire length of Mallard Way from the junction with Station Road to a point to the east of 1 Mallard Way subject to the following: Alternative parking arrangements for narrowboat users be made since the majority of these are now used as permanent residencies, many of whom park light commercial vehicles, and use all of the available parking along Mallard Way particularly overnight and at weekends causing major disruption to residents in Mallard Way and Heron Way. There is vacant land available, and WBC owned, at the junction of Mallard Way and Station Road, which should be designated for resident parking/permit holders only at minimal cost. It is the Canals and Rivers Trust and their licensee of the narrowboat moorings who have caused this problem by dramatically increasing the number and nature of the narrowboat moorings and should make a significant contribution towards the cost of providing this alternative parking as should Network Rail who, through the introduction of increased parking fees, have displaced vehicles from the historically free car park to on street parking. It should also be noted that alternative parking for narrowboat users was available until the Canals and Rivers Trust was granted planning permission to redevelop the area around Aldermaston Tea Rooms and Wharfside.
18	This is specifically commenting on BL74 (Mallard Way) and BM74 (Station Road) as although separate proposals need to be considered together. I have been a resident of Heron Way, for 28 years so have firsthand experience of the parking situation. The introduction of "no waiting" in Mallard Way will make absolutely no difference as no-one parks on that side of the road. All parking, which the vast majority have narrowboats moored, is on the other side of the road. When parking is busy, and vehicles are travelling both ways, this does cause one of the vehicles to reverse some distance to allow the other to pass. The new restrictions (BM74) is highly likely to cause more congestion in Mallard Way as commuters will seek "free" parking further into the estate. A couple of potential alternative solutions could be to encourage

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	commuters/narrowboat owners to park in the area on the right (down a slope) immediately as you enter Mallard Way. Also, since the railway car park introduced a parking fee the Car Park has only ever had a handful of cars utilising it. Should the local government approach National Rail to review the charging position and perhaps remove charges?
19	Cars parked in the areas highlighted do not cause any obstruction or danger to residents. This area is useful for parking when visiting the nearby flats on Mallard Way.
20	It will simply push cars out to the surrounding residential streets which are already congested.
21	It will push cars further into the residential area. Not helpful!
22	There needs to be parking by station
23	Time should be spent negotiating with train companies to reduce parking charges. Land is available at station. Rail tickets are expensive enough. Parking restrictions only displace the issue. If no parking in station road or mallard is allowed then people will just go to the next street and create the same problem there. It needs a solution not a knee jerk reaction.
24	I object to a specific part of the proposal. Which is the parking along Station Road, Aldermaston. I am a resident of Stowe Close, directly across from the area where the parking will be restricted. Our close was never adopted by the council due to the wrong lighting being put in by the builder, even though there was a bond for the development this was not used to replace the lighting correctly by the Council. As a result, there are no parking restrictions in Stowe Close. I believe that if commuters are unable to park on Station Road in the suggested place, it will move the issue to the entrance of Stowe Close where we are unable to enforce restrictions. There is only Audrey Court other than Stowe Close in the immediate facility, which has its own car park. Also, we want commuters to use Aldermaston Station as we don't want the station to be at risk of closing if commuters stop using it because they have to pay to park whereas at Midgham Station, the parking is free
25	There is a strong risk that amendments to parking regulations on Station Road in Padworth will exacerbate problems with parking in Stowe Close, which is private property. The problems which the scheme is designed to address would be better resolved by removing parking charges at the station car park - after all, that's where commuters are supposed to park. The car park is almost always empty since the charges were introduced, and therefore there would be little loss of existing revenue.
26	Object to the proposal to introduce restrictions on Station Road, Padworth. I live on Stowe Close which is adjacent to Station Road and have not had any issues over the last ten years. Providing on street parking to encourage the use of local facilities including the Tea Rooms and towpath is positive. Introducing restrictions on Station Road and Mallard Way will push cars into Stowe Close which will cause significant inconvenience to me and other residents and also potentially additional cost as we are responsible for the upkeep of this unadopted road

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
27	I am a resident of Stowe Close in Padworth which is not included on the plans within the application. Stowe close as exactly next to aldermaston station. Therefore, preventing commuters parking on Mallard Way and Station Road will more than likely push them onto Stowe Close which currently has no parking restrictions despite being a private close.
28	I am a resident of Stowe Close, RG7 4SF. I have serious concerns that the implementation of parking restrictions on Station Road by Aldermaston Station will encourage drivers to park their vehicles on our Close which is already overrun by cars and does not appear to be included within the council's parking restriction plans. We live at the very end of the Close and struggle to back into our drive. Any more cars parking here would make this impossible
29	Proposed parking restrictions on Station Road and Mallard Way in Padworth will merely transfer the parking to Swan Drive. I have lived in Swan Drive for nearly 30 years and every time there is an issue with Station Road, the parking is just transferred. There is no problem with the parking in Station Road. It is simply not an issue. Similarly there is no parking problem in Mallard Way. Hence you are proposing a solution to a non existent problem and your solution will actually create a real problem.
30	Closing parking in station road in Aldermaston will force cars to park in residential streets like swan drive. This would be more dangerous to pedestrians
31	Object as only moves the issue from Station road to swan drive where I live
32	This would only push the cars to park in the residential areas for example Swan Drive.
33	Cars will just park slightly further away - eg Swan Drive and block this access. Why not lobby GWR to make station free parking ?
34	This action will transfer the parking issues to Swan Drive RG7 4UZ. The simple answer is to make the parking at Aldermaston Station free of charge as it is at Woolhampton Station
35	To stop parking in Station Road will only increase parking in Swan Drive and further into Mallard. This just moves the problem and doesn't solve anything. Mallard is already congested with parked vehicles from canal boat residents. Parking in the station is not used to its full capacity, due to cost. Parking with a resident parking permit system may reduce local parking and prevent spillage into local streets but it seems extreme and an unnecessary cost. Is there a massive problem or just a handful of residents with a bee in their bonnet. Parking on Station road has always happened and is acceptable as long as not near the junction which is working ok since the yellow lines were introduced. The spare ground next to hag pit could be assigned properly - suggestion for boat users only with a permit or local residents ???
36	This will bring traffic into Swan Drive. It's bad enough when we get cars parked opposite our house and we cannot use our driveway properly.
37	I live in Kingfisher Close, Aldermaston Wharf. I believe that the restrictions in Station Road will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding residential roads.

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
38	<p>I live on a Canal Boat on the Kennet and Avon. I have read the above proposal and just have a small concern regarding the wording regarding parking in the Mallard Way and Station Road area of Aldermaston Wharf (Padworth). As a "Continuous Cruiser", which means that I have to change location every two weeks, I often find myself having to park by the roadside in order to be in some sort of distance of my boat. One of these locations is the above mentioned area. Now I have always ensured that I park in a responsible and respectful manor to those who live in the area. I will not block access ways, driveways or pavements and completely understand that I have no priority over anyone else. I am writing to clarify your terminology regarding the parking in these areas. Where the document says "PROPOSED NO WAITING 12:30-1:30PM Proposal will address long-term parking and obstruction concerns for local residents caused by rail commuters for residents with limited or no off-street parking" for Station Road and "PROPOSED NO WAITING AT ANY TIME Proposal will address obstruction and road safety concerns for residents caused by rail commuters while still allowing some on-street parking for the local narrowboat community", Will these measures take into account visiting boaters, or just those who are paying for the moorings alongside Mallard Way. If these measures do allow visiting boaters to park, how will we indicate that our cars are justified to park in these areas?</p>
ALDERMASTON WHARF (Plans BL74 & BM74) - SUPPORT	
39	<p>Parking in Mallard Way and Station Road in Aldermaston Wharf has gotten out of hand in recent years and needs to be brought under control</p>
40	<p>Live in Aldermaston. The road is currently dangerous and we have had many near miss incidents as well as a lot of aggression road rage incidents.</p>
41	<p>I'm a householder directly adversely affected by commuters parking on Mallard Way & Station road, Padworth. Commuters' vehicles cause obstruction to all legitimate traffic and may act as an obstacle to emergency vehicles.</p>
42	<p>I have witnessed many near misses and agree parking should be restricted. Would also mean access is not blocked for emergency services.</p>
43	<p>Long term parking in Station Road means that street cleaners are unable to remove leaves leading to blocked drains and flooding across Station Road.</p>
44	<p>BL74 has the potential to simply push the restricted "parkers" further along into Mallard Way and (less likely) Heron Way. I would hope to see what restrictions there may be on such happening ; if it were to do so.</p>
45	<p>I think commuters should pay for parking in the rail car park and not clog up station road. However, as a resident in Stowe Close am concerned that people forced off of station road may try parking on Stowe Close instead. Therefore I would only support this proposal if council ensure people then do not park in Stowe Close.</p>
46	<p>Parking around Aldermaston station is a nightmare forcing commuters to park in Millard Way, as well as, Station Road. there is also a problem in the entrance part of Swan Drive which may be worsened if not included too.</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	LAMBOURN (Plan J28) - OBJECTION
47	<p>Regarding Plan Reference J28 I would like to object to the proposed scheme on the following grounds:- As a resident of Sheep Fair Way, Lambourn I and my neighbours have lived with the trials and tribulations of living next to a school for many years. I agree that the safety of the children is paramount and all measures to improve this is to be applauded. However it all comes down to half an hour at the beginning of the school day and half an hour at the end where chaos reigns. In general the chaos is mainly good natured. I think your proposals are unlikely to improve the situation. If anything you are just going to move the same problem to another location such as completely into Sheep Fair Way, further down Edwards Hill, into Close End or Greenways. These possibilities will be intolerable for the residents of these roads and the safety of the children will not be improved. Surely the sensible solution would be to re-open the school car park with an additional entrance/exit onto Greenways or Edwards Hill with a one way system in place. Vehicles could enter at one end and depart at the other with somebody monitoring that the vehicles only stop long enough to drop off or pick up their children. It is often said that parents should walk their children to school but of course this is totally impractical for a parent who has two children at different schools or a parent who has to get off to their place of work. I'm sure cost comes into this equation but I doubt that improvements to the school car park will be much different to all the road marking and signage required for the proposal. Finally I would just like to add that, unless a police officer is there morning and evening, a high proportion of parents will completely ignore the new restrictions proposed.</p>
48	<p>Regarding Plan Reference J28 I would like to object to the proposed scheme. The scheme proposed is pointless. Going by my experience, the parents will ignore it or do the same thing in another location. The problem is the school and it is surely their problem to solve. They could easily open their car park and then 80% of the problem would disappear. It is unfathomable why they decided to close the car park some years ago. Prior to this there was no problem. I think the scheme you are proposing should be scrapped. It would probably prove to be a costly waste of time and money.</p>
49	<p>As a resident of Edwards Hill, Lambourn, proposal J28 is the one I am able to comment on. While I agree that there are too many vehicles parked on Edwards Hill, particularly at School times, there is no point in adding additional restrictions to the area around the lane to Lambourn Primary School. There is no alternative parking for parents dropping off and collecting children between their working day. I imagine that the situation is no different close to any of the other schools, with more cars in use everywhere. In Lambourn there is a lower car park next to the lane up to school which is closed off to parents, presumably because the exit comes out onto the bottom of the lane used by the children. This may need to be looked at again. Also the congestion at the top of Close end is caused by the large number of vehicles belonging to the residents of the two social housing semis on the corner. I counted 7 vehicles one day last week, some on the grass and there are also two larger vans used by two of them for work. One of the vans is often parked in the Lambourn Centre Car Park. At the other end of Edwards Hill vehicles are sometimes left for days on end on the wrong side of the road close to the junction with Station Road. Vehicles trying to turn into Station Road then have to be on the wrong side and those coming up Station Road can't see them. Station Road, Bockhampton Road and the entrance to Old Station</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	Yard are equally congested. Please don't make thing any worse for residents or school runs.
50	Regarding parking in region of Lambourn school. Whilst a problem it does contain the issue to a relatively small area. Changes to 'no waiting' will only mean spreading the problem to a wider area. It will not stop parents collecting their children by car
51	This a very small village. We do not need parking restrictions here, and we do not want them. It is presumptuous and dictatorial for the council to impose on us things we do not want or need. You do not know what is best for us. If you impose these dictates on this village, where do you propose the parents wait to pick up their children or drop them off in the morning? In the side streets? That will cause worse congestion and a lack of safety. You are not accounting for the fact that not all primary school pupils in Lambourn can walk to school. People drive because they live too far away for a young child to walk to school, and they may perceive that as unsafe for many reasons, the cars being the least of them. Is a green woke agenda pushing this? Are you going to suddenly provide buses for small children to get to school? There will be a general election soon. Never forget who pays your wages: We do. Issues like this could lose you the vote at the next election.
52	Lambourn school doesn't have a car park open no more, some people have no choice than to drive their children to school as they have to go straight to work also some people live more rural like Sheepdrove that's a mile into the village how are they expected to walk to school with young children it's not safe with how fast cars go up and down there also people will then start using other housing estates to park there car like old station yard, Bockhampton Road so your just pushing the problem else where. You can not leave such a popular school with no car park and no parking near to it that's just absolutely ridiculous young children will then be put in more danger as people start parking all over the place!!
53	Re the Lambourn proposal. There is no need for these restrictions, as parking for the school is available in the school carpark (which should be reconfigured with an entrance away from the pedestrian entrance, as it used to be), at the Lambourn Centre and in the High St carpark, for those who NEED to park there. Other pedestrian options should be considered like a Walking Bus, encourage walking to school, staggered times for drop off/pick up, or a drop off only zone where children can exit the car and the driver moves on immediately. There is also various options to move the pedestrian entrance to the school, so that children could walk to school safely.
54	I object to this as it will make the parking worse as taking away current parking places to enable school drops will leave parents with nowhere to park which will force them to park inconsiderately. The school in lambourn should be responsible and provide a safe drop off and collection area which they already have a car park next to the road but they choose to keep it locked, if this was to be opened it would cause less congestion and make it safer, however a separate exit point to the car park to the road opposite (Greenways) would make the system so it could be a drive through, this would help road, children and people's safety and ease the issues surrounding the school. Restricting the parking further will cause more chaos and force vehicles to park and block properties and access nearby, at the moment it is manageable but this will worsen the situation.

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
55	The proposal to put double yellow lines and parking restrictions at school pick up and drop off for Lambourn School on Edwards hill and surrounding does not create a solution to the problem. It forces vehicles to park further down Edwards hill into Bockhampton Road. This may create another problem for vehicles turning out of station road onto Bockhampton Road with visibility seriously restricted and create issues with vehicle parking across dropped kerbs and driveways. A potential solution to the problem would be for the school to open the gates to the lower car park and usage of the lambourn centre car park or encouragement of walking to school and such methods as drop off points. You have not offered a solution to the issue and therefore a pushing it further down the road to please residents who chose to buy houses next to a school.
56	The parking restrictions in Lambourn will not solve the issue they will just push the cars to different streets, sane issues slightly different spots. They will also likely be ignored as they are on the high street making no difference. There is never any enforcement. The high street is very dangerous as is speeding in the village plus people parking at various junctions for very long periods - days to weeks. The council should prioritise looking at these dangerous areas first. School runs are for two brief periods a day, at the same times, not even every day. They can easily be worked around.
57	I reject the proposal for Lambourn as it will cause more chaos at school times. I believe it will create a bigger issue around the village and actually make it more dangerous for the children.
58	Reject roads in Lambourn having no waiting zones. There is no parking available.
59	Whether its there or somewhere else, everywhere in lambourn has parking issues. My myself need to get my other child to nursery and myself to work, if I can't pull up near the school for drop off, which takes a few minutes, we would all be late. People personaly park pretty sensibly, and no seen any unsafe driving during school pick up and drop off
60	It just moves the problem some where else
61	How are the restrictions going to be enforced .. also whilst in theory I support the restriction around Lambourn school you are just going to push the problem into the high street (which needs a review of its own!). The high street is the biggest issue from a road safety perspective
62	If u put yellow lines at close end where will we park our cars and if we park somewhere else and if they get broken into will u pay the damages because it has happen before and when the school has a car park but they never open it up for the parents to use to take and pick up there kids from school they park all over close end because of it
63	The proposal for lambourn is not going to work, I walk most days but along with many others have to leave to go to work a couple of days a week and need to park as close as possible to allow enough time to drop children off and get to work/other schools in time. This plan will only cause more congestion on the high street and the other local roads. The cars parking on the hill slow other vehicles down, in stopping cars from parking near the school, this will allow the through traffic to go even faster than they already try and do.

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	LAMBOURN (Plan J28) - SUPPORT
64	<p>I fully support the proposals as they all seem to be reflective of local safety or other concerns. I would make an amendment to the proposal for Lambourn as I am familiar with the parking situation and ask that the single yellow line parking restriction is extended further east down Edward's Hill to its junction with Station Road as the narrow nature of the road and its steepness as a hill make parking at school time dangerous down the whole stretch, especially for children crossing further down the road nearer to the station Road junction.</p>
65	<p>Plan Ref J28 - Lambourn Since Lambourn Primary School closed the gates to their on site car park parents and cars have been pushed out into the surrounding streets during drop off and collection times. This has raised the risk of a serious accident / fatality with children crossing in the vicinity of the junctions between Edwards Hill and Sheep Fair Way and Close End. The chaos with children and parents trying to cross at these busy junctions between parked cars is often compounded by stables exercising horses on the road as they to and fro from the gallops. Over the years residents of Sheep Fair Way have had several discussions with the school and councillors about reopening the car park. Its closure has significantly increased safety risks with the volume of cars, pedestrians (and at time horses) in a confined area immediately outside the school. I appreciate that reopening of the car park (with some suitable modifications to its configuration / operation) is not part of this consultation. It is however central to the parking issues and road safety around the school. The proposed road markings will help but the root cause of the issues relate to closure of the car park and the reluctance of the school to consider options to reopen and operate it in a safe manner. The school have essentially pushed the problem into the surrounding streets and intensified the risk of road accidents on Edwards Hill and the junctions with Sheep Fair Way and Close End. The extension of the road markings proposed in the consultation should help with reducing the chaos around the Sheep Fair Way / Edwards Hill / Close End junctions and in other surrounding areas. However, with the school car park closed, inevitably the problems will be displaced elsewhere. Some parents will of course ignore the new markings so it is important that parking and dropping off/collection is monitored and policed at least occasionally and restrictions enforced. In general I agree with the road markings as proposed. However there is one modification which I believe will reduce traffic chaos and safety risks significantly. Double yellow lines should be added to the section of Edwards Hill (on the school side of the road) from where the 'School Markings' end up to the junction with Greenways. This will open up the Close End / Edwards Hill junction enabling improved visibility for parents and children crossing the road. This will also help significantly with traffic movement. I appreciate that, as per the Highway Code, vehicles should not be parked opposite a junction but double yellow lines will reinforce that ethos</p>
66	<p>I live on Close End, Lambourn. [Personal information REDACTED]. Parking near Lambourn School during the school day narrows Edwards Hill and cars still race through it as a rat run to avoid a left turn in the Market Place and onto the High Street. Especially during rush hours. Morning rush hour aligns with morning drop offs at the school (8 a.m.- 9 a.m.). I will also draw attention to what I believe is a serious related issue that has arisen in the last 3-4 years. The school management closed the school car park around 3 years or so which has increased the number of cars parking on Edwards Hill narrowing the thoroughfare considerably. I believe their reasons were "to</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>avoid safety issues in the car park". However, cars had to slow down considerably in order to access the car park from Sheep Fair Way so I do not believe that is a real issue. The effect has been to increase the likelihood of a more serious incident between children and parents with cars travelling much faster on the narrowed Edwards Hill. Local residents signed a petition to this effect over a year ago but nothing has been done. If West Berks Council can assist in making the school reopen the lower car park on Edwards Hill it can only help. Even with the proposed parking restrictions cars will still be travelling much faster on Edwards Hill when they reach the school area than they would be in the school car park if it was open. And finally, new restrictions will only work if they are enforced. We rarely see traffic wardens in Lambourn so increasing the frequency of their visits, especially soon after the new restrictions come into force, will definitely be needed in order to change driver behaviour.</p>
67	<p>Whilst I believe the safety of all pedestrians is of the up most importance as it will reduce the build of cars park along the road, so long as car drivers adhere to the rules of the road. How is the council going to enforce this measures? I believe this will move the problem to other roads by putting this in place. This doesn't resolve the bottleneck of significant pedestrian waiting outside the school gates overflowing across footpaths/roads during drop off and pick up. As the school does not utilise their carpark as an entrance for them.</p>
68	<p>I live near the area in Lambourn, the parking often blocks my drive and also blocks traffic from flowing. The cars parked on verge make it treacherous to cross and use the junction with Close End. Have seen children almost knocked down. Excellent initiative.</p>
69	<p>Number of parked cars near the school in Lambourn is increasingly dangerous with limited visibility and blocking junctions. Restrictions would make the roads much safer</p>
70	<p>I support the decision but would like to see further restrictions on parking moving down the hill onto Bockhampton Road and the cross roads from station Road and old station yard. I feel the problem parking now will just be pushed down onto an already busy cross roads and there is always cars parked on one side of the road anyway on station road that the safety of the children that walk to school and to the bus stops etc will just be pushed down the hill and actually potentially more dangerous.</p>
71	<p>In Lambourn the area around the school is very dangerous at drop off and pick up time in particular. Outside of that there are a lot of cars that park on the roads restricting visibility.</p>
72	<p>I support the Lambourn changes as it can be very difficult to pull out of those junctions due to parked cars. Also hard to get past the school with all the cars parked</p>
73	<p>Particularly regarding Lambourn, the proposals will address long standing issues</p>
74	<p>This refers to the Lambourn proposal. I fully support the proposal. The area around Lambourn School is highly dangerous with the number of parked and waiting cars. Pedestrian access is often blocked by waiting cars, road junctions are blocked and pedestrians are forced into the road by cars.</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
75	The parking near Lambourn school is an accident waiting to happen. There is ample parking very nearby but parents seem to think its their right to park where they like and how they like.
76	My response is limited to LAMBOURN ONLY. I have no view on the other areas. Edwards Hill at Lambourn has tight access to many of the properties and any parking in the areas under review hinder safe access to properties and junctions. Inappropriately parked cars result in dangerous manoeuvres in the area and particularly at the entrance to the school.
77	I support the proposed changes in LAMBOURN because I am concerned about child safely in the vicinity of the school.
78	It is very difficult to drive down these roads due to car drop off parking and parents and children walk between the park cars onto the road and I have to be very careful driving here
79	People parking inconsiderately, especially at school drop off times, accident waiting to happen
80	Lambourn: It makes the school drop of area much safer for children as well as the horses which use the road to go to the yards in the mornings.
81	I support the proposed changes outside of Lambourn Primary school but I am concerned that this congestion will simply move to the nearby and adjoining streets. My daughter walks along Bockhampton Road which is already full of parked cars along the road. Often the junction of Bockhampton Road/Beales Farm Roads is congested with dangerously parked cars. Please can this be monitored?
82	The parking around Close End in Lambourn is dangerous all day but markedly so during school drop off and pick up. Illegal parking and parents too lazy to walk from within the village making it so. Also the residents on the corner of Close end park on the green verge and on an over the junction making it difficult for children to navigate and cross the road. Have seen many close shaves with children struggling to cross.
83	I am a resident in lambourn who lives close to the school and Edwards Hill. I fully support the plan regarding parking restrictions but me and the other residents of our estate are concerned that our estate will become over run with cars during pickup/drop off. We already have parents who park just inside the entrance and it causes chaos trying to access our estate. We have on many occasions asked them not to park there but are ignored. Im not sure who would be best to contact but we would like to have our estate considered and possibly added to the plan for parking restrictions.
	LAMBOURN (Plan J28) - NEUTRAL
84	I am referring to the proposals for Lambourn school. The parking at present is dangerous, however the school has a car park that I believe has been closed since Covid. As the school catchment area includes places that would not be within walking distance (no pavement roads) such as Eastbury and Upper Lambourn it is not practical to assume people will stop using vehicles. The proposal is not workable unless the car

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	park is reopened. I should add that my children were at Lambourn School over 20 years ago, I am not directly affected by the situation.
85	We recognise that there may be some parents and/or children with disabilities who may need to park closer to the school entrance. There needs to be an area marked for 'coaches only' as the school regularly use coaches for trips so a designated area is required for pick up and drop off which may occur at 9am and 3pm in order to relate to the school day
	COLD ASH (Plan AU62 & AU63) - OBJECTION
86	I can only comment about Cold Ash. I am concerned that by restricting the parking as described people will park on the Ridge and Ashmore Green Road . The Ridge currently has some intermittent double yellow lines which finish just past the sharp bend - this is extremely dangerous. The visibility on the bend is poor and as a result of the parking, in order to proceed along the ridge from the crossroads it is necessary to drive in the middle of the road - On numerous occasions cars which are driving towards the crossroads come round the bend really fast and it is lucky that no accidents have been caused . Some cars park on the double yellow lines which makes the situation worse- I have reported this to the school and west Berkshire roads. It worries me that if more cars park and more children and parents are walking on the Ridge it will increase the likelihood of an accident . If this measure is implemented I would suggest that there needs to be clear signage informing drivers about the sharp bend and perhaps a lower speed limit at key times of day . I used to have children at the school and I live on the Ridge and it was dangerous then - it is more now with increased numbers of cars parking and the school has increased in size. The same applies to Ashmore Green Road
87	In regards to the Cold Ash Hill submissions I strongly object to any changes which are fundamentally flawed. There is no provision onsite for parking or even pickup / drop off or one way entry / exit which is common to all schools. Teaching staff take permanent spaces in the school instead of allocating the space for a one way drop off and pickup system. The onstreet parking is needed without restriction for the following reasons: 1 - No other way to access the school as no public transport or school buses provided 2 - No parking or pickup / drop off provision made available to local authority school 3 - If removed cars will stop in inappropriate locations and parents forced to park further afield causing issues and massive increase of risk for health and safety of children and parents with the road There is no pedestrian crossing for the school or the playing fields despite the dropped curbs and resurfacing of the road. This encourages crossing of children into a 30mph road and no warning of requirement for drivers to stop creating a high risk unacceptable situation the responsibility of the council. Pedestrian crossings should be added asap outside the school and across the roads to the playing fields so safe for pedestrians and school children. If the objective is to improve traffic flow to comply with statutory emission and air pollution laws then the numerous traffic calming / obstructions in the road which block the traffic in the morning and evening peak periods. As a result this causes congestion and any emergency services would be impeded to any time critical medical emergency, fire or police incident. The road also gets totally gridlocked as the design means stationary traffic extends beyond each obstruction. I observed the data collection devices in the road and your data approach will validate these observations. To make it clear the illegal traffic calming obstructions in the lanes are the cause of the problems NOT parking for drop off and

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>collection at the school. Even the regular slowing down and atop / start from 30 to zero releases so many brake and tyre particulates as well as exhaust emissions into local schools on the road and pedestrians. This is illegal and they should all be removed and the road resurfaced immediately. My summary is that the motivation of this change is for a certain demographic of older drivers want any impediments to be removed be it cars temporarily parked or school children and pedestrians in the road rather than the health and safety requirements of our most vulnerable residents being the children who have no voice. Have they or the school been consulted? Where are the risk assessments I do not see being conducted. The emissions and pollution surveys and air quality collecting monitors which have never been installed or used despite being a primary school on a main road? Have lawyers been consulted as laws and national regulations are not and have not been followed. Suggest starting from scratch with a comprehensive analysis with all factors and legal requirements being adhered to.</p>
	COLD ASH (Plan AU62 & AU63) - SUPPORT
88	<p>I would only like to comment on only two and those are those in Cold Ash AU62 and AU63, which I fully support. This is my opinion and not that of Cold Ash Parish Council as a whole. I have no comment regarding any of the other proposals</p>
89	<p>Specifically regarding the proposals for Cold Ash Hill near St Mark's school I support these proposals as the current arrangements create unnecessary traffic around the school. This must make it difficult for the crossing patroller to enable children to cross the road safely.</p>
90	<p>Specifically the removal of parking outside St Marks school is a good thing and wholeheartedly support this.</p>
91	<p>I support the cold ash proposal for removing parking spaces as during school run hours, the parked cars anger drivers which as a result they then pull away too quickly, or are encouraged to make riskier driving decisions in order to get around the cars ahead of oncoming traffic. I have witnessed significant road rage incidents on multiple occasions as a result of school run parking. These spaces are rarely used, if ever, outside of school run time</p>
92	<p>I support the proposals in Cold Ash. Traffic during key morning hours are terrible. Traffic does not flow, leading to a build up of traffic and then risks being taken by drivers to avert or pass through. It would be more sensible and safer to continue to make parking available away from the main road and walk. Car parks at the Hall, church, two pubs are available and should be plentiful. New parking restrictions on the Ridge corner would also be extremely beneficial for the same reasons. Worse still, this location does not have adequate kerb side walking. Not only are cars parked in the road but people are also walking IN the road as a result. As a local resident, I have witnessed several near accidents where traffic has had to avert danger as a result of trying to manoeuvre around parked cars. I am very surprised nobody has yet been seriously injured. An accident waiting to happen, Fully support both sensible provisions.</p>
93	<p>I regularly commute through Cold Ash and support restrictions around St Marks school.</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
94	Au62 and au63 cold ash cause more traffic jams in peak hours and need to be removed. As the traffic builds in the years ahead this will only become worse.
95	Sensible amendments for safety
96	all very reasonable
COLD ASH (Plan AU62 & AU63) - NEUTRAL	
97	I fully support the extension of the parking restrictions on Cold Ash Hill by St Mark's school as the parked cars pose a serious danger to pedestrians, removing these spaces will support and maximize the safety the lollipop lady provides. However, as a local resident (Walters Close, RG18 9PU) I am concerned about the domino effect this will have on the parking in my residential street- which currently has no road markings allowing unrestricted parking.
PANGBOURNE (Plan BT37) - OBJECTION	
98	I object as there isn't any parking in the centre of Pangbourne if you want to quickly pop into Londis at the corner of Horseshoe Road without having to pay for a car park space. Remove these two spaces and you'll just get more people parking on double yellow lines. The car park at the front of shop was taken away in 2010 for no reason at all and ever since then the most convenient place has always been the two spaces on Horseshoe Rd right next to the shop and the other two spaces in front of 4-6. I have no problem with this resident getting a driveway built but there is NO need to remove both spaces. Keep the space in front of No4. There is also need for there to be yellow lines in front of a driveway. I don't have them and neither does anyone else on this road all the way road. Mark it with a white line like the rest of us have.
99	Pangbourne already has too little free parking spaces for people using the shops. Shops there are competing with shops in Tilehurst where there is plentiful free parking for up to 30 mins at least. Removing a space on Horseshoe Road to provide a resident with a driveway makes this worse, simply to enhance the value of that resident's property value and make life a bit more convenient (there is plenty of permit parking on Horseshoe Road so they're assured of a space as a resident there).
100	I object to the proposal in Pangbourne. There is very limited parking, especially now that the car parks charge 24/7. this will accelerate the destruction of Pangbourne as a shopping centre. The benefi of all outweighs the wish of no. 6 to have a dropped curb.
PANGBOURNE (Plan BT37) - SUPPORT	
101	Opportunity for off-road parking at my property. I (Personal information - REDACTED)
102	The amount of illegal parking in Pangbourne is a majorv problem. Increasing the restrictions will not solve the problem UNLESS THE SITUATION IS ADEQUATELY ENFORCED, WHICH IT IS NOT. The enforcement officer is so rarely seen in PANGBOURNE. When they are presnt they spend more time in the official car parks than they do on ON STREET PARKING offences. This needs to be addressed. The NO LOADING restrictions in Pangbourne village are NEVER ENFORCED

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
103	No issues with Pangbourne changes
104	I support the action to change the parking on Horseshoe Rd Pangbourne. This is a very busy corner and removing street parking will make this corner safer for pedestrians
THATCHAM (AV76) - OBJECTION	
105	Specifically on plan AV76 I don't support any restriction past restriction at junctions. There is already sufficient restriction to allow busses safe passage with restrictions on one side of the road. There are parking demands and removal of parking to houses that front onto Urquart road will force cars onto side streets that already have demands.
106	The 'no waiting' proposal for Urquart Road into Coldstream Way outside the Community Centre will cause problems as cars currently use the side of the road opposite the centre to park and it will lead to cars parking outside houses in Coldstream Way (namely numbers from 17 to 3) which is already experiencing problems with cars taking spaces (mostly to enter the park to walk dogs). However I am ambivalent about the no waiting proposal along rest of Urquart Road as it does not affect me, but expect further objections to this may be forthcoming! I think it is only right and fair that the Council write to every home in the proposal zone as some may not have seen the parking review plans
107	I object to the restrictions on Urquhart Road, as many houses do not have many parking spaces and all the side streets are already full of cars. The road was made deliberately wide to ensure cars can park on one side and two vehicles can pass.
108	I am objecting to the introduction of the no waiting areas on Urquhart roads and Braemore close. I have been a resident of Hussars drive for the past 9 years and have not once witnessed the progress of busses been affect such that would warrant such a change to our roads. Notably this road is wide enough for three cars abreast. This alteration will drive cars into neighbouring roads where there is just about enough parking consequently making it so there won't be enough parking. Knock on effects being that the narrow roads off the Urquhart road will not be able to accommodate deliveries or moving vehicles. This change is completely unnecessary and will waste taxpayer money when it would be better spent in tackling actual issues like child safety in crossing Station road for kids going to Kennet school or the madness every morning on Spurcroft road as people drop their kids off at Spurcroft school. Can the council use it money to tackle actual issues which are a problem in our area rather than fictitious ones
109	I currently live at [REDACTED] Urquhart Road. The planned proposal for the no waiting/stopping zone will make it impossible for residents to park as there is already a high volume of cars and it will make it impossible to park. I have lived here my whole life and buses from what I see on a day to day basis do not have an issue with it. At maximum one in three buses will have to wait for approximately 10 seconds if there is a car parked and it lets on past.

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
110	Not necessary and does not add value to the residents. It's also insulting and a waste of resources to run a consultation when this will proceed anyway
	THATCHAM (Plan AV76) - SUPPORT
111	I support these proposals, which aim to enhance the safety of all road users and ensure the safe passage of our public transport.
	THEALE (Plan BV59)- OBJECTION
112	My only objection is for the extension in Theale at Arrowhead Road. A lot of the current free parking is utilised by staff who work at Westcoast Ltd and Southern electric as there is simply not enough parking spaces within the compounds. By extending, you are forcing people to get fined. Unless the free parking time is between 8am and 6PM, with no 2 hour max wait time.
	THEALE (Plan BV59) - SUPPORT
113	We are writing to offer our full support to the proposed parking amendments on Arrowhead Rd. We are writing on behalf of 10 Tenants on Kennet Weir Business Park The chaos caused by people parking along the river side of Arrowhead Rd outside Kennet Weir Business Park must be stopped. Cars park there and prevent access for large lorries and causes traffic along the road. Furthermore, the road seems to have become a place for camper vans and caravans with people permanently living in them so the restrictions would be most welcome to prevent people living on the highway Thank you for proposing these changes, it will make a huge difference to the businesses here.
114	There have been caravans and camper vans on Arrow Head road for years, they do not have road tax or insurance and the occupants urinate on the road and local area theres a continual stench where our employees work. We are struggling with recruitment and when we bring people to site all we have is this eye sore. We are a business why should it be any different to residential areas?
115	Arrowhead Road Theale. Along with the proposals, I would like to see them extended to the Eastern end of Arrowhead Road, where LGV's tend to park all day in the 2 hour restricted parking zones , making the left turn into Arrowhead Road from Station Road very difficult for LGV vehicles
116	My office is on Arrowhead Road Theale, RG7 4AD Just past the old John Lewis Depot. For a long time now, we have had numerous vehicles some look to be abandoned while others are being used a residence some without number plate and others with, I have noticed vans with small generators being used for heat and power these are at times on the public footpath. Someone had a cable coming out of the lamppost across the path and into a van. ML59 GZK and SL53 WGU are two vehicles in particular the others have no registration plates. This is a busy road with many articulated vehicles servicing the businesses which at times are struggling to get through causing the road to become blocked. This is accruing from where the road bends by the old John Lewis Depot to the end of the road, the bend by the John Lewis building is a dangerous blind spot caused because vehicles are left around this bend making it a single lane many

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	times, we hear vehicle skidding to a stop and horns blasting. Can this situation please be sorted before some gets hurt either by RTA or welfare issues.
BUCKLEBURY (Plan AZ67 & AZ68) - OBJECTION	
117	I am generally uneasy at the continuing efforts of WBC, and authorities elsewhere, to make life as difficult as possible for the motorist. I feel there is a limit to the restrictions that are placed on the free movement of traffic, in a society that, like or not, is heavily dependent upon the private motor car. I specifically object to the restrictions proposed in plans AZ67 and AZ68, on the link road between Harts Hill Road and Burdens Heath. I object on the following grounds. 1. The proposal includes the suggestion that the presence of parked cars acts "as a speed reduction measure". Exactly so. Therefore I would suggest that reducing the volume of parked cars will do the opposite - lead to an INCREASE in speeds. 2. The parked cars forming the majority in this road are to do with the three small businesses operating or based in this road, a vehicle servicing garage, a vehicle body repair shop and a roofing business. As a resident of the village, I am pleased that we have small, practical businesses such as these and I believe that Bucklebury Parish Council is wrong to request a measure which will have some degree of negative impact on them. As a frequent user of the road in question, both on foot and as a driver, I do not feel that there exists any real issue in need of addressing
BUCKLEBURY (Plan AZ67 & AZ68)- SUPPORT	
118	Parking is becoming a problem generally. However, I think that you should also look at the congestion caused by parking at Chapel Row caused by patrons of The Bladebone Inn and the Blackbird Cafe. Cars often park along Hatch Lane blocking the view of on-coming traffic from the Kiff Green direction.
119	I am District Councillor and Resident of Bucklebury Ward. The restricts proposed have been discussed at Parish Council, Local Residents and Businesses and were voted for by Bucklebury Parish Council. I fully back the parking restrictions proposed.
GREENHAM (AN79, AN80 & AO80) - SUPPORT	
120	The parked traffic in and out of Woodlands View is blocking access to Greenham Road as well as access to the estate for large vehicles
121	In greenham at the willows school, people park on pavements, disability lower kerbs, outside along the road causing horrendous traffic problems.
122	In reference to AN80 and AN79 these are dangerous junctions with cars frequently parking close to the main road and causing problems both for the local school and other pedestrians using Greenham road. Arguably the no waiting at any time needs to extend further down both roads to create clearer pathways and avoid cars clogging up these roads as they attempt to find limited parking. By removing some of these on-street parking options would encourage some to walk rather than drive to school having additional benefits for the local community as well.

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS ON THE ISSUING OF PERMITS REFERRED TO IN THE PROPOSED ORDER - OBJECTION
123	I oppose the extension of zone H1 in Hungerford to include Bridge Street and The Croft. These roads already have time-limited parking constraints to avoid people parking long term, allowing residents plenty of access. There is no issue parking in these areas day or night as plenty of space remains. However these areas - especially The Croft - are critical for visitors to the Hungerford Nursery School, the Croft Hall, and the Church. This change would have an extremely detrimental impact on these critical parts of Hungerford life.
124	How can Denmark Road be included in a residents permit scheme when it is a private road / existing parking is on private land?
125	There needs to be parking at hungerford Croft for nursery, doctors, dentist & library services making totally residential will impact school runs and make life miserable
126	Parking in Hungerford is rate enough and will push car users to park in the tesco car park causing further congestion on the high street . Parking restrictions at the croft hungerford does not recognise the facilities available here, such as the doctors, the croft hall, the church the tennis club, the bowls clubman of which are used by people with mobility challenges. Increasing Parking restrictions will reduce accessibility to these facilities
127	(1) I am in general support of the proposal. However, I do not understand the inclusion of the following "Private Streets" in E1 Zone within this new parking order. Junction Terrace, Aston Road, Denmark Road & Orts Road are all categorised as "Private Streets" on the West Berkshire Road Maps (ie - Tracks/Roads that are neither Private nor Adopted). I can presume that the intention is that residents of these "Private Streets" will now be permitted to purchase Residents Permits in the E1 Zone. (2) To be honest there is already severe pressure on E1 Parking in Hambridge Road with all "parking slots" already fully occupied from around 5pm to 8am every evening & through the night. We also have an "abandoned car" opposite our house (44 Hambridge Road) for the last 10 weeks which takes up an additional 1.5 parking slots. It has been reported to both the Thames Valley Police & West Berkshire Council but I understand that the legal process may take months! (3) In summary, we support the proposal apart from our concern that the E1 Residents Parking Zone is already fully occupied! (i.e. There are already more permit holders than parking slots.) Hence it is unclear where additional permit holders (Residents from Junction Terrace, Denmark Road, Orts Road & Ashton Road) will park unless the council releases additional parking locations for residents permit holders.
	MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS - OBJECTIONS
128	I object to some of the proposals as again there is limited provision for people trying to park in town. As part of these proposals you need to show where you are increasing options, not only removing options.
129	Adding to or increasing the parking restrictions will only be viable if you have the Budget to hire a significant number of additional traffic wardens to enforce them and can find a way to issue PCN's not only to drivers in town who ignore them but who also park on the pavements. e.g Vehicles, (including taxis I might add) regularly pull up on

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	<p>the pavement at the clocktower which has double yellow line road markings. Vehicles can be observed regularly parking on the Yellow lines and the pavement within 10 metres of junction of St Michaels Road and Bartholomew street whilst they pop to the shops opposite. This not only obstructs pedestrian access but contravenes the highway code on more than 1 level, yet there is a noticeable absence of traffic wardens to enforce this I suspect the whole exercise is, in fact, just a thinly disguised revenue raising attempt by WBC. If the car parking charges were not so high people would use the car parks more frequently. Currently people wishing to visit business premises on Bartholomew street from Market street up to Black boys bridge can use the laybys free for 30 mins to 'pop in' If you make these resident only parking or remove them altogether this is going to have a dramatic effect on footfall to those businesses. Where is the evidence to support these moves, i.e. road traffic surveys etc or is this, as I suspect part of the Councils 'Grand plan' to remove all vehicle access to Newbury Town centre and only allow pedestrian and Cycle access and in the process place the already struggling businesses under even more financial pressure</p>
130	<p>I am writing to express my firm opposition to the proposals outlined in Parking Review 36. These plans—reducing parking spaces, expanding restrictions, and introducing no-waiting zones—are yet another example of West Berkshire Council pushing through deeply unpopular measures under the guise of “consultation.” Let’s be clear: this is not meaningful consultation. It is a box-ticking exercise. Time and again, residents raise valid concerns, only to be ignored as the council proceeds with its predetermined agenda. This review is no different. The proposals are ill-conceived, unfair, and out of touch with the realities faced by the majority of residents. Reducing parking and increasing restrictions will disproportionately impact working families, carers, the elderly, and those with mobility issues—people who rely on their vehicles because public transport outside major towns is unreliable or non-existent. These changes will make daily life harder, not easier. Moreover, this review reeks of a revenue-generating scheme. The council appears more interested in issuing fines than in serving the community. At a time when many residents are already struggling financially, introducing more punitive measures is not just tone-deaf—it’s exploitative. I urge the council to abandon these proposals and start listening to the people it claims to represent. We need practical, inclusive transport policies—not ideological experiments that punish the many to serve the few.</p>
131	<p>I object to the changes in Newbury on the basis that some areas of Newbury should also be included. This may appear strange but it there are areas of West Fields which should also be included which are not. The reason I am objecting however is that when other areas have parking restrictions then people will find other areas to park where there are no restrictions. This has become very clear with changes in parking at the Council with more and more Council staff and shoppers clearly parking in Craven Road and others areas of West Field where there is limited or no parking restrictions making it harder and harder for residents to park. Therefore my objection in relation to the Newbury situation is that it does not go far enough.</p>
132	<p>It is very disappointing that the situation in Berkeley Road has not been addressed. Residents suffer in this road, due to the high number of restriction free parking spaces. Residents cannot get parked due to the number of free spaces being treated as a car park. When Sovereign Housing exited the town it was immediately noticeable how much easier it was to park. now we have lots of West Berkshire Council staff using our street as a car park - they should take their lanyards off. Why must residents pay for</p>

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	parking permits when the council gives our street to free parking. the proposed suggestions are inadequate - only addressing need in a very few areas.
133	The areas around shops and deliveries that cause the problem have not been addressed. Instead you are targeting individuals when a larger problem is Lorries making deliveries in large articulated vehicles, on our smaller roads. Not individual cars. The reason behind this is not specific enough to each individual area for me to support this. It feels like a pointless expensive exercise that isn't tackling bigger issues such as inappropriate behaviour in parks and on streets, crime, pollution to area with littering and fly tipping.
134	How are you going to encourage people to use public transport if you can't provide adequate parking for them. I notice now that I can rarely get a parking space at the railway station car park because wbc have reserved whole floors for their staff. So I am forced to look elsewhere. This will be the same all over the district. You will just push the "problem" not solve it.
135	These changes seem to be a change for the sake of changing. The cost of the changes planned seem to be poorly thought though based on the challenges of money within the council currently. Surely, this money could be used to support essential services rather than changes to parking structure
136	I don't object per-se to formalising existing no parking and no stopping proposals to ensure junctions and thoroughfares are kept clear, however I do have object where it causes further inconvenience to disabled drivers, more specifically where the driver on their behalf, there doesn't appear to be a provision of the ability to drop-off a mobility-impaired person at a convenient location so as to reduce the distance to walk to their target location. I wish to see clarification and amendment to include Blue Badge holders in stopping zones that is afforded to busses and taxis. I object to increasing creep of parking permit zones. It is prohibitive to residents and their visitors, it moves parking congestion from one area to wider areas.
137	I am writing to express concerns regarding the potential implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). It is anticipated that implementing the CPZ will lead to an overspill of parking into non-CPZ zones. Furthermore, current residents do not widely report parking as a significant issue. In addition, this measure will negatively affect local businesses by making it more difficult for customers to park close by, which could cause their trade to suffer further.
138	Teach children the highway code, that way many fewer will be injured on the roads. All these prohibitions are stated to be for "safety concerns". Where is the evidence that the current arrangements are unsafe? What is the accident rate? Just another load of LibDem anti-car bias.
139	Do not stop people parking near the central area, the town needs people to be able to access the centre for the shops and businesses to survive. It is acceptable to make some safe areas near schools and junctions though.
140	There aren't enough parking spaces in the area and there are too many confusing restrictions.

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
141	Free street parking encourages people to visit places like Newbury
142	Permit parking just pushes the parking problem to surrounding roads. Residents should be parking on their driveways or in garages.
143	There needs to be more on street parking available not less. Our businesses are dying because people cannot find parking so go elsewhere
144	Parking in Newbury is already too difficult and expensive.
145	This is non essential work and the council has not got a good enough financial position to spend money on it.
146	There is no parking for the people that can't walk to the school. Parent that have to then go to work
147	Many of the areas have no available parking for visitors with no alternative areas except those that cause congestion in busier areas.
148	We're are we supposed to park vechile tax insuranced some only park few days then move we spend money in local shops mill lane Newbury laundrette are you trying to close these business down
149	Because of an accident I cannot walk very well ! I use the butchers , the chemist and the Co opp frequently! the co op car park is always full! I I am an OAP
150	There is already not enough visitor parking in these areas
	MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS - SUPPORT
151	People living in the effected areas should have priority for parking. I would like to extend the restricted parking area in Craven Road west beyond the current zone. This area is heavily used by personnel working in town for free parking.
152	I am a resident with a SW2 permit. There have been opening of new rental properties in the area over the last few years meaning that there is an increased demand for spaces in the area. Combine that with the fact that there are copious amounts of people using the spaces for 60 minutes. Often parking is unavailable. As a resident this can be frustrating.
153	Provide safer environments for local residents. Ensure those residents themselves then have somewhere to park.
154	Too often there are vehicles parked on the road obstructing the roads making cycling more dangerous. Increasingly, this offence is carried out by delivery drivers. They seem to drive as they please, park as they please, as long as it is convenient to them with no regards to other road users.
155	As a Newbury resident that lives in a road with an Infant school, I understand the importance of ensuring residents are prioritised for car parking and that roads are

Ref	CONSULTATION RESPONSE
	made as safe as possible for children. I also understand the need for the residential parking areas in the other streets listed.
156	Although not directly affected by the proposals, safety must be the top priority in restricting parking particularly near schools and junctions.
157	sensible precautions and improvements
158	Currently we experience parking by non residents restricting availability for residents
159	Safer for cyclists. More space for people with children (push chairs)
MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS - NEUTRAL	
160	This is a flawed survey. The proposals stretch from Lambourn to Pangbourne yet the survey asks a simplistic question "Do I support the proposal?" Which one? Surely the question should be asked: which of these proposals are the comments about? Then ...do I support it? This is an example of lazy thinking. It undermines confidence in consultation as the results will not be a valid reflection of what the public think about each proposal
161	I don't have a car, nor live in any of these roads - but would ask that any parking restrictions takes into account the safety of pedestrians and ensuring sufficient pavement space for buggies and wheelchairs.
162	Traffic safety is very important, and restrictions to protect junctions are necessary. On the other hand, without detailed maps of the affected areas, I am unable to assess the potential impacts on any local businesses caused by a strict 'no waiting' policy.
163	It willnot directly affect me
164	It doesn't matter what I say or do, West Berks will do what they like.