

Parking Review Amendment 37

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES RECEIVED

1. General responses:

1.1 Thames Valley Police provided no objections and only requested that standard exemptions were included for emergency service vehicles in support of their duties.

a **Officer comment** – there is already a standard exemption for emergency service vehicles included in the Principal Consolidated Traffic Order from 2009 for our parking restrictions.

2. ALDERMASTON

2.1 **Wasing Lane (Plan BJ81)** Two objections and three responses in support of the proposals.

a **Objection summary** – Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds.

b **Officer comments** – Complaints were reported of regular obstruction issues for through traffic when vehicles parked on both sides of the road outside of Aldermaston CofE Primary School during school peak periods of drop-off and pick-up. The proposed restriction will prevent inconsiderate parking on the south side to address this. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

3. BEENHAM

3.1 **A4 Bath Road (layby) (Plan BL73)** Two objections to the proposals.

a **Objection summary** – Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed restrictions will only apply to the layby and not the live A4 carriageway and will ensure turnover in the driver rest facility. There will be no impact on traffic speeds as a result of this proposal. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

4. CHIEVELEY

4.1 **East Lane (Plan AN46)** 14 objections and five responses in support of the proposals. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary**

(i) Stakeholders, including Downland Pharmacy, The Downland Practice, and members of the community, collectively objected to the proposal, which they considered unnecessary, disproportionate, and unsupported by evidence and were concerned would cause significant adverse impacts on access to essential healthcare services locally.

(ii) They considered there to be no recorded evidence of safety concerns associated with existing on-street parking and neither the

Pharmacy nor the Practice was aware of any accidents, near misses, visibility issues, or congestion problems that would justify the introduction of double yellow lines. They further complained that the justification for the proposal did not include collision data, enforcement records, or risk assessments.

(iii) The proposal incorrectly attributes parking demand to patients of The Downland Practice. The GP surgery has a large, dedicated car park for its own patients. In contrast, Downland Pharmacy customers have no alternative parking provision, despite representing the primary source of on-street parking. The pharmacy serves a wide catchment area and provides essential NHS services within a rural region recognised as a "pharmacy desert" and this proposal would have a direct negative impact on this facility.

(iv) A significant proportion of pharmacy users are elderly, disabled, mobility-impaired, or managing long-term conditions. The removal of proximate parking would create a substantial barrier to accessing vital healthcare services, exacerbating existing rural health inequalities. Concerns were also raised that the Council had not demonstrated compliance with its obligations under the Equality Act 2010, and no evidence has been presented to show that a suitable Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out.

(v) The proposed double yellow lines represent the most restrictive form of parking control. Stakeholders emphasise that less restrictive alternatives, such as short-stay bays, time-limited restrictions, or measures aligned with pharmacy operating hours have not been adequately considered, despite their potential to address any safety concerns while maintaining essential access.

(vi) The proposal is likely to produce negative unintended consequences, including displacement of vehicles into narrower and less safe parts of East Lane, increased congestion, and inappropriate pressure on the GP surgery's car park. These impacts may undermine both current and future healthcare provision and adversely affect community wellbeing.

(vii) Stakeholders requested that the proposals be withdrawn or reconsidered and a full evaluation of alternative measures that uphold both public safety and equitable access to healthcare be undertaken instead.

b Officer comments

(i) The request for parking restrictions was initially made in November 2017 by the Practice Manager at the Surgery at that time who raised serious concerns about inconsiderate parking and obstruction for emergency service vehicles. Unfortunately this location could not be included in any parking scheme during 2018/19 and the subsequent impact of Covid and resourcing issues within the Traffic & Road Safety team further delayed work on parking schemes for a lengthy period to date.

(ii) Chieveley Parish Council raised similar concerns about obstruction of the area fronting the Pharmacy in July 2023 and asked for yellow lines to encourage drivers to park in the available off-street car park spaces.

(iii) Following the significant level of objection to these parking proposals from the new Practice Manager for the Surgery and from the doctors and management staff at the Surgery, the Parish Council was contacted directly to confirm from a local perspective whether the parking continued to be a serious road safety concern. This was in order to help us determine whether the proposed restrictions should be introduced regardless of local objection.

(iv) Their response indicated that they now considered the parking to have a beneficial effect on traffic speeds and asked that the parking could instead be reconsidered at a point in the future if a local planning application for a new housing development was to go ahead.

(v) In light of these comments and the objections received it is recommended that the proposed restriction is OMITTED from the final scheme.

4.2 Hazeldene (Plan AN46) Three objections to the proposals, five responses in support and five wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reason given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** – Concerns were raised that the proposed yellow lines were linked to a planning application for a housing development in the vicinity and the restrictions would also impact on the viability of the Pharmacy and access to local healthcare, with similar complaints that were raised to the East Lane proposals above.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed yellow lines were intended as proactive measures to address potential displacement of parked cars from outside the Pharmacy and would also reinforce Rule 243 of The Highway Code relating to parking within 10 metres of a junction. If the Officer Recommendation for East Lane is approved and the proposed measures outside the pharmacy are omitted there should be no significant displacement. **In light of the objections received and comment from Chieveley PC it is recommended that the proposed restriction is OMITTED from the final scheme.**

5. GREENHAM

5.1 Hambridge Lane (Plan AP75 & AQ75) Three objections to the proposals, one response in support and one wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – There is already very limited parking in the industrial estate and the proposals would make it even worse. Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds.

b **Officer comments** – The proposals address a continuing obstruction issue on this only exit from the Hambridge Lane industrial area, with parked vans and cars causing congestion and road safety concerns close to the roundabout feature

on Hambridge Road. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6. **HUNGERFORD**

6.1 **Charnham Park (Plan L66 & L67)** Three objections to the proposals, five responses in support and two wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - The proposal is seen as a good start, but should go further and introduce 24/7 restrictions on both sides for the full length, not just restrictions prohibiting overnight parking by HGVs. The main parking problems occur during the day due to vehicles speeding past parked cars when there is opposing traffic, which is a hazardous overtaking manoeuvre due to the road being reduced to single lane. Double yellow lines on both sides would improve forward visibility for drivers, especially for visitors to the town unfamiliar with the road on completion of the new Wetlands Visitor Centre.

b **Officer comments** – The proposals are intended to address ongoing complaints regarding inconsiderate and obstructive parking and more recently a request from Hungerford Town Council to address environmental hazard concerns caused by HGV drivers using the area for overnight parking and as a toilet. The proposals will lengthen the existing double yellow line restrictions in order to shorten the space for overtaking parked cars on this busy industrial estate road, but does not remove all available parking. Experience shows that some level of on-street parking does have a beneficial effect on traffic speeds and on the lengths where forward visibility is good the daytime parking has been allowed to remain. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.2 **Tealgate (Plan L66 & L67)** Two objections to the proposals, three responses in support and three wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposals should not be introduced unless enforcement takes place.

b **Officer comments** – The proposals were requested by a local Site Manager to address obstruction concerns for large delivery vehicles accessing Units 1 & 2 in this industrial estate. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.3 **High Street (Plan L68)** Six objections to the proposals, two responses in support and one wishing to record a neutral position.. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Parking is already difficult and removing or restricting spaces will worsen the situation as it is considered important for visitors to the northern end of town and shouldn't be restricted to goods vehicles only. There was some support to prioritising goods vehicles but suggested that cars be allowed a short 2-minute stop, as many drivers only need to quickly post a letter and there's no nearby alternative.

b **Officer comments** – The bay is currently subject to a daytime ‘No Waiting’ restriction. Informally this allows the area to be used as a loading bay for local businesses. By converting the bay to a formal loading bay it will clarify the availability of this space and allow clearer signs to be erected on-site. Hungerford Town Council had asked that the bay also be made a ‘Coach parking’ facility for visitors to the town and local cafes, but it is not permitted to combine both restriction types. The bay could however be used by coach parties for short periods to allow passengers to drop-off and be collected. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.4 **Salisbury Row (A338) (Plan L70)** Two objections to the proposals, five responses in support and two wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds. The parking is fine as it is.

b **Officer comments** – The proposals are intended to shorten the available parking space and ensure that parked vehicles do not extrude out onto the live carriageway of the A338 and will address local road safety concerns. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.5 **Fairfields Close (Plan L70)** One objection to the proposals, two responses in support and five wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed junction protection yellow lines will address road safety concerns in the area of Hungerford Primary School and ensure the dropped kerb pedestrian crossover is not obstructed. This road has been waiting for formal parking restrictions since it was adopted onto the highway network in 2018. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.6 **Tarrants Hill (Plan L70)** Three objections to the proposals, five responses in support and two wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - The proposed changes are detrimental to road safety as the removal of parked cars would result in increased traffic speeds through the narrow section of Tarrants Hill and the proposal does not address displacement or suggest where vehicles could be parked instead. The proposed changes would also significantly worsen parking difficulties for residents of Orchard Park Close and those fronting Tarrants Hill lay-by. Parking is already extremely limited, often requiring residents to park several streets away. Further restrictions would make the situation worse.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed restrictions have been requested by local residents experiencing obstruction problems when exiting their driveways and also requested by Hungerford Town Council to address road safety concerns for vehicles turning off Salisbury Road and into Tarrant's Hill caused by vehicles parking close to the junction. Residents of Orchard Park Close do not immediately front this road and although parking may be at a premium locally there is an off-street block of 38 garages available for local properties that could be made better use of. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

6.7 **Morley Place (Plan L70)** Two objections to the proposals, three responses in support and three wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - The proposed changes would significantly worsen parking difficulties for residents of Orchard Park Close and those fronting Tarrant's Hill lay-by. Parking is already extremely limited, often requiring residents to park several streets away. Further restrictions would make the situation worse.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed yellow lines will address road safety concerns at the junction with Tarrant's Hill and reinforces Rule 243 of The Highway Code related to parking within 10 metres of a junction where vehicles should not be parked anyway. Residents of Orchard Park Close do not immediately front this road and although parking may be at a premium locally there is an off-street block of 38 garages available for local properties that could be made better use of. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

7 NEWBURY

7.1 **Andover Road (A343) (Plan AL77 & AL78)** Eleven objections to the proposals, 23 responses in support and five wishing to record a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** –

(i) Removing roadside parking will create serious access issues for residents, especially for families with young children, elderly relatives, and people with mobility needs as the alternative layby parking is too distant and too small. In addition, the removal of convenient space for visitors would isolate residents and make routine family visits or tradespeople's access extremely difficult.

(ii) The alternative layby parking is always full and routinely used by non-resident commuters. The layby also has a history of vehicle theft/damage and is out of sight from homes leaving residents without safe reliable parking.

(iii) The proposed changes disproportionately benefit cyclists, despite low cycling traffic in the area and there are concerns about property devaluation and the long-term impact on residents without driveways.

(iv) If the proposals are introduced regardless of local objections the Permit parking should be provided free of charge as charging for them is seen as unfair and financially motivated.

(v) Several residents believe these proposed changes reflect political or personal motives, rather than community needs and feel the council's process lacks transparency, evidence and meaningful consultation.

b Officer comments

There is significant level of support for safety to be improved on this cycle facility, which has been in place since at least 2009. It is accepted that some residents with limited off-street parking may be negatively impacted by the proposals, but our priority is to support Active Travel measures and address road safety concerns along those routes where possible and provision has been made within the proposals to reserve daytime parking space in the layby area for those residents wishing to opt into a permit parking scheme should they choose to do so. Providing parking Permits free of charge would not however be allowed.

The proposals will remove commuter parking from the layby and provide space for residents and their visitors, although it is accepted that this may not be a convenient location for some residents. The majority of properties do however have some form of off-street parking available to them even if some of this space is limited.

It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.

7.2 Bartholomew Street (Plan AL75) Five objections to the proposals, six responses in support and eleven wishing to record a neutral position. Five additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a Objection summary - Many restaurants and food venues rely on accessible parking and residents object to removing free parking after 6pm. This evening charge will deter people from going out and is unjustified.

b Officer comments – The proposed restriction addresses an anomaly in Bartholomew Street as this daytime loading bay is the only bay with no on-street charging in the evening and is unrestricted parking all day Sunday. This bay was omitted in error from Parking Amendment 34 in 2025. The proposed change ensures there is a consistent restriction in Bartholomew Street and avoids confusion for visitors to the town. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

7.3 Meadow Road (AL79) Two objections to the proposals, nine responses in support and 13 wishing to record a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a Objection summary - The proposed parking restrictions are unnecessary and could harm local trade, as the area is commonly used for short-term parking by people conducting daily business.

b Officer comments – The proposed yellow lines will address road safety concerns at a junction in the vicinity of St Johns Infant & Nursery School and reinforces Rule 243 of The Highway Code related to parking within 10 metres of a junction. There is sufficient parking space remaining on Meadow Road away from

the junction that would meet the needs of customers to the local business. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

7.4 **Orchardene (Plan AN72)** Three objections to the proposals, seven responses in support and 14 wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** – This area is needed by locals when visiting and there is no justification for the restriction.

b **Officer comments** – The proposal will only prevent parking on the north side where there are no residential frontages, as parking both sides in this road in the vicinity of St Joseph's Catholic Primary School has been raised by residents as being a road safety and obstruction concern. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

8 **PADWORTH**

8.1 **(A4 Bath Road (layby) (Plan BM72)** One response in support of the proposal and one wishing to record a neutral position. Two objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Officer comments** – No valid objections received. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

9 **PURLEY-on-THAMES**

9.1 **Long Lane (Plan BX39)** 22 responses in support of the proposals and three wishing to record a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Officer comments** – No valid objections received. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

9.2 **Wintringham Way (Plan BZ37)** Two objections to the proposals, eleven responses in support and nine wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – A resident believes that parking should only be restricted on the Social Club side, not both sides (outside numbers 55–63). They state that inconsiderate parking on the Social Club side frequently blocks their driveway and that the proposed restriction would worsen access issues rather than solve them.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed restrictions were requested to address obstructive parking at the entrance into River Gardens who were concerned about emergency access and opposite the entrances to Purley Park Social Club, as it also presented problems for deliveries and visitors to the club. Parking in the area has been a regular reported problem since the Covid lockdown period when this estate became a favoured spot for locals visiting the area and walking the Thames towpath. Properties on the south side of this length of Wintringham Way have some off-street parking available to them however there is ample unrestricted parking space locally when they have visitors and are unable to access the off-street spaces. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

9.3 **Chestnut Grove (Plan BZ37)** Five objections to the proposals, eleven responses in support and seven wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – The proposed clearway would force drivers to be on the wrong side of the road, creating unsafe conditions and increasing the likelihood of near misses near the junction. The bus sits stationary for long periods and this is unsafe for overtaking vehicles. Residents from River Gardens frequently relocate their cars to Chestnut Grove during flood threats and restricting parking would reduce essential flood-management parking space. The yellow lines are unnecessary.

b **Officer comments** – The proposal only formalises and slightly extends an existing Bus Stop Clearway that is in place and ensures buses are not obstructed on their approach to this terminal stop for the Route 16 Sky Blue Service with Reading Buses, which had been reported as presenting a problem and requiring bus drivers to reverse back into the Clearway. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

10 **STRATFIELD MORTIMER**

10.1 **Tower Gardens (Plan BX84 & BX85)** Two objections to the proposals and seven responses in support. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – The proposals do not provide safe areas for delivery vans to stop. The current restrictions on The Street also do not extend far enough to stop cars from parking close to the Tower Gardens exit, which makes it difficult to see oncoming traffic.

b **Officer comments** – The proposal will extend the current yellow lines out onto The Street and prohibit parking within 10 metres to reinforce Rule 243 of the Highway Code. They will also formalise and make permanent the yellow line restrictions that were introduced under Temporary traffic Order. The housing development is still in construction phases and the parking restriction is still considered necessary to prevent obstruction for building materials and other plant for the site. Delivery drivers are permitted to park on yellow line restrictions for short periods while loading or unloading provided they do not cause an obstruction. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

11 **THATCHAM**

11.1 **Lower Way (Plan AU74)** Seven objections to the proposals, ten responses in support and one wishing to record a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary**

(i) The original justification for the yellow lines which were introduced in 2020 due to the route forming part of National Cycle Route 4 is no longer valid as improvements to the existing pavements, shared-use paths, and a recently introduced traffic signal crossing already provide adequate provision for cyclists and pedestrians.

(ii) The original lines were implemented without proper engagement with residents and the restriction presents significant problems for those households with insufficient off-street parking space for visitors and family vehicles who now struggle to find alternative parking locally.

(iii) Safety has worsened rather than improved since the introducing of the temporary yellow lines, as traffic speeds have increased due to the lack of parked vehicles which used to act as a form of traffic calming on this busy distributor road.

b Officer comments – The double yellow lines on Lower Way were introduced under a Temporary Traffic Order as part of Active Travel enhancements for Thatcham. This proposal was intended to make those temporary measures permanent. It is however agreed that there is a formal segregated cycle facility already in place on the north side on that length of Lower Way between The Moors roundabout and the lane immediately west of No 16 Lower Way, with a newly introduced Toucan Crossing facility to link to the segregated facility on the south side past the new Lambourn Meadows housing development and there is no absolute requirement for cyclists to use the carriageway. **In light of these comments and the objections received it is recommended that the proposed restriction is OMITTED from the final scheme and that the double yellow lines on site are removed.**

11.2 Green Lane (Plan AU74) Five objections to the proposals, eight responses in support and three wishing to record a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a Objection summary - Parking on Green Lane is considered essential for both the church and Crown Mead due to limited existing parking. Agreement that parking should be kept away from junctions but there is no reason to restrict parking along the straight length up to the chicane, as residents will simply park in Meadow Close instead. Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposal is a waste of money when you are looking to cut services and increase charges.

b Officer comments – The proposal will provide junction protection for Green Lane with Lower Way, where currently there is only a double yellow line restriction on the east kerbline. It will also prohibit parking opposite the junction with Meadow Close and will address residents' complaints related to turning in and out of their road and address visibility concerns for traffic turning into Green Lane from Lower Way. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

11.3 Meadow Close (Plan AU74) Four objections to the proposals, eight responses in support and one wishing to record a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a Objection summary - Parking near the church is already inadequate, especially during stressful events like funerals and these proposals would make it worse. Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposal is a waste of money when you are looking to cut services and increase charges.

b **Officer comments** – The proposed yellow lines will prohibit parking on the junction with Green Lane only and reinforces Rule 243 of The Highway Code related to parking within 10 metres of a junction where vehicles should not be parked anyway. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

11.4 **Roger Croft Drive (Plan AS73)** Two objections to the proposals, three responses in support and seven wishing to record a neutral position. Three additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposal is a waste of money when you are looking to cut services and increase charges.

b **Officer comments** - The proposed yellow lines address reported road safety concerns from vehicles parking close to the junction with Pound Lane on this recently adopted road and reinforce Rule 243 of The Highway Code relating to parking within 10 metres of a junction. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

11.5 **Victor Road (AW74)** Two objections to the proposals, four responses in support and five wishing to record a neutral position. Four additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposal is unjustified.

b **Officer comments** – The proposal was requested following complaints received regarding significant damage to the wide grass verge continuing to occur at the junction splay and the hazard that mud presents to users of the footway as residents illegally cross the area to access their front gardens. The proposed junction protection yellow lines will prohibit vehicles from parking on the grass verge as restrictions apply to the full width of public highway. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised and that preventative measures are introduced to physically address the issue of residents illegally using the footway and pedestrian dropped kerbs to access their front gardens.**

11.6 **Enterprise Way (Plan AY75)** Four objections to the proposals, four responses in support and five wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary**

(i) Formal objections were submitted by a consultancy of behalf of Forterra Plc who operate a major building supply production facility on the south side of Enterprise Way. The objections indicated that the removal of on-street unrestricted areas would significantly impact on the operational effectiveness of the business and if the proposal is introduced may result in

Forterra having to undergo costly redevelopment within site to compensate for lost parking.

(ii) The unrestricted spaces provide a useful stacking area for HGVs to wait as part of the production process of building blocks produced on site and if removed this could result in HGVs parking in less safe area, which would conflict with Statement of Reasons for this proposal and will have an adverse impact on the highway.

(iii) The proposal would remove approximately 30 parking spaces used by local businesses and HGVs and was unjustified and could result in vehicles displacing into nearby residential roads.

(iv) The objection concluded that the reasons for the proposal on road safety, road usability and amenity grounds and lack of any recorded traffic incidents in the last ten years demonstrated the proposals were not supported by local highway evidence.

b Officer comments

(i) The location was included within the parking scheme following complaints of obstruction for HGVs accessing the M&S distribution centre located at the end of Enterprise Way. The primary area of concern was however the area opposite the entrance to their depot as employees parked their despite having adequate parking space within site. This often results in incoming HGVs waiting along Enterprise Way and during busy periods an operative acts as guided assistance into the site and off the highway.

(ii) In light of the objections received and having given consideration to the primary highway concerns of Gist Ltd at the M&S depot it is recommended that the proposal is amended and the proposed waiting restriction between Pipers Way and the entrance to the Forterra site are OMITTED from the final scheme and that the proposed waiting restrictions opposite the Gist M&S site entrance should remain as part of the final scheme.

11.7 Colthrop Lane (Plan AZ75 & AZ76) Four objections to the proposals, three responses in support and six wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a Objection summary - Removing parking from the industrial estate will displace vehicles into nearby residential areas in Thatcham. The current parking is important for locals and business visitors and its removal would negatively affect trade. Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposals are a waste of money and there is frustration with the council's decision-making and consultation process.

b Officer comments – Displacement into residential areas is considered unlikely given the distances involved and whilst some businesses may consider the parking important for trade most have ample off-street parking available for their staff. The proposals were requested by businesses in the industrial estate to

address regular obstruction issues increasingly caused by large HGV trailer units being left unattached on the highway and introducing a safety concern for through traffic. In addition to businesses located on Gables Way and Colthrop Lane there is a significant number of large Vehicle Operating Centres located on the north side of the level crossing which all use this access road resulting in considerable number of traffic movements. Preventing trailer units being left on the highway is an enforcement matter for DVSA but historically this has been infrequent in our area and parking restrictions are considered necessary. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

11.8 Gables Way (Plan AZ76, BA75 & BA76) Two objections to the proposals, three responses in support and six wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Obstructions such as parked vehicles act as traffic calming features and their removal will result in increased speeds and pollution. The proposals are a waste of money.

b **Officer comments** – The proposals were requested by businesses in the industrial estate to address regular obstruction issues increasingly caused by large HGV trailer units being left unattached on the highway and introducing a safety concern for through traffic. In addition to businesses located on Gables Way and Colthrop Lane there is a significant number of large Vehicle Operating Centres located on the north side of the level crossing which all use this access road resulting in considerable number of traffic movements. Preventing trailer units being left on the highway is an enforcement matter for DVSA but historically this has been infrequent in our area and parking restrictions are considered necessary. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

12 THEALE

12.1 Englefield Road (Plan BT56 & BT57) Two objections to the proposals, nine responses in support and one wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** - Englefield Parish Council objected to the proposals and the current restrictions which they state are routinely ignored and poorly enforced. They believe additional restrictions west of the school could displace parking further toward North Street, Deadman's Lane, and the A340, creating new hazards on bends and junctions and question the value of extending restrictions if current ones are unenforced. They also requested that the proposals be extended further, up to the Golf Club entrance on North Street. A resident requested that the restriction only operate during daytime, including weekends, to cover periods when the playing fields were being used.

b **Officer comments** – The advertised restrictions are intended to make permanent the yellow lines that were introduced under Temporary Traffic Order as part of the supporting works for the new Theale Primary School and are already in place. The current restrictions do not cover the junction with North Street and these proposals rectify that and will provide junction protection. Enforcement of parking restrictions outside schools is a problem across the district due to the wide area

the enforcement team has to cover, but the effectiveness of enforcement is not a consideration for this parking scheme. If displacement does occur along North Street up to the Golf Club this can be considered in a future scheme. A restriction that operates throughout the day and late into the evening was requested by Theale Parish Council for the area opposite the exit to the village recreation hall car park and a 'daytime only' restriction would not address the obstruction issues for exiting vehicles that had been raised. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

12.2 North Street (Plan BT56) Two objections to the proposals, seven responses in support and two wishing to record a neutral position. One additional objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Objection summary** – The proposals should be extended further, up to the Golf Club entrance on North Street as current parking behaviour by parents dropping off/picking up children from school is creating safety hazards for members and visitors to the golf club. Some of the problems would be addressed by providing additional parking for parents at peak times at the Recreation Hall.

b **Officer comments** – The advertised restrictions for North Street will provide junction protection and reinforce Rule 243 of the Highway Code relating to parking within 10 metres of a junction. If displacement does occur along North Street up to the Golf Club this can be considered in a future parking scheme. The Recreation Hall car park is already in use as a park & Stride facility for the school but unfortunately a significant number of parents continue to drive up to the school entrance and this scheme cannot address this inconsiderate behaviour. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

13 **TILEHURST**

13.1 Longleat Drive (Plan BX42) Seven objections to the proposals, 14 responses in support and three wishing to record a neutral position. Two additional objections were received with no supporting detail or reasons given and were discounted.

a **Objection summary** – The proposals would displace school-related parking into adjacent narrow residential roads, worsening congestion, introducing new obstruction problems in those roads for emergency service vehicles and delivery vehicles and would raise problems for elderly residents who rely on on-street parking to be available for regular visitors and carers. The existing restrictions are rarely enforced, so new ones will not solve the problem.

b **Officer comments** – The proposal to extend the current length of No waiting during school peak periods of drop-off and pick-up was requested by a resident and supported by the Ward Member at that time and prevents vehicles being parked on both sides of the road and causing obstruction problems. In order to address potential displacement into areas where parking would continue to cause concerns the proposal included junction protection measures to reinforce Rule 243 of The Highway Code related to parking within 10 metres of a junction, where vehicles should not be parked anyway. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

13.2 **Voller Drive (Plan BY52)** Six responses in support of the proposals and three wishing to record a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Officer comments** – No valid objections received. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

13.3 **Highworth Way (Plan BX44)** Six responses in support of the proposals and three wishing to record a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Officer comments** – No valid objections received. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**

13.5 **Heathfield Avenue (Plan BZ50 & BZ51)** Six responses in support of the proposals and four wishing to record a neutral position. One objection was received with no supporting detail or reason given and was discounted.

a **Officer comments** – No valid objections received. **It is recommended that the proposal is introduced as advertised.**