

## Annex B

### OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>Scheme:</b>	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2014		
	<b>B3408 LONDON ROAD, BINFIELD – ‘NO WAITING AT ANY TIME’ RESTRICTIONS</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> October 2014	<b>No. of Objections Received:</b>	0

<b>Objector</b>	<b>Summary of Objection/ comment</b>	<b>Officers Comments</b>	<b>Decision</b> Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.
			<b>Proceed as advertised.</b>

#### **Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:**

Cllr I Leake – No comments received

Cllr Miss B Wilson – No comments received

Cllr J Harrison – No objection in principle to the parking restrictions from me but I have not received any evidence or argument either way. My only question is that I have not seen any problematic parking on the road, so is it worth the cost of the exercise?  
Given the limit on the amount of money we have to spend I hope the Executive Member will weigh up the benefits (what are they?) against the cost. Just because the money is in a budget does not mean we have to spend it.

## OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>Scheme:</b>	<b>BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2014</b>		
	<b>UPPER BROADMOOR ROAD – ‘NO WAITING AT ANY TIME’ RESTRICTIONS</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014</b>	<b>No. of Objections Received:</b>	<b>0</b>

Objector	Summary of Objection/ comment	Officers Comments	Decision <small>Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.</small>
			<b>Proceed as advertised.</b>

**Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:**

Cllr R Wade – Please proceed

Cllr J Finnie – No comments received

## OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>Scheme:</b>	<b>BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2014</b>		
	<b>HIGH STREET/LONGDOWN ROAD – PROPOSED ‘NO WAITING AT ANY TIME’ RESTRICTIONS</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014</b>	<b>No. of Objections Received:</b>	<b>5 objections</b>

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision <small>Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.</small>
<p>██████████ Longdown Road Sandhurst</p>	<p>██████████ had her kerb lowered due to the dreadful parking problems. ██████████ agrees that the yellow lines should be installed but not all the way to her house as she believes that people will park between the yellow lines and her driveway. She adds that this will make parking very difficult for houses further up Longdown Road.</p>	<p>In response to resident objections the proposals have been modified to shorten the length of double yellow line restriction opposite the junction with Edgebarrow Rise. The new proposals will reduce the number of cars potentially displaced by the restrictions whilst keeping the junction and bend clear of vehicles parked in contravention of the rules stipulated in the Highway Code.</p>	<p><b>Proceed with the modified proposals as shown on Drawing no. 5030/005C</b></p>
<p>██████████ Longdown Road Sandhurst</p>	<p>██████████ states that finding a parking space in Longdown Road after 5.30pm weekdays and anytime at the weekends is almost impossible. Most of the local residents own 2 or 3 cars and have no consideration for those, like himself, who cannot afford to convert their gardens into driveways.</p> <p>██████████ agrees with the proposal on safety grounds however for inconvenience reasons he objects.</p> <p>At present, ██████████ states that he has to contend with people pulling up outside his house and walking to the Bird in Hand pub as they cannot be bothered to park in the pub car park.</p> <p>██████████ believes that should the proposals go ahead then the Council should provide additional parking in the area or provide the remaining council houses with driveways.</p> <p>██████████ adds that Longdown Road is already heavily congested with parking and the loss of so many parking spaces will just make the situation worse.</p>	<p>In response to resident objections the proposals have been modified to shorten the length of double yellow line restriction opposite the junction with Edgebarrow Rise. The new proposals will reduce the number of cars potentially displaced by the restrictions whilst keeping the junction and bend clear of vehicles parked in contravention of the rules stipulated in the Highway Code.</p>	

<p>██████████ High Street Little Sandhurst</p>	<p>██████████ objects to the proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is an overreaction to what is a very occasional problem of inconsiderate individuals parking directly on the south side on the very crown of the bend;</li> <li>• Having lived in the vicinity of the bend for 7 years he has never witnessed an accident and safety is only compromised when cars are parked on the south of the bend;</li> <li>• The proposal is over designed for the actual problem;</li> <li>• Parking restrictions to the junction with Edgebarrow Rise or in front of the pub are unnecessary as these areas are not parked upon;</li> <li>• The proposal does not address the problem of where cars will park if the restrictions are extended as proposed. All that will happen is that parking will be pushed elsewhere possibly causing other problems;</li> <li>• The biggest flaw with this proposal is that it will clear the road at the bend and will increase the speed of traffic at this point, thus lessening the need for caution and possibly compromising road safety.</li> </ul> <p>██████████ concludes by saying all that is needed is to restrict parking on the southern side of the bend.</p>	<p>In response to resident objections the proposals have been modified to shorten the length of double yellow line restriction opposite the junction with Edgebarrow Rise. The new proposals will reduce the number of cars potentially displaced by the restrictions whilst keeping the junction and bend clear of vehicles parked in contravention of the rules stipulated in the Highway Code.</p>	<p><b>Proceed with the modified proposals as shown on Drawing no. 5030/005C</b></p>
<p>██████████ Longdown Road Sandhurst</p>	<p>██████████ wishes to register her objection to the proposed parking restrictions on Longdown Road.</p> <p>██████████ states that parking anywhere near her property is very limited which is worsened when the nearby pub has a special event on.</p> <p>██████████ adds that every evening there are cars and commercial vehicles parked on the corner of Longdown Road, High Street and the side roads meaning that seldom can she find a space to park near to her home. ██████████ that should these restrictions go ahead this matter will be considerably worsened as these vehicles will be forced to park outside my property.</p> <p>██████████ states that whilst she appreciates restrictions are necessary for safety reasons, there are only 3 houses (including her own) which do not have driveways. She asks that Bracknell Forest Council consider a permit scheme or providing the 3 houses with dropped kerbs.</p>	<p>In response to resident objections the proposals have been modified to shorten the length of double yellow line restriction opposite the junction with Edgebarrow Rise. The new proposals will reduce the number of cars potentially displaced by the restrictions whilst keeping the junction and bend clear of vehicles parked in contravention of the rules stipulated in the Highway Code.</p>	
<p>██████████ High Street Little Sandhurst</p>	<p>██████████ would like to make the following comments with regards to the parking restriction proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• She agrees that the parking close to the bend does restrict</li> </ul>	<p>In response to resident objections the proposals have been modified to shorten the length of double yellow line restriction opposite the junction with Edgebarrow Rise. The new proposals will reduce the number of cars potentially displaced by the restrictions whilst keeping</p>	

	<p>vision and some restriction on parking would be an improvement. However, she does not agree that it is necessary to remove all parking down to the first house in Longdown Road;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [REDACTED] states that not all of the parked vehicles are pub customers and many belong to nearby residents. These proposals will merely force these residents to park elsewhere and possibly cause problems there;</li> <li>• [REDACTED] believes that removing parking will increase the approach speeds to the bend and increase the likelihood of a collision;</li> <li>• [REDACTED] suggests that motorists should be discouraged from using High Street/ Longdown Road as a cut-through. She suggests that a “break” could be introduced to make it a no through road;</li> <li>• Little Sandhurst is an attractive area with a rural feel to it and yellow lines are ugly in the street scene. [REDACTED] asks that if the proposals are adopted then the thin type of lines are used.</li> </ul>	<p>the junction and bend clear of vehicles parked in contravention of the rules stipulated in the Highway Code.</p> <p>The Council will be using the 50mm wide yellow lines instead of the standard 100mm.</p>	<p><b>Proceed with the modified proposals as shown on Drawing no. 5030/005C</b></p>
--	---	--	---

**Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:**

Cllr D P Birch - Having seen the public comments I am satisfied they have been taken into account and I'm pleased to support the proposal as shown.

Cllr P D Bettison – I appreciate the residents concerns regarding the need for parking in the area but this needs to be balanced against safety concerns. I am happy to proceed with the modified proposals

## OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>Scheme:</b>	<b>BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2014</b>		
	<b>BRANTS BRIDGE ROUNDABOUT – ‘NO LOADING/UNLOADING AT ANY TIME’ RESTRICTIONS</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014</b>	<b>No. of Objections Received:</b>	<b>2 objections</b>

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
██████████ Ralphs Ride	██████████ runs a retail outlet and states that he needs flexible parking for customers and delivery vehicles. ██████ lease states that all loading and unloading must be done at the rear of the shop and issues arise when cars are parked in the lay-by and lorries cannot park and deliver.	In view of the comments received it is proposed to remove the no loading/unloading restrictions from the length of highway outside the 2 shops.	<b>Proceed with the modified proposals as shown on Drawing no. 5030/006A</b>
Bracknell Town Council	The Town Council has concerns regarding the impact on the shops deliveries.	In view of the comments received it is proposed to remove the no loading/unloading restrictions from the length of highway directly outside the 2 shops.	

### Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr Mrs S R Pile - I agree. I only wish we could create more parking in this area but then we wish that for many other places too.

Cllr T G Kensall - I agree with your proposals for this scheme and I am happy for you to take this forward.

Cllr M Sergeant – No comments received.

Cllr R Angell – I agree with the modifications.

## OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>Scheme:</b>	<b>BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2014</b>		
	<b>YORKTOWN ROAD SERVICE ROAD – ADDITIONAL LIMITED WAITING &amp; REMOVAL OF TAXI ONLY WAITING RESTRICTIONS</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014</b>	<b>No. of Objections Received:</b>	<b>0</b>

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
			<b>Proceed with the modified proposals as shown on Drawing no. 5030/007A</b>

### Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr M Brossard - You have our green light! Although I have not spoken to Alan I am confident that he supports this laudable proposal. It will not solve the 'problem' of having a vibrant shopping centre (there are no vacant shops) but it will overcome the issue of residents saying 'why have you got a redundant taxi rank'!

Cllr A Ward – This ok by me

## OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>Scheme:</b>	<b>BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2014</b>		
	<b>BUCKLEBURY – PROPOSED ‘NO WAITING AT ANY TIME’ RESTRICTIONS</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014</b>	<b>No. of Objections Received:</b>	<b>1 Comment</b>

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision <small>Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.</small>
<p>█ █ Bucklebury █ Bracknell █ Berkshire █ RG12 7YJ</p>	<p>Although █ supports the introduction of the double yellow lines she is concerned that it will lead to more cars parking in front of her garage.</p> <p>█ has raised this issue with the Council before and has put a notice on her garage door. She also points out that there is a dropped kerb which should be kept clear. █ has spoken to the Council and has been referred to the Police. As █ works shifts it is not convenient for her to call the Police every time this happens and then wait for them to come and remove the vehicle.</p> <p>█ has spoken to her neighbours about this situation but this has not helped. She requests that the Council erect a sign telling motorists to keep the area in front of her garage clear.</p>	<p>Unfortunately the area in front of █ garage is privately owned therefore the Council has no power to introduce or enforce additional parking restrictions.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the parking issues in Bucklebury and following implementation of these restrictions, further parking surveys will be undertaken to ascertain if further measures may be necessary.</p>	<p><b>Proceed as advertised.</b></p>

### Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr C Baily – No comments received

Cllr Mrs G M Birch – No comments received

Cllr W Davison - I confirm that I am in agreement with the recommendation.



## OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>Scheme:</b>	<b>BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2014</b>		
	<b>BABBAGE WAY&amp; NEUMANN CRESCENT – ‘NO WAITING AT ANY TIME’ RESTRICTIONS</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014</b>	<b>No. of Objections Received:</b>	<b>1 comment &amp; 1 objection</b>

Objector	Summary of Objection/ comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.
<p>██████████ Babbage Way Bracknell</p>	<p>██████████ welcomes the double yellow line proposals although feels that they do not go far enough. ██████████ feels that double yellow lines should also be added at the south-western end of the “oval”. ██████████ adds that there are cars parked there and it can make traversing the one way system difficult as drivers are caught by surprise and have to go extremely wide to avoid them.</p>	<p>The total number of cars likely to be displaced by the scheme is estimated to be 3 / 4. Whilst it is accepted that these cars will be forced to park elsewhere it is not considered that this would form a new safety issue.</p> <p>Following the implementation of the restrictions, further parking surveys will be undertaken to ascertain if further measures may be necessary.</p>	<b>Proceed as advertised.</b>
<p>██████████ Babbage Way Bracknell Berkshire RG12 7GN</p>	<p>The objector states that appears to have been no thought as to the ramifications of the proposed no waiting zones. If implemented these would only serve to move the problem to the Babbage Way “oval”.</p> <p>The objector adds that if any significant level of parking were to take place on the “oval” there would be the potential to interfere with larger vehicles that require access. Larger vehicles would presumably have to drive on the pavements to gain access and access to some driveways would be restricted.</p> <p>That objector states that the Highway Code prohibits parking opposite or within 10metres of a junction so the proposals should include a restriction on parking opposite the junctions. However, this would restrict parking further and where would the displaced vehicles park?</p>	<p>The total number of cars likely to be displaced by the scheme is estimated to be 3 / 4. Whilst it is accepted that these cars will be forced to park elsewhere it is not considered that this would form a new safety issue.</p> <p>Parking is already present on the oval section of Babbage Way and given the 2 lane width of the carriageway the Council is not aware of problems in this respect.</p> <p>Following the implementation of the restrictions, further parking surveys will be undertaken to ascertain if further measures may be necessary.</p>	

### Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr Heydon - Many thanks. The objections are noted but presumably are not strong enough to change anything. I'm supportive of the stated intentions.

Cllr McCracken - As am I

## OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>Scheme:</b>	<b>BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2014</b>		
	<b>PARK ROAD – ‘NO WAITING AT ANY TIME’ RESTRICTIONS</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014</b>	<b>No. of Objections Received:</b>	<b>0</b>

Objector	Summary of Objection/ comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.
			<b>Proceed as advertised.</b>

**Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:**

Cllr M Sargeant – No comments received

Cllr R Angell – Fine with me

## OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>Scheme:</b>	<b>BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2014</b>		
	<b>NEW ROAD, ASCOT – ‘NO WAITING AT ANY TIME’ RESTRICTIONS</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014</b>	<b>No. of Objections Received:</b>	<b>0</b>

Objector	Summary of Objection/ comment	Officers Comments	Decision <small>Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.</small>
			<b>Proceed as advertised.</b>

**Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:**

Cllr Virgo and Cllr Hayes have both indicated their support of the proposals.

## OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

<b>Scheme:</b>	<b>BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2014</b>		
	<b>ALL SAINTS RISE – PROPOSED ‘NO WAITING AT ANY TIME’ RESTRICTIONS</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014</b>	<b>No. of Objections Received:</b>	<b>7 objections</b>

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision <small>Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.</small>
<p>██████████ All Saints Rise</p>	<p>██████████ does not see why yellow lines are needed on such a quiet residential road. She has not seen driveways blocked and the residents are all considerate to one another. ██████████ believes the road is wide enough for cars to park and was shocked when her friend received a note on Police headed paper on her windscreen. She &amp; her friend have reviewed the location and do not feel that the parking was causing any obstruction.</p> <p>██████████ also feels that yellow lines will make a pretty road quite ugly and very formal.</p>	<p>As All Saint Rise is a lightly trafficked cul-de-sac, the present situation is not thought to constitute a road safety issue. Our proposals were made on the basis that parking in this location may cause obstruction and inconvenience to a small number of residents who share an access. The proposals were drafted based on evidence given by a resident and we had no reason to doubt that this would be the opinion of the other residents who share the same access. The consultation results have shown however, that there are other local residents who have a differing opinion and do not consider the parking to be an obstruction or inconvenient. As the consultation process has revealed significant numbers of opinions/arguments opposing the proposals in All Saints Rise, we intend to remove this specific proposal from the TRO to afford the council time to gather impartial evidence itself. Once we have undertaken this process, the Council will be in a position to consider whether to re-advertise the proposals for All Saints Rise.</p>	<p><b>Defer decision on scheme pending additional parking surveys.</b></p>
<p>██████████ All Saints Rise</p>	<p>██████████ objects to the proposed parking restrictions in ██████████ which ██████████ believes are totally unnecessary. She states ██████████ grounds for objecting are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.s 41, 43 &amp; 45 are all typical of this estate. If the level of access to driveways wasn't acceptable, planning would not have been granted for the development.</li> <li>• The resident of ██████████ parks his car on the tarmac area adjacent to his garage. This would suggest that he has 3 parking spaces which is contra to the norm which is for each property to have 2 allocated spaces.</li> <li>• ██████████ states that the manoeuvre required to exit ██████████ driveway is no more onerous than a standard 3 point turn which</li> </ul>	<p>As All Saint Rise is a lightly trafficked cul-de-sac, the present situation is not thought to constitute a road safety issue. Our proposals were made on the basis that parking in this location may cause obstruction and inconvenience to a small number of residents who share an access. The proposals were drafted based on evidence given by a resident and we had no reason to doubt that this would be the opinion of the other residents who share the same access. The consultation results have shown however, that there are other local residents who have a differing opinion and do not consider the parking to be an obstruction or inconvenient. As the consultation process has revealed significant numbers of opinions/arguments opposing the proposals in All Saints Rise, we intend to remove this specific proposal from the TRO to afford the council time to gather impartial evidence itself.</p>	

	<p>is part of a the UK driving test. She also points out that this part of All Saints Rise has an exit in either direction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [REDACTED] asks if other residents of 41, 43 &amp; 45 have complained about parking in the past although advises that the owners of [REDACTED]</li> <li>• The resident of XXXXXXX has carers visiting 3/4 times a day who may find difficulty in finding a parking space nearby, whereby the [REDACTED] rarely goes out and their car is moved no more than twice a week.</li> <li>• [REDACTED] questions as to when the site surveys were carried out as she has never seen a car parked there on a long term basis.</li> <li>• Cars that visit properties in All Saints Rise will all be inconvenienced and forced to find space further along the road towards Whitegrove School where space is already limited.</li> <li>• When [REDACTED] first moved into her home, the resident of [REDACTED] asked her not to park opposite his driveway as he liked to exit in one manoeuvre. She has done this and asked visiting friends to do the same, however she objects to this becoming a formal arrangement.</li> <li>• If double yellow lines are painted in front her house [REDACTED] fears it will affect the value of her house.</li> <li>• Painting 15 metres of double line in one section of the road will look odd and she objects to the expense of traffic wardens having to come to the road to enforce them.</li> <li>• [REDACTED] that if this were to go ahead then there should be total ban on street parking in the estate.</li> <li>• [REDACTED] asks for us to monitor parking with street light mounted CCTV. This will also prove how infrequently the resident of [REDACTED] goes out.</li> </ul> <p>[REDACTED] finishes by stating that if the proposal goes ahead she would like a guarantee that she will be granted planning permission for the driveway she will be forced to make.</p>	<p>Once we have undertaken this process, the Council will be in a position to consider whether to re-advertise the proposals for All Saints Rise.</p>	<p><b>Defer decision on scheme pending additional parking surveys.</b></p>
<p>[REDACTED] All Saints Rise</p>	<p>[REDACTED] is appalled at the short sightedness of the Council to propose double yellow lines on All Saints Rise. He makes the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The average household appears to own more than one vehicle. [REDACTED] is lucky enough to have a driveway for one car however our guests struggle to find a parking space forcing them to park opposite a junction. Further restrictions would force drivers to park elsewhere such as lawns/junctions and footpaths;</li> <li>• Warfield School which is placed on All Saints Rise requires many parking spaces during peak times, having a shortage of parking spaces will cause waiting and therefore pollution, noise and obstruction outside the school.</li> <li>• The yellow lines proposed are opposite driveways which are not</li> </ul>	<p>As All Saint Rise is a lightly trafficked cul-de-sac, the present situation is not thought to constitute a road safety issue. Our proposals were made on the basis that parking in this location may cause obstruction and inconvenience to a small number of residents who share an access. The proposals were drafted based on evidence given by a resident and we had no reason to doubt that this would be the opinion of the other residents who share the same access. The consultation results have shown however, that there are other local residents who have a differing opinion and do not consider the parking to be an obstruction or inconvenient. As the consultation process has revealed significant numbers of opinions/arguments opposing the proposals in All Saints Rise, we intend to remove this specific proposal from the TRO to afford the council time to gather impartial evidence itself. Once we have undertaken this process, the Council will be in a</p>	

	<p>remotely obstructed by parked cars; the drivers can both reverse into their space or drive in normally. Upon departure the drivers have the opportunity to exit in both directions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upon speaking to other residents, this proposal is hugely unpopular.</li> </ul>	<p>position to consider whether to re-advertise the proposals for All Saints Rise.</p>	<p><b>Defer decision on scheme pending additional parking surveys.</b></p>
<p>██████████ All Saints Rise</p>	<p>██████████ is invalidated and relies on the support of carers/friends/family who visit her on a daily basis. Currently the visitors park outside her garage, in a nearby lay-by, or in the area of highway where it is proposed to put the double yellow lines. They do not feel that when cars are parked in the latter position that they are obstructing anyone's driveway.</p> <p>The driveway allocated to ██████████ is considerably more limited than those of her neighbours (██████████) and there has been no issue when reversing out.</p>	<p>As All Saint Rise is a lightly trafficked cul-de-sac, the present situation is not thought to constitute a road safety issue. Our proposals were made on the basis that parking in this location may cause obstruction and inconvenience to a small number of residents who share an access. The proposals were drafted based on evidence given by a resident and we had no reason to doubt that this would be the opinion of the other residents who share the same access. The consultation results have shown however, that there are other local residents who have a differing opinion and do not consider the parking to be an obstruction or inconvenient. As the consultation process has revealed significant numbers of opinions/arguments opposing the proposals in All Saints Rise, we intend to remove this specific proposal from the TRO to afford the council time to gather impartial evidence itself. Once we have undertaken this process, the Council will be in a position to consider whether to re-advertise the proposals for All Saints Rise.</p>	
<p>██████████ All Saints Rise</p>	<p>██████████ wish to make the following points in objection as they will be affected if the proposal is implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no long term parking in the affected area with only delivery vans/ utility vans or carers for the resident of ██████████;</li> <li>• Nobody else in the road has an issue with the parking in this area apart from the ██████████ Putting in restrictions in this location will move the parking elsewhere and maybe cause an issue at the new location.</li> <li>• How will the restrictions be enforced?</li> <li>• ██████████ suggest installing CCTV to assess the parking which then should be assessed against other areas on All Saints Rise especially in the region of the school.</li> <li>• ██████████ does not believe that a car cannot exit the driveway in question should a car be parking in the area where restrictions are proposed.</li> <li>• More properties should be allowed to convert their front gardens into driveways which remove more cars form parking on the road.</li> </ul>	<p>As All Saint Rise is a lightly trafficked cul-de-sac, the present situation is not thought to constitute a road safety issue. Our proposals were made on the basis that parking in this location may cause obstruction and inconvenience to a small number of residents who share an access. The proposals were drafted based on evidence given by a resident and we had no reason to doubt that this would be the opinion of the other residents who share the same access. The consultation results have shown however, that there are other local residents who have a differing opinion and do not consider the parking to be an obstruction or inconvenient. As the consultation process has revealed significant numbers of opinions/arguments opposing the proposals in All Saints Rise, we intend to remove this specific proposal from the TRO to afford the council time to gather impartial evidence itself. Once we have undertaken this process, the Council will be in a position to consider whether to re-advertise the proposals for All Saints Rise.</p>	
<p>██████████ Teresa Vale</p>	<p>██████████ was surprised to see the proposal for double yellow lines on a road that clearly doesn't need it.</p>	<p>As All Saint Rise is a lightly trafficked cul-de-sac, the present situation is not thought to constitute a road safety issue. Our proposals were made on the basis that parking in this location may cause obstruction</p>	

	<p>██████████ believes that if double yellow lines are installed outside no. 40 All Saints Rise than even more cars will than at present be forced to park elsewhere, impacting on Teresa Vale. Already there are cars that park on the pavement, grass verges thus restricting and blocking access to and from driveways.</p> <p>██████████ is currently medical treatment and requires that medical staff have access to her house.</p> <p>██████████ states that the Council is taking these steps in All Saints Rise then Teresa Vale should also be assessed as the parking is far worse there.</p> <p>██████████ also asks why two of the three visitors spaces in Teresa Vale have been sold to a particular property giving them 4 spaces when the other properties only have 2.</p>	<p>and inconvenience to a small number of residents who share an access. The proposals were drafted based on evidence given by a resident and we had no reason to doubt that this would be the opinion of the other residents who share the same access. The consultation results have shown however, that there are other local residents who have a differing opinion and do not consider the parking to be an obstruction or inconvenient. As the consultation process has revealed significant numbers of opinions/arguments opposing the proposals in All Saints Rise, we intend to remove this specific proposal from the TRO to afford the council time to gather impartial evidence itself. Once we have undertaken this process, the Council will be in a position to consider whether to re-advertise the proposals for All Saints Rise.</p> <p>As all of the parking spaces in Teresa Vale are in private ownership the Council is unable to offer comment on the issue of the sale or otherwise of said bays.</p>	<p><b>Defer decision on scheme pending additional parking surveys.</b></p>
<p>██████████ Teresa Vale</p>	<p>██████████ was surprised to see the proposal for double yellow lines on a road that clearly doesn't need it.</p> <p>██████████ believes that if double yellow lines are installed outside no. 40 All Saints Rise than even more cars will than at present be forced to park elsewhere, impacting on Teresa Vale. Already there are cars that park on the pavement, grass verges thus restricting and blocking access to and from driveways.</p> <p>██████████ states that the Council is taking these steps in All Saints Rise then Teresa Vale should also be assessed as the parking is far worse there.</p> <p>██████████ also asks why two of the three visitors spaces in Teresa Vale have been sold to a particular property giving them 4 spaces when the other properties only have 2.</p>	<p>As All Saint Rise is a lightly trafficked cul-de-sac, the present situation is not thought to constitute a road safety issue. Our proposals were made on the basis that parking in this location may cause obstruction and inconvenience to a small number of residents who share an access. The proposals were drafted based on evidence given by a resident and we had no reason to doubt that this would be the opinion of the other residents who share the same access. The consultation results have shown however, that there are other local residents who have a differing opinion and do not consider the parking to be an obstruction or inconvenient. As the consultation process has revealed significant numbers of opinions/arguments opposing the proposals in All Saints Rise, we intend to remove this specific proposal from the TRO to afford the council time to gather impartial evidence itself. Once we have undertaken this process, the Council will be in a position to consider whether to re-advertise the proposals for All Saints Rise.</p> <p>As all of the parking spaces in Teresa Vale are in private ownership the Council is unable to offer comment on the issue of the sale or otherwise of said bays.</p>	
<p>Warfield Parish Council</p>	<p>Warfield Parish Council request that a study of parking in the wider area be carried out rather than treating one road in isolation.</p>	<p>The issue of parking in the wider area has been passed to the Council's Sustainable Modes of Transport to School Officer for consideration in future work programmes.</p>	

**Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:**

Cllr McClean – No comments received

Cllr Thompson – I am in agreement with the recommendation on the understanding that the impartial gathering of evidence is carried out without delay and given prompt consideration.

Cllr Barnard - In agreement with Cliff