

Annex D

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	RESIDENTS PARKING ORDER 2017 – ZONE B		
Date Advertised:	19th October 2016 – 9th November 2016	No. of Objections / Comments Received:	32

Name	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify /Proceed as advertised.
XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XX Dukeshill Road Bracknell RG42 XXX	Wishes to object to the Order as X is concerned that residents (and their visitors) who live in Horsneile Lane will try to avoid purchasing permits and will use the connecting roads to park in. This will put more pressure on the roads outside the permit areas. Suggests either retaining the permits for the whole area or remove them completely.	The proposal is to keep the Residents Parking Scheme in those roads where residents have confirmed, through the consultation process, that the scheme is of benefit. Any Resident Parking Zone will have a boundary between those roads within the zone and those not and it is an unfortunate reality that vehicles belonging to those within the zone can be parked in the roads beyond the zone. However, it is hoped that the presence of the Resident Parking Scheme will make parking in their own street within the Zone easier for residents, reducing the need to park elsewhere.	Proceed as advertised
XXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XX Shepherds Lane Bracknell RG42 XXX	Queries why number 91-109 Shepherds Lane have been omitted from the scheme and yet numbers 1-89 appears to be left in. Won't be fair to those numbers 1-89 who will have to pay for a permit.	The Notice of intent may have caused confusion. The proposal is to remove all the properties within Shepherds Lane from the residents parking scheme as shown on the consultation plan. This will therefore result in all properties within Shepherds Lane being outside the Zone.	Proceed as advertised
XXX XXXXXX XX Binfield Road Bracknell	Believes the removal of Binfield Road from the permit scheme needs to be reconsidered. States that parking in Binfield Road is difficult enough with the scheme in place. Prior to the trial, it was almost impossible to get a space in Binfield Road due to the short walk to the Town Centre. Has no objection to being charged for a permit.	A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the Council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,	Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme

		The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.	
XXXXX XXXXXXXX XX Ashridge Green Bracknell	Extremely disappointed that the permit scheme is being removed from Ashridge Green. States that parking is difficult at the best of times and believes that once the Lexicon is opened it will be even worse. Urges the Council to reconsider and include Ashridge Green, Fraser Road and Dukeshill Road in the permit scheme.	The council recognise that the residents of Ashridge Green responded to the informal consultation in favour of remaining within the scheme. Unfortunately the surrounding roads were against remaining in the scheme. It has not been possible to include Ashridge Green within the residents parking zone without incorporating the surrounding roads. If a main through road within a zone is to be removed from the scheme, the minor side roads will also be removed from the scheme. This is to prevent small isolated areas of residents parking that are not included within a larger zone. If a smaller side road is not included within a larger zone there would be insufficient road side parking available to allow a residents parking scheme to be of benefit.	Proceed as advertised
XXXXXX XXXXXXXX Horsneile Lane Bracknell	Realises that nobody has the right to park near their home but it seems unfair for residents to pay when there is no guarantee that parking will be available. Concludes by stating that they believe it is unfair to residents in the named zones that they don't get one free allocation. Believes that that this will cause problems for residents in adjacent roads as people will be inclined to park their free of charge, particularly visitors. Understands the reasons behind the scheme but believes that residents, as Council tax payers, should not be financially disadvantaged particularly when a space cannot be guaranteed.	The original charging regime set out within the rules of the scheme does not meet the operating costs incurred by the Council. There is currently a shortfall in funding and to continue to operate a subsidised scheme is not sustainable in the current economic climate. Consideration has been given to all the possible means of balancing the shortfall in income generated by the Residents Parking Scheme to make the scheme self-funding. The only realistic means to make the scheme self-funding is to charge for permits in accordance with the charges proposed. To this end the charging regime as advertised is essential for the resident parking scheme to continue. It is not possible for the Council allocate parking spaces on the public highway to individuals.	Proceed as advertised
XXXXXX XX XXXXXX Horseneile Lane Bracknell	Has lived in Horsneile Lane since XXXX and have seldom had a problem with parking. Objects to having to pay to park their car outside their house, especially when they can't guarantee a parking space. States that green areas in the vicinity of their property should be converted into parking spaces to take more cars off the road.	The original charging regime set out within the rules of the scheme does not meet the operating costs incurred by the Council. There is currently a shortfall in funding and to continue to operate a subsidised scheme is not sustainable in the current economic climate. Consideration has been given to all the possible means of balancing the shortfall in income generated by the Residents Parking Scheme to make the scheme self-funding. The only realistic means to make the scheme self-funding is to charge for permits in accordance with the charges proposed. To this end the charging regime as advertised is essential for the resident parking scheme to continue. The council do currently have an annual programme of installing	Proceed as advertised

		additional residential parking within residential areas. However the aim of the residents parking scheme is to protect residents from competition for road side parking, and not to provide off street parking for residents.	
XXX X XXXXX XX Binfield Road Bracknell XXXX XXX	<p>States that before the trial permit scheme the parking in Binfield Road was being used by people leaving their cars all day and going into Town to work or commute and that they struggled to park their own vehicle. Since the permit scheme was introduced the parking has been great.</p> <p>If the scheme stops the parking will cause problems for residents who live on Binfield Road.</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme
XX XXXXXXX XXXXXXX Ashridge Green	<p>The objector would like to remain within the scheme and does not feel that 'scrapping' the permits within Ashridge Green is a good idea as they are already having parking issues and the town centre is not yet open. They have 16 houses with only 12 parking spaces, one of which is disabled.</p> <p>Neighbours are having to park in ways that block other cars as there is not enough parking. They say that there is not much available parking on street parking in the roads around, where parking is occurring it can be blocking footways</p> <p>They would happily pay for permits. They have also suggested that converting Bracknell Forest Homes owned grass and hedged areas into additional parking would assist in their parking problems.</p> <p>They state there was a child knocked off their bike in Fraser Road last week and suggest this may be due to the number of parked vehicles on the footway and the overgrown hedges obscuring visibility.</p>	<p>The council recognise that the residents of Ashridge Green responded to the informal consultation in favour of remaining within the scheme. Unfortunately the surrounding roads were against remaining in the scheme. It has not been possible to include Ashridge Green within the residents parking zone without incorporating the surrounding roads.</p> <p>If a main through road within a zone is to be removed from the scheme, the minor side roads will also be removed from the scheme. This is to prevent small isolated areas of residents parking that are not included within a larger zone. If a smaller side road is not included within a larger zone there would be insufficient road side parking available to allow a residents parking scheme to be of benefit.</p> <p>If parking is causing road safety issues this can be investigated by the Transport Engineering team outside of the scope of this Traffic Regulation Order consultation</p>	Proceed as advertised
XX XXX XXXXXXX Bull Lane	The objector agreed with the implementation of the resident parking scheme in Bull Lane as they did get lots of cars parking in front of their houses due to the school opposite.	The original charging regime set out within the rules of the scheme does not meet the operating costs incurred by the Council. There is currently a shortfall in funding and to continue to operate a subsidised	Proceed as advertised

	<p>When the scheme was trialled the free pricing did not impose a financial strain on the residents and so it seemed a good idea. However, the proposal to charge residents to park outside their own homes is not fair. Their houses do not have off road parking and as such must find parking on the highway.</p> <p>They object to the charges</p>	<p>scheme is not sustainable in the current economic climate.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to all the possible means of balancing the shortfall in income generated by the Residents Parking Scheme to make the scheme self-funding. The only realistic means to make the scheme self-funding is to charge for permits in accordance with the charges proposed. To this end the charging regime as advertised is essential for the resident parking scheme to continue.</p>	
<p>XX XXXXX Folders Lane</p>	<p>The objector is disappointed with the proposal and would like to remain within the scheme. They live in Folders Lane which they say is a 5 minute walk from the town centre and next to a school. The loss of the permit parking in Folders Lane will make an already difficult parking situation worse.</p> <p>They understand that the proposals have been based on the responses to the consultation but believe that the questions asked did not allow residents to offer the finer points associated with the trialled scheme. They give an example of the trialled scheme having 2 free permits but the proposed scheme having a charge for every permit.</p> <p>To accept a charge for a permit they say that residents will have to have felt the scheme has been of benefit, and for it to have been of benefit it must be being enforced, which they say it was not. This resident has contacted the Council on several occasions to report not permitted vehicles parking in the zone and blocking driveways. They go on to state that the Councils Operations team did send parking attendants out that placed warning notices on the offending vehicles, (not fines) and that this did not act as a sufficient deterrent and that the parking attendants have not patrolled regularly enough afterwards.</p> <p>Lack of parking in the area is very stressful even with the residents parking as there is not sufficient space for the vehicles with permits, this will be worse if non resident vehicles can also use the parking</p>	<p>There are 17 properties within Folders Lane that were included within the original Residents Parking Scheme trial and we have only received objection / comment from 3 properties. This implies that there is a majority of residents who are not wishing to continue with the scheme.</p> <p>Furthermore, with the proposed removal of the surrounding roads, Folders Lane would become a small isolated length of restriction that is not within the Zone.</p> <p>Enforcement of the scheme has been undertaken and will continue. If there are vehicles parked in breach of any waiting restrictions, including the Residents Parking Scheme, this can be reported to the Councils Operations team.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>XXX XXXX XXXXXX Binfield Road</p>	<p>The objector wants to remain within the resident parking scheme. They say they have fought very hard in the past to get these permits, as they would regularly return home to find no available parking. The past two years has been appreciated and they will accept having to pay for it due to the benefits provided.</p> <p>They believe that if the road is removed from the scheme the parking situation will revert back to how it was and once the Lexicon opens, even worse.</p> <p>They cannot believe that the top end of Binfield Road has been excluded from the scheme when it is one of the closest to the town centre and parking demand.</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p>	<p>Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme</p>

	They implore the council to keep them in the scheme.	The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.	
XX XXXXXX XXXX XX Binfield Road	The objector wants the scheme to remain and they pay for permits in Binfield Road. They believe the parking is 'going to be a nightmare' if the permits are removed, especially when the town centre regeneration is complete.	A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme, The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.	Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme
XX XX XXXXXXXX XX Binfield Road	The objector would like the scheme to remain in Binfield Road. They explain that prior to the current scheme they would regularly be unable to park, and even with the scheme it can be a challenge. They believe that with the new town centre they would not be able to find anywhere near their property. They mention that the Bakery may become a vets with residential properties above and questions where these customers will park. They conclude that they do not expect to be able to park directly outside their property, but they are very unhappy that a scheme that was designed to assist the residents is proposed to be scrapped	A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme, The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.	Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme
XX XXXXXX XXXXXXX Binfield Road	The objector would like the scheme to remain in Binfield Road. They state the resident parking scheme has vastly reduced the number of non-residents using Binfield Road to park and go into town. Once the town centre is reopened this issue will return.	A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of	Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97

	<p>The residents could not park near their homes which can result in a long walk with supermarket shopping. The protest most strongly with regard to the removal of the scheme.</p>	<p>the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	<p>odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme</p>
<p>XX XXXXXX XXXXX XX Binfield Road</p>	<p>The objector would like the scheme to remain in Binfield Road.</p> <p>The objector believes the resident parking scheme has been an outstanding success and made a huge improvement to their way of life.</p> <p>They explain that their property is very close to the Lexicon and the newly approved Vets which will create additional parking pressures.</p> <p>They would be more than happy to pay a subsidised rate to ensure the scheme remains. They appreciate that the Council is under increasing budget pressures and believes paying for the permits would be a small price to pay for quality of life.</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	<p>Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme</p>
<p>XXX XXXX XXXXXXX XX Binfield Road</p>	<p>The objector would like the scheme to remain in Binfield Road.</p> <p>The objector is shocked to see that the resident parking permit scheme is to be stopped in Binfield Road. They state that of all the roads around the town centre theirs needs it the most. The parking will be much worse with the new town centre and they need the resident parking scheme.</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the</p>	<p>Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme</p>

		<p>scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	
<p>XX XXXXXX XXXXX XX Binfield Road</p>	<p>The objector would like the scheme to remain in Binfield Road.</p> <p>The objector is concerned about the decision to remove the resident parking scheme. They say that as the row of houses (no 37-97) rely on on-road parking, the parking scheme is needed and makes a huge difference to their way of life. Before the scheme, parking was extremely difficult but the scheme has made it better.</p> <p>They explain that of all the odd number houses only 2 have driveways. The street is within a 5 minute walk of the town centre and without the protection it will be used as free parking for the town centre.</p> <p>They explain that they did forget to comment when recently consulted but believe that the majority of the odd number houses will be favour of keeping the scheme.</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	<p>Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme</p>
<p>XXX XXX XXXXX XX Binfield Road</p>	<p>The objector would like the scheme to remain in Binfield Road.</p> <p>The objector is concerned about the loss of the resident permit parking. They explain that they are a 1 car family but still struggled to park before the scheme was trialed. It has been much better since its introduction.</p> <p>They explain that they did respond to the consultation, and believe their neighbours of 59 and 63 also responded in favour of keeping the scheme and so are unsure why our summary of the responses show no record of these responses.</p> <p>They explain that they are in such close proximity to the town centre and a pedestrianised route into the town that they can only imagine chaos along the road once the town centre has been fully opened.</p> <p>They believe that it is the odd numbers 37-97 that would suffer if the scheme were removed.</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	<p>Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme</p>
<p>XXX X XXXX XX Binfield Road</p>	<p>The objector would like the scheme to remain in Binfield Road.</p> <p>They believe the road should be within the scheme as Binfield Road will be used for parking for those going into town to work or shop. They experienced lots of external parking pressures before the trial started</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The</p>	<p>Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane</p>

		<p>results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	within the scheme
<p>XXX XXXXXXXX XXXX XX Binfield Road</p>	<p>The objector would like the scheme to remain in Binfield Road but objects to having to pay.</p> <p>The objector states that they voted in favour of the scheme remaining during the previous consultation and 99% of her neighbours are of the same opinion.</p> <p>They object that the Council have not understood how close they are to the town centre and what parking issues will be introduced by the associated parking.</p> <p>They object to having to pay for the scheme and believe the scheme should remain as it is. They do not believe it would be fair to remove the right to park outside their properties which many residents have lived in for many years.</p> <p>They object that the scheme should not end before the town centre has been completed. Residents cant be expected to understand the full impact of removing the scheme before the new visitors arrive at the town centre</p> <p>They believe that the loss of the scheme will introduce a free for all parking which will block the road and effect traffic flow.</p> <p>They object to not being clearly told of the options of where residents will now park their cars once the town centre is open.</p> <p>They say they did not receive the letter of the 19th October and had to find out from the on-street notice</p> <p>They then list other concerns that fall outside the scope of this consultation</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme
<p>XXX XXXXXXXX XXXX XX Binfield Road</p>	<p>This objection has been sent by a neighbour on their behalf, they object to the removal of the scheme and to the charges.</p> <p>They object on the following grounds</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial</p>	Modify the scheme – maintain

<p>On behalf of XXXXXX and XXXXX at No XX</p>	<p>They object to the removal of the free permit parking scheme</p> <p>That the Council haven't considered the location of their properties in relation to the town centre and that they are on a slip road which would become blocked with additional parking</p> <p>They object to having to pay for parking</p> <p>A huge proportion of the residents of Binfield Road have lived in their properties for a long time and it is not fair to remove their right to park outside their property</p> <p>That the town centre is not yet complete and the town centre parking demand is at its quietist and so the timing is not correct.</p> <p>That the Council have not given consideration to the full impact of taking away the permit parking just before thousands of new visitors come to Bracknell.</p>	<p>scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	<p>Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme</p>
<p>XXX XXXXXXXX XXXX XX Binfield Road</p> <p>On behalf of no XX</p>	<p>This objection has been sent by a neighbour on their behalf, they object to the removal of the scheme and to the charges.</p> <p>They object on the following grounds</p> <p>They object to the removal of the free permit parking scheme</p> <p>That the Council haven't considered the location of their properties in relation to the town centre and that they are on a slip road which would become blocked with additional parking</p> <p>They object to having to pay for parking</p> <p>A huge proportion of the residents of Binfield Road have lived in their properties for a long time and it is not fair to remove their right to park outside their property</p> <p>That the town centre is not yet complete and the town centre parking demand is at its quietist and so the timing is not correct.</p> <p>That the Council have not given consideration to the full impact of taking away the permit parking just before thousands of new visitors come to Bracknell.</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	<p>Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme</p>

<p>XXX XXXXXXXX XXXX XX Binfield Road</p> <p>On behalf of no XX</p>	<p>This objection has been sent by a neighbour on their behalf, they object to the removal of the scheme and to the charges.</p> <p>They object on the following grounds</p> <p>They object to the removal of the free permit parking scheme</p> <p>That the Council haven't considered the location of their properties in relation to the town centre and that they are on a slip road which would become blocked with additional parking</p> <p>They object to having to pay for parking</p> <p>A huge proportion of the residents of Binfield Road have lived in their properties for a long time and it is not fair to remove their right to park outside their property</p> <p>That the town centre is not yet complete and the town centre parking demand is at its quietist and so the timing is not correct.</p> <p>That the Council have not given consideration to the full impact of taking away the permit parking just before thousands of new visitors come to Bracknell.</p>	<p>A number of objections have been received from the residents of Binfield Road that have resulted in the Council looking again at the Resident Parking Scheme within the south eastern end of the road, in the location of the odd numbered properties within the original trial scheme and those even numbered properties opposite. As a result of the number of objections, the council again wrote to these properties to ask the residents if they would like to be included within the scheme and accept the charges, or to be removed from the scheme. The results of this additional consultation showed 35 responses in favour of remaining in the scheme and paying the charges, and 9 wanting to be removed from the scheme. Whilst this does not represent every property within this part of Binfield Road it is a clear majority in favour of remaining within the scheme,</p> <p>The Council are therefore proposing to amend the Order and keep Binfield Road No's 37-97 (odds) and 24-66 (evens) within the scheme. It is also proposed to keep Fowlers Lane within the scheme as its parking is interlinked with this part of Binfield Road.</p>	<p>Modify the scheme – maintain Binfield Road no's 37 – 97 odds, 24 – 66 evens and Fowlers Lane within the scheme</p>
<p>XXX XXXXXX XXXXXX Daventry Court</p>	<p>They object to having a permit scheme in Daventry Court as there are 2 private car parks which the Council enforcement officers cannot enforce.</p> <p>Also that the road leading to these car parks has 2 90 degree bends within 50 yards of each other and the road should be double yellow lines. They request that these double yellow lines are introduced as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>They then explain that they believe that Albert Road should also have double yellow lines and designate some of Albert Road car park for the Albert Road residents</p>	<p>The Traffic Regulation Order that has recently been advertised does not propose to introduce the Residents Parking Scheme into Daventry Court (the development). Daventry Court (the road) was included within the Residents Parking Scheme trial in 2014 and remains within the current TRO proposals. However, the fact that a road is included within the resident's parking scheme does not preclude it from having additional more stringent restrictions if there is a genuine need. Indeed, Daventry Court (the road) does have a single yellow line restriction that prevents parking Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm which we are not proposing to remove. This single yellow line restriction protects the road from on mass parking by local residents whilst enabling parking for a few residents' vehicles outside of these hours, so long as they are displaying valid permits and parked in a safe and considered manner. Since the introduction of the Resident Parking Trial in 2014 we have not had any resident representations regarding parking issues of any type relating to Daventry Court.</p> <p>The Residents Parking Scheme was designed to protect residents close to the town centre from increased parking demands associated with the town centre regeneration and assist local residents in finding on street parking by removing any external competition for this kerb side space. However, as with all public highway, this does not mean</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

		that it is safe for a driver to park anywhere on the highway within the residents parking zone without due care and attention. It remains the driver's responsibility to find a safe and un-obstructive location to park. If vehicles are parked in an unsafe and obstructive manner Thames Valley Police can enforce these offenses without the need for waiting restrictions. Where the Police receive complaints regarding obstructive parking, that they consider to be genuine, they can contact the Council to bring this to our attention.	
XX XXXX XXXXXXXXX 33 Daventry Court	<p>The objector objects to having permits for Daventry Court as there are 2 privately owned car parks that the council can not enforce within.</p> <p>Also that the road leading to these car parks has 2 90 degree bends within 50 yards of each other and the road should be double yellow lines. They request that these double yellow lines are introduced as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>They then explain that they believe that Albert Road should also have double yellow lines and designate some of Albert Road car park for the Albert Road residents</p>	<p>The Traffic Regulation Order that has recently been advertised does not propose to introduce the Residents Parking Scheme into Daventry Court (the development). Daventry Court (the road) was included within the Residents Parking Scheme trial in 2014 and remains within the current TRO proposals. However, the fact that a road is included within the resident's parking scheme does not preclude it from having additional more stringent restrictions if there is a genuine need. Indeed, Daventry Court (the road) does have a single yellow line restriction that prevents parking Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm which we are not proposing to remove. This single yellow line restriction protects the road from on mass parking by local residents whilst enabling parking for a few residents' vehicles outside of these hours, so long as they are displaying valid permits and parked in a safe and considered manner. Since the introduction of the Resident Parking Trial in 2014 we have not had any resident representations regarding parking issues of any type relating to Daventry Court.</p> <p>The Residents Parking Scheme was designed to protect residents close to the town centre from increased parking demands associated with the town centre regeneration and assist local residents in finding on street parking by removing any external competition for this kerb side space. However, as with all public highway, this does not mean that it is safe for a driver to park anywhere on the highway within the residents parking zone without due care and attention. It remains the driver's responsibility to find a safe and un-obstructive location to park. If vehicles are parked in an unsafe and obstructive manner Thames Valley Police can enforce these offenses without the need for waiting restrictions. Where the Police receive complaints regarding obstructive parking, that they consider to be genuine, they can contact the Council to bring this to our attention.</p>	Proceed as advertised
XXX XXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XX Folders Lane	<p>Object to the removal of the scheme from Folders Lane in the strongest terms</p> <p>Prior to the introduction of the scheme property owners in Folders Lane were prevented from leaving or accessing their homes twice a day by parents dropping off their children at Sandy Lane School. They say that there was a long line of parked cars which caused obstruction and a danger to pedestrians.</p>	<p>There are 17 properties within Folders Lane that were included within the original Residents Parking Scheme trial and we have only received objection / comment from 3 properties. This implies that there is a majority of residents who are not wishing to continue with the scheme.</p> <p>Furthermore, with the proposed removal of the surrounding roads, Folders Lane would become a small isolated length of restriction that is not within the Zone.</p>	Proceed as advertised

	<p>The trial scheme provided an immediate solution to this problem.</p> <p>They are concerned by the timing. The Lexicon opening draws near and traffic flows and parking needs will alter and increase in this area.</p> <p>They are concerned that the scheme will be removed at cost and then shortly after the town centre opens re introduced, again at cost.</p>	<p>Enforcement of the scheme has been undertaken and will continue. If there are vehicles parked in breach of any waiting restrictions, including the Residents Parking Scheme, this can be reported to the Councils Operations team.</p>	
<p>XXX XXXXX XXXXXX XX Daventry Court</p>	<p>They object to the charges as they say the 2 car parks in Daventry Court are privately owned and the council cannot enforce and so would be completely inappropriate.</p> <p>They also say that parking in Albert Road is becoming 'a nightmare' having to negotiate parked cars at certain times of the day.</p>	<p>The Traffic Regulation Order that has recently been advertised does not propose to introduce the Residents Parking Scheme into Daventry Court (the development). Daventry Court (the road) was included within the Residents Parking Scheme trial in 2014 and remains within the current TRO proposals. However, the fact that a road is included within the resident's parking scheme does not preclude it from having additional more stringent restrictions if there is a genuine need. Indeed, Daventry Court (the road) does have a single yellow line restriction that prevents parking Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm which we are not proposing to remove. This single yellow line restriction protects the road from on mass parking by local residents whilst enabling parking for a few residents' vehicles outside of these hours, so long as they are displaying valid permits and parked in a safe and considered manner. Since the introduction of the Resident Parking Trial in 2014 we have not had any resident representations regarding parking issues of any type relating to Daventry Court.</p> <p>The Residents Parking Scheme was designed to protect residents close to the town centre from increased parking demands associated with the town centre regeneration and assist local residents in finding on street parking by removing any external competition for this kerb side space. However, as with all public highway, this does not mean that it is safe for a driver to park anywhere on the highway within the residents parking zone without due care and attention. It remains the driver's responsibility to find a safe and un-obstructive location to park. If vehicles are parked in an unsafe and obstructive manner Thames Valley Police can enforce these offenses without the need for waiting restrictions. Where the police receive complaints regarding obstructive parking, that they consider to be genuine, they can contact the Council to bring this to our attention.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>XX XXXXXX XXXXXX Horsneile Lane</p>	<p>They object to the continuation of the scheme and the charges.</p> <p>They say that the scheme has caused friction in Horsneile Lane and not addressed the school related parking.</p> <p>The objector is a resident that runs their own business from home and says continuing the scheme, especially with charges will have an impact on the business. They believe that the charges are outrageous and the first 2 permits should be free and the cost of the visitor permits is too</p>	<p>The original charging regime set out within the rules of the scheme does not meet the operating costs incurred by the Council. There is currently a shortfall in funding and to continue to operate a subsidised scheme is not sustainable in the current economic climate.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to all the possible means of balancing the shortfall in income generated by the Residents Parking Scheme to make the scheme self-funding. The only realistic means to make the scheme self-funding is to charge for permits in accordance with the charges proposed. To this end the charging regime as advertised is</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

	<p>high. They do not have a driveway as their property fronts a green so they have no choice but to park on street and now they will have to pay to park outside their home.</p> <p>They understand that it costs money to run such a scheme but say the presence of enforcement is virtually invisible.</p> <p>They suggest instead of running a scheme the Council should extend the road into the green area to enable properties such as theirs to have driveways</p>	<p>essential for the resident parking scheme to continue.</p> <p>The Council do currently have an annual programme of installing additional residential parking within residential areas. However the aim of the residents parking scheme is to protect residents from competition for road side parking, and not to provide off street parking for residents.</p>	
<p>XXX XXXXX XXXXXXX Fraser Road</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of Fraser Road from the scheme</p> <p>The objector says that they have a XXXXX XXXXX and find parking near their property difficult already. They have to park in other roads already as there is limited parking in Fraser Road. With the town centre the parking demand will only rise</p> <p>They ask if the road could be</p>	<p>It has been proposed to remove Fraser Road from the residents parking scheme based on the results from the consultation at the end of the 2 year trial period.</p> <p>All the residents of Fraser Road have been consulted and only one resident has objected to the proposals. This implies that the remainder of the resident of Fraser road are either in favour of the proposal, or at the least, not significantly against them. Based on these results we are proposing to continue as advertised</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>XX XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXX Daventry Court</p>	<p>They request double yellow lines in Daventry Court</p> <p>The objection is based on the residents parking order keeping the single yellow line restrictions in Daventry Court as this is the access road into Daventry Court and should not have any parking. They would like the single yellow line amended to be a double yellow line</p>	<p>The Traffic Regulation Order that has recently been advertised does not propose to introduce the Residents Parking Scheme into Daventry Court (the development). Daventry Court (the road) was included within the Residents Parking Scheme trial in 2014 and remains within the current TRO proposals. However, the fact that a road is included within the resident's parking scheme does not preclude it from having additional more stringent restrictions if there is a genuine need. Indeed, Daventry Court (the road) does have a single yellow line restriction that prevents parking Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm which we are not proposing to remove. This single yellow line restriction protects the road from on mass parking by local residents whilst enabling parking for a few residents' vehicles outside of these hours, so long as they are displaying valid permits and parked in a safe and considered manner. Since the introduction of the Resident Parking Trial in 2014 we have not had any resident representations regarding parking issues of any type relating to Daventry Court.</p> <p>The Residents Parking Scheme was designed to protect residents close to the town centre from increased parking demands associated with the town centre regeneration and assist local residents in finding on street parking by removing any external competition for this kerb side space. However, as with all public highway, this does not mean that it is safe for a driver to park anywhere on the highway within the residents parking zone without due care and attention. It remains the driver's responsibility to find a safe and un-obstructive location to park. If vehicles are parked in an unsafe and obstructive manner Thames Valley Police can enforce these offenses without the need for waiting restrictions. Where the police receive complaints regarding</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

		obstructive parking, that they consider to be genuine, they can contact the Council to bring this to our attention.	
XX XXXXXX XXXXXX Horsneile Lane	<p>They object to the charges</p> <p>They agree that the scheme is essential for local residents in regard to the new town centre, but fail to see why the residents in the streets we have chosen to keep within the scheme should stay have to pay.</p> <p>They say the new town centre will benefit all Bracknell residents, but those in close proximity have suffered with noise and dust for 2 years already and now have to pay to park in their own road.</p> <p>They believe the fees required to run the scheme should be taken from the additional revenue taken from the parking in the town centres.</p> <p>They don't park on street by choice but out of necessity</p>	<p>The original charging regime set out within the rules of the scheme does not meet the operating costs incurred by the Council. There is currently a shortfall in funding and to continue to operate a subsidised scheme is not sustainable in the current economic climate.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to all the possible means of balancing the shortfall in income generated by the Residents Parking Scheme to make the scheme self-funding. The only realistic means to make the scheme self-funding is to charge for permits in accordance with the charges proposed. To this end the charging regime as advertised is essential for the resident parking scheme to continue.</p> <p>.</p> <p>It is not possible for the council allocate parking spaces on the public highway to individuals.</p>	Proceed as advertised
XX & XXX X XXXXXXXXXX Folders Lane	<p>They object to the removal of Residents Parking along Folders Lane.</p> <p>They state that residents have always had problems parking and accessing homes along Folders Lane particularly during school periods vehicles have been damaged on a number of occasions where vehicles have parked inconsiderately restricting passing space.</p> <p>When the trial parking scheme was introduced they were amazed how clearer the road became. Workers to the town centre were using the free parking spaces along Folders Lane and Bull Lane to their advantage as well as the schools drop off point at Garth and Sandy Lane.</p> <p>The introduction of permits had an immediate impact and made parking easier for residents and safer with fewer car incidents.</p> <p>The Bracknell Town Centre Regeneration Project will mean and increase to the number of workers employed in town areas and a significant increase in footfall traffic from shoppers. Folders Lane is a short walking distance to the town, once people are aware of free unrestricted parking a parking problem will increase and also at weekends as the town shopping centre becomes more popular. The fact that you cannot park in Bull Lane merely pushes more parked vehicles to the Folders Lane End.</p> <p>They confirm that no-one likes having to pay for permits but in this instance they welcome it as it makes parking for Folders Lane residents a lot easier and improves quality of life.</p> <p>They believe the introduction of permits clearly showed that there was a</p>	<p>There are 17 properties within Folders Lane that were included within the original Residents Parking Scheme trial and we have only received objection / comment from 3 properties. This implies that there is a majority of residents who are not wishing to continue with the scheme.</p> <p>Furthermore, with the proposed removal of the surrounding roads, Folders Lane would become a small isolated length of restriction that is not within the Zone.</p> <p>Enforcement of the scheme has been undertaken and will continue. If there are vehicles parked in breach of any waiting restrictions, including the Residents Parking Scheme, this can be reported to the Councils Operations team.</p>	Proceed as advertised

	<p>parking problem even prior to the regeneration project and alleviated the situation. Bull Lane and Folders Lane is effectively one road and they do not see permitting one half and not the other would make sense.</p> <p>They ask that the Council reconsider and reverse the decision to remove the permits from Folders Lane.</p>		
--	--	--	--

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

The Local Members for the effected roads were briefed and consulted prior to the statutory consultation.

Councillor G Birch – I have viewed this proforma and discussed it with the Executive Member, I wanted to check that some objections I had been made aware of were included and that the changes to the Binfield Road area was what I had hoped for. Nothing else to add other than glad the changes were made in line with resident wishes.

Councillor A Finch – No further comments received

Councillor T McKenzie-Boyle - Having read the objections and comments from the residents I have both sympathy with those who want to remain in the scheme, those who do not to be in the scheme and the Council for trying to ensure that all residents needs are examined. The problem is that everyone's requirements and needs will not be the same. As with all restrictions implemented on the highway by the Council, this scheme can be monitored over the next year as the town centre come into operation and amendments considered as and when they become required.

Some Horsneile Lane properties have deep front gardens which could be turned to parking spaces. Could they be reminded of the Council procedures for applying for a dropped kerb and driveway as part of this process.

We also need to insure that the permits are enforced especially after September 9th.