

Annex F

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	RESIDENTS PARKING ORDER 2017 – ZONE D		
Date Advertised:	19th October 2016 – 9th November 2016	No. of Objections / Comments Received:	13

Name	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify /Proceed as advertised.
XXX X XXXXXXXXX North Green Bracknell	<p>Objects strongly to the proposed payment for the permit parking scheme. States that the parking in their area is inadequate for the population and that the residents have been forced to park on the grass.</p> <p>Believes that it is outrageous to expect people to pay for parking when there aren't enough spaces. States that the civil enforcement officers do not patrol at the correct times as the roads are empty during the day but there are often cars without permits parked at 5.30pm.</p> <p>If there is a charge then they believe there should be allocated parking spaces for each resident. They would be happy to pay a charge if it guaranteed a space.</p> <p>The Council should be tackling the problem by creating parking spaces. The green areas are usually an eyesore with broken bottles or dumped furniture.</p> <p>Would like to know what warrants the scheme being removed in Zone A and reduced in Zone B but not their zone.</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>It is not possible for the council allocate parking spaces on the public highway to individuals.</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 of road side parking, and not to provide off street parking for residents</p> <p>The proposals as advertised were designed following the end of trial consultation where views were sort from all residents within the trialled zones. Further information on this consultation can be found at http://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=102&MId=6498&Ver=4</p>	Proceed as advertised
XXX X XXXXXXXXX XX Fielden Place Bracknell	<p>Objects to the permit parking as it has made the parking more crowded in the Square. When there was only resident parking it was a lot better.</p> <p>States that they do not own a car but when visitors or workmen come they will have to pay to provide permits for them.</p>	<p>The resident parking scheme only provides permits to those properties within the Zone and as such should not be encouraging additional parking into the Zones from non-residents.</p> <p>This consultation, including the proposal to charge for all permits has</p>	Proceed as advertised.

	<p>They state that when flats were built on the Met. Office site they were told that there would be enough parking for them. This has not been the case which has had an effect on the parking in the area.</p>	<p>raised the issue of some residents who neither have off road parking facilities nor operate any vehicles from their address. In the proposed charging regime these residents would be required to pay for any visitor permits. The scheme is intended to protect the residents from kerb side competition and it is recognised that if a property has not applied for any resident's permits this property is not contributing to the on street parking pressures and as such are indirectly assisting other residents to find parking. Additionally, the absence of a registered vehicle is likely to be more prevalent in circumstances where a resident is in receipt of care or support. Therefore, it is proposed to amend the rules of the scheme to enable the council to issue a free 4 hour reusable permit to residents who have no current permits allocated to their property and have no off road parking facilities.</p> <p>The properties within the Kelvin Gate development built on the Met Office site are included within the Zone but are not entitled to have resident parking permits for their vehicles as Kelvin Gate is a private development with its own parking management plan. The residents of Kelvin Gate are permitted to apply for visitor permits but this should be limiting the effects of parking on street within Zone D.</p>	
<p>XX X XXXXXXXX North Green Bracknell</p>	<p>Objects as they do not believe the permit system is working and that the proposed cost is too high especially when you are not guaranteed a space.</p> <p>They state that they hardly ever see a Civil Enforcement Officer when there are plenty of cars and vans parked without any type of permit displayed.</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>It is not possible for the Council allocate parking spaces on the public highway to individuals.</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 department.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>X XXXXXXXXXX Deepfield Road</p>	<p>The resident objects to remaining within the scheme.</p> <p>They say they have lived in the road for over 14 years and never had a problem parking outside their home. They believe the Council are trying to foresee and prevent problems before they have actually occurred and think it would be better to build and open the Lexicon, then monitor the situation before reacting instead of penalising the residents with what ifs.</p>	<p>Parking within Deepfield Road was a topic that was regularly brought to the attention of the Council prior to the introduction of the Resident Parking Scheme.</p> <p>The end of trial results indicates that residents of Deepfield Road believe that the Residents Parking Scheme has been successful in this area.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

		<p>The proposals as advertised were designed following the end of trial consultation where views were sort from all residents within the trialled zones. Further information on this consultation can be found at http://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=102&MId=6498&Ver=4</p>	
<p>XX X XXXXX Smith Square</p>	<p>The resident objects to remaining within the scheme.</p> <p>They object to remaining in the scheme as they cannot see how the parking scheme can be beneficial as they can never find a parking space after 17:30 to park in. that there are too few spaces for residents and that the Council should build more spaces in Smith Square.</p> <p>They ask questions relating to the need to charge for permits to cover costs. Such as how much money goes to Vinci, how much to the council and what is the money used for. They say they can print a permit for less than £25 each and ask if we would pay that and claim it's unfair.</p> <p>They say that if we are going to charge for parking on street we should allocate specific parking spaces to specific permits. This will mean that at least they have a space to park</p> <p>The objector does not know one person happy with the scheme, because it has no sense. They say it offers no protection to residents.</p> <p>The objector then states, Don't forget the Council are there to serve the residents and not the other way around, if the residents will not pay their Council tax we will be out of jobs, They say they the above are facts from an honest citizen that works hard (and not earn £100k+) to sustain their family and that we would consider these facts the next time we go shopping or decide to create another charge.</p> <p>The objector finishes by saying that Deepfield Road looks like a war zone, with uneven road surfaces that can lead to accidents, especially in the winter and asks if the council will ever resurface this road.</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>It is not possible for the Council allocate parking spaces on the public highway to individuals.</p> <p>The concerns relating to Highway Maintenance have been passed to the Highways Asset Management section.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>XX X XXXXX Zone D</p>	<p>The resident objects to the charging and would like the first permit to remain free of charge</p> <p>The objector does not believe the trial scheme has made any difference to the parking situation during the enforcement hours. They say there have vast amounts of illegally parked vehicles that remain unenforced.</p> <p>Their main objection is that they are a single income, single vehicle family that struggle to make ends meet and that they already pay their Council tax and feel the first permit should be free. They feel they are being asked</p>	<p>Parking within Deepfield Road was a topic that was regularly brought to the attention of the council prior to the introduction of the Resident Parking Scheme.</p> <p>The end of trial results indicates that residents of Deepfield Road believe that the Residents Parking Scheme has been successful in this area.</p> <p>The proposals as advertised were designed following the end of trial consultation where views were sort from all residents within the</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

	<p>to pay additional fees for a service they didn't request. They suggest raising the charges for the 2-5th permit to enable the first to be free</p>	<p>trialled zones. Further information on this consultation can be found at http://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=102&Mid=6498&Ver=4</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>XX X XXXXXXXX Deepfield Road</p>	<p>The resident objects to the introduction of the charges</p> <p>The resident recently moved into Deepfield Road and was not aware that the residents parking scheme was a trial, (they accept that the not knowing was their fault). They believe that the parking scheme is a good idea considering the town centre growth but do not agree that the residents should pay for the permits. They believe the additional funding should be raised either through the regeneration of the town centre or from existing Council tax. They conclude with whatever the decision the first 2 permits should be free.</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>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>XX X XXXXXXXXXXXXX Zone D</p>	<p>The resident objects to the introduction of the charges.</p> <p>The objector says charging for parking in any parking zone is not the solution and kindly gives the Council the solution 'free of charge'. The say we should 'sort out the Kelvin Gate parking and the rest will fall into line'.</p> <p>They say the Council did not take into consideration local residents concerns before planning consent was given for the Kelvin Gate site. They claim the parking in Zone D is caused by the overspill from Kelvin Gate and 'if we go down the charging route there will be big problems for the Council'</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>The properties within the private Kelvin Gate development built on the Met Office site are included within the zone but are not entitled to have resident parking permits for their vehicles as there is a private parking management plan in place for this development. The residents of Kelvin Gate are permitted to apply for visitor permits but this should be limiting the effects of parking on street within Zone D.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

<p>XX XXXXX XXXXXXXX Deepfield Road</p>	<p>They object to the introduction of the charges</p> <p>The objector does not have a car but does have visitors. They have been Council tenants for over 20 years and lived in Deepfield Road for 10. They say they already get a discount from Council tax and feel that paying £25 for a car that they don't own is not acceptable</p> <p>They object to the cost of the visitor permits and ask do they have to limit the number of people who visit them, and if they get ill does somebody have to pay for them to come and look after them.</p> <p>They say £25 is a lot of money.</p> <p>They say that there are lots of vehicles within the zone that are parked without permits. They think the charges will make people try to avoid the charges by parking on the grass verges</p> <p>They would like every property to get 1 free permit</p>	<p>This consultation, including the proposal to charge for all permits has raised the issue of some residents who neither have off road parking facilities nor operate any vehicles from their address. In the proposed charging regime these residents would be required to pay for any visitor permits. The scheme is intended to protect the residents from kerb side competition and it is recognised that if a property has not applied for any resident's permits this property is not contributing to the on street parking pressures and as such are indirectly assisting other residents to find parking. Additionally, the absence of a registered vehicle is likely to be more prevalent in circumstances where a resident is in receipt of care or support. Therefore, it is proposed to amend the rules of the scheme to enable the council to issue a free 4 hour reusable permit to residents who have no current permits allocated to their property and have no off road parking facilities.</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 Council's Operations team.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>XX X XXXX X Forest Green</p>	<p>They object to the charges</p> <p>They believe that as they are not guaranteed a parking space, even if they have paid for a permit. They do not believe it is right to buy permits for family and friends to park.</p> <p>They say they Council are only picking on certain areas to introduce this charge. They are Foster carers and need a regular number of meetings.</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>It is not possible for the Council to allocate parking spaces on the public highway to individuals.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>XXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXX XX Fielden Place</p>	<p>They object to the proposals</p> <p>They question why those in Zone A and part of Zone B have been removed from the need to pay the charges, but the rest haven't.</p> <p>They continue that when the trial was begun 2 years ago the Council's aims were to protect the residents from parking pressures generated by the regenerated town centre. They ask considering this, how will the scheme help if its operations hours are not 24 hours a day but the town centre is.</p>	<p>The proposals as advertised were designed following the end of trial consultation where views were sort from all residents within the trialled zones. Further information on this consultation can be found at http://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=102&MId=6498&Ver=4</p> <p>The intention of the scheme not being 24 hours a day is that the competition for on street parking is removed from the Zones during the day and to the early evening, so that residents going about their daily business will be able to more easily find on street parking. However, visitors during the evenings and overnight, when visiting is</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

	<p>They say that if we are going to charge, it should be the same for each car and ask how the Council can justify increased charges per vehicle and say it sounds like a stealth tax to help with the running of the scheme.</p> <p>They ask why she should pay £40 (2nd vehicle permit) to park her car on street during the hours she is at work, and there is no need for a permit during the evening when she returns.</p> <p>If the Council continues the scheme and introduces the charges, it should be made 24hrs a day</p>	<p>more common can park without the need for permits, albeit, if there is space left.</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>XXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXX XX Fielden Place</p>	<p>Objects to the charges</p> <p>They object as the parking in Fielden Place has become impossible. They finish work at 8pm and can never find parking in their street. They work 2 jobs to live and can't afford the money for parking</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>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>XX XXXXXXXX XXXX XXX Kelvin Gate</p>	<p>They say they responded to the consultation, and the original proposal but do not believe that their feedback has been considered.</p> <p>The state that whilst the Council are saying the scheme is to protect residents from parking associated to the town centre this is clearly not the case and that it is a money making exercise. They are disgusted by the management of the scheme and the decisions made around those residents eligible for the scheme. Residents of Kelvin Gate and other in the town centre are being discriminated against.</p> <p>Kelvin Gate does not have sufficient parking to allow more than 1 vehicle per property, and that this should be an issue the council assist with. Deepfield Road residents can apply for up to 5 permits but Kelvin Gate residents ant even apply for 1 and that this is not fair. Being only able to apply for scratch cards was a kick in the teeth but now the council are having the audacity to charge for even these.</p> <p>They would like Kelvin Gate residents to be more included with the opportunity to purchase at least 1 permit.</p>	<p>The proposals as advertised were designed following the end of trial consultation where views were sort from all residents within the trialled zones. Further information on this consultation can be found at http://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=102&MId=6498&Ver=4</p> <p>The properties within the Kelvin Gate development built on the Met Office site are included within the Zone but are not entitled to have resident parking permits for their vehicles as Kelvin Gate is a private development with its own parking management plan. It is for this reason we expect the private estate to be providing the required parking for its residents. We are however, as noted, continuing to supply visitor parking.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

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

Councillor R Angell- No further comments received

Councillor K Miller – No further comments received