OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	RESIDENTS PARKING ORDER 2017 – ZONE E		
Date Advertised:	19 th October 2016 – 9 th November 2016	No. of Objections / Comments Received:	3

Name	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify /Proceed as advertised.
XX X XXXXXXX Goodways Drive Estate	Objects as they believe the proposals for the new pricing structure are outrageous. Currently they pay £20 but under the new proposal will have to pay £125 and they believe they will no longer be getting visitors in fear of getting a parking ticket. Would like to know the facts and figures behind the new pricing structure (wages, running costs, number of tickets issued).	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 proposals as advertised were designed following the end of trial consultation where views were sort from all residents within the	Proceed as advertised
		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	
XX X XXXXXX Goodways Drive Bracknell	Understands that central Bracknell will be expanded soon but objects to being charged to park in his own 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.	Proceed as advertised

XX XXXXX XXXXX XX The Oaks	They object to the charges		
	The objector objects most strongly to the continuation of the scheme with the proposed charges. They have lived in their property for over 35 years and seen the area develop from a quiet residential street to a mismatch of multi-occupancy dwellings.	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.	Proceed as advertised
	They say that the additional Council tax received from the multi occupancy dwellings, evidenced by the number of waste bins, should be used to cover the cost.	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	
	They ask why the first permit cannot be free, especially as they are pensioners. They say the Council gives them money to help with tv licences so why not these permits as well.	charges proposed. To this end the charging regime as advertised is essential for the resident parking scheme to continue.	
	They then say, if the charges do have to be introduced, could the first permit be valid for either car, preventing the need to purchase 2, as they have room on their drive for 1 vehicle.		

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Councillor R Angell- No further comments received

Councillor K Miller - No further comments received