

Annex B

--

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2017		
	Westmorland Drive – ‘Prohibition of Waiting’ Restrictions		
Date Advertised:	26.07.2017	No. of Objections Received:	2 objections

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXX (Address unspecified)	<p>X would like to register an objection to the proposal as it does not address the root cause. X believes the real issue is that the 44 parking spaces provided by the park are inadequate.</p> <p>X states the surrounding roads are being used to supplement the inadequate provision in the park itself rather than for the occasional overspill that residents could all accept. The park car park is used by Anglers who use the lake, playground users, dog walkers, walkers using the woods and general visitors. At least double the parking capacity is required within the park.</p> <p>X believes it is a simple matter of prioritisation and informed choices to redirect funding to something as fundamental as basic infrastructure for the capacity of parking offered and that land available to extend the car park is fairly obvious.</p> <p>X believes that the local residents deserve greater transparency as to why this was the solution that the Council saw fit to use rather than other options. It is felt that more responsibility should be placed on Whitegrove FC to inform visiting teams of the lack of parking, to promote car sharing and to consider the impact of parking on the local residents.</p>	<p>The Councils primary duty is to ensure that traffic is able to traverse the highway in a safe reasonable manner, so a balance must always be struck between the need for parking and the safe movement of traffic. It is for this reason that these restrictions have been proposed.</p> <p>The proposed waiting restriction on Saturday 9am – 1pm has been placed in areas where parking is unsafe and has restricted access in Westmorland Drive during local sports activities in Westmorland Park recreation ground to alleviate parking issues raised by residents.</p> <p>The waiting restriction scheme has been proposed in a staggered layout to maintain safe vehicular access in Westmorland Drive, whilst still permitting a balance and sufficient level of on street parking to visitors.</p> <p>The layout of the proposed restrictions mirror the existing arrangement of traffic cones which are placed on highway during Saturday mornings when the recreation ground is used for sport to maintain access and the safe movement of traffic. The restrictions, therefore, will not inconvenience residents more than at present.</p> <p>As part of the consultation process ‘parking pressures’ to the highway in Westmorland Drive from visitors who use local amenities at Westmorland Park recreation ground will be raised with the Parks & Countryside Services, with a view to reviewing their current travel plan and other available options to meet the ongoing demand of residents and visitors to the park.</p>	Proceed as advertised
X X XXXXXX Kent Folly	X XXXXXX feels that the restrictions will increase the difficulty of moving around the area on Saturday mornings during the football season. X	The Councils primary duty is to ensure that traffic is able to traverse the highway in a safe reasonable manner, so a balance must always	Proceed as advertised

	<p>believes that reduced parking in Westmorland Drive will increase parking in Bedfordshire Down and Kent Folly.</p> <p>X asks if these areas could be considered for further waiting restrictions in the current proposal list –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West side of Bedfordshire Down opposite the junction with Kent Folly • Both sides of Kent Folly between Bedfordshire Down and Cornwall Close • Both sides of Kent Folly between Cornwall Close and the cul-de-sacs (6-16 Kent Folly) 	<p>be struck between the need for parking and the safe movement of traffic. It is for this reason that these restrictions have been proposed.</p> <p>The proposed waiting restriction on Saturday 9am – 1pm has been placed in areas where parking is unsafe and has restricted access in Westmorland Drive during local sports activities in Westmorland Park recreation ground to alleviate parking issues raised by residents.</p> <p>The waiting restriction scheme has been proposed in a staggered layout to maintain safe vehicular access in Westmorland Drive, whilst still permitting a balance and sufficient level of on street parking to visitors.</p> <p>The layout of the proposed restrictions mirror the existing arrangement of traffic cones which are placed on highway during Saturday mornings when the recreation ground is used for sport to maintain access and the safe movement of traffic. The restrictions, therefore, will not inconvenience residents more than at present.</p> <p>As this is a statutory procedure we are unable to introduce additional restrictions other than those shown in the proposal. However, as with all waiting restriction schemes the Council will monitor the highway after installation to assess if displaced vehicles do result in obstruction or road safety problems in surrounding roads, restrictions can be considered at that time.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr R MCClean – No comment received

Cllr C Thompson – Agrees with proceeding with the advertised proposals and monitoring the effects on adjoining roads. He points out that extending the park car park has been looked at before and suggest maybe it could considered again.

Cllr G Barnard – agrees with Cllr Thompson’s comments

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2017		
	Prince Drive – 'Prohibition of Waiting" Restrictions		
Date Advertised:	26.07.17	No. of Objections Received:	4 Objections

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXXXX Prince Drive	<p>X agrees that parking can be an issue but does not agree that the double yellow lines proposal is the answer.</p> <p>X states the X is very aware that Prince Drive is parked in regularly by the four houses of XXXX, three of which have driveways (unlike their own property). X is also aware that all of these neighbours have regular visitors who park along Prince Drive (one neighbour runs a business from home and frequently has clients visit).</p> <p>X claims X has suffered criminal damage to X families cars from one of their neighbours so X is reluctant to have the cars parked further away from the property where they are unable to see the them. X states that X and X family constantly have to juggle the 'prime' parking spots with visitors of other houses that do have available off-street parking and driveways.</p> <p>X believes the extent of lining goes too far and will remove parking spaces that do not affect the visibility at the junction. However, X agrees that occasional parking over the give way marking in Prince Drive, on the corner, is dangerous and does restrict visibility.</p> <p>X would rather see a resident parking scheme rather than yellow lines so that it benefits the residents over the visitors.</p> <p>Additional comment – X added that imposing the restrictions will likely affect the value of X property.</p>	<p>It is the Councils responsibility to act on reports of parking that is causing safety or obstruction issues.</p> <p>The waiting restriction proposal was designed to alleviate issues raised by residents with regards to obstructive parking at the junction entrance to Prince Drive.</p> <p>The section of carriageway in The High Street, Little Sandhurst adjacent to the entrance to Prince Drive outside 'Camelot' and 'Merillees' is on a hill and bend in the road. It is for this reason that a 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction has been proposed as the Council do not believe that it is safe for vehicles to park in these positions.</p> <p>If criminal damage is caused to vehicles in the area then this is a matter for the Police and falls outside the scope of this traffic regulation order.</p> <p>Resident Parking has been installed in Bracknell Town where there are parking pressures to the new town centre areas. There are no immediate plans at present to trial Residents Parking in other areas of the borough, such as in Little Sandhurst.</p>	Proceed as advertised
X X XXXXXXX Prince Drive	<p>X approves of the proposal but asks if the double yellow lines can be extended to include the area of pavement in front of X property. People often park there, and because the road is already quite narrow this forces</p>	<p>The waiting restriction proposal was designed to alleviate issues raised by residents with regards to obstructive parking at the junction entrance to Prince Drive.</p>	Proceed as advertised

	<p>traffic down to single file and blocks the view left when leaving Prince Drive.</p>	<p>The section of carriageway in The High Street, Little Sandhurst adjacent to the entrance to Prince Drive outside 'Camelot' and 'Merillees' is on a hill and bend in the road. It is for this reason that a 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction has been proposed as the Council do not believe that it is safe for vehicles to park in these positions.</p> <p>As this is a statutory procedure we are unable to introduce additional restrictions other than those shown in the proposal. However, as with all waiting restriction schemes the Council will monitor the highway after installation to assess if displaced vehicles do result in obstruction or road safety problems in surrounding roads, restrictions can be considered at that time.</p>	
<p>XX X XXXXXXXX J-Giblets Folly</p>	<p>X states that this is where X and X XXXX park as they don't have driveways. X also believes that if the restrictions are put in place, it will mean residents further down will be inconvenienced when they park further down the road. X also feels that the restrictions will decrease the value of their property.</p>	<p>It is the Councils responsibility to act on reports of parking that is causing safety or obstruction issues.</p> <p>The waiting restriction proposal was designed to alleviate issues raised by residents with regards to obstructive parking at the junction entrance to Prince Drive.</p> <p>The section of carriageway in The High Street, Little Sandhurst adjacent to the entrance to Prince Drive outside 'Camelot' and 'Merillees' is on a hill and bend in the road. It is for this reason that a 'No Waiting At Any Time' restriction has been proposed as the Council do not believe that it is safe for vehicles to park in these positions.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>X & X XXXXXXXXXX</p>	<p>X fully agree with the proposal, but would like the area extended further to include in front of The Wrekin. Anyone parking in front of The Wrekin results in visibility being reduced for people trying to exit Prince Drive.</p>	<p>It is the Councils responsibility to act on reports of parking that is causing safety or obstruction issues.</p> <p>The waiting restriction proposal was designed to alleviate issues raised by residents with regards to obstructive parking at the junction entrance to Prince Drive.</p> <p>As this is a statutory procedure we are unable to introduce additional restrictions other than those shown in the proposal. However, as with all waiting restriction schemes the Council will monitor the highway after installation to assess if displaced vehicles do result in obstruction or road safety problems in surrounding roads, restrictions can be considered at that time.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr D Birch - Questions why the residents suggestions cannot be implemented now rather than in a future Order.

Council response - When the Council propose waiting restrictions, we have to follow a statutory process to get the formal Traffic Regulation Order signed and sealed. Unfortunately, once we have undertaken the statutory consultation and received objections it is not legally possible for the Council to add any restrictions to the proposal without starting the process again. It is legally possible to lessen or reduce the restrictions proposed in response to comments received as this is seen to be less stringent, but altering the proposals to make them more stringent is not permitted without again consulting on the added restrictions.

Cllr P Bettison - No comment received

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2017		
	Chadwick Mews – 'Prohibition of Waiting" Restrictions		
Date Advertised:	26.07.17	No. of Objections Received:	1

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/ Modify/ Proceed as advertised
X X XXXX (No Address Noted)	<p>X understands the need for something to be done given the problems caused at times by parking in Chadwick Mews from visitors to the Open Learning Centre together with parents collecting school children from the nearby Brackenhale School. Inconsiderate parking occurs at the junction, as well as double parking throughout the length of Chadwick Mews at times, which restricts access and two way vehicular traffic to safely exit this residential close.</p> <p>X does not know where these people are going to go and believes it is a well known fact that the Open Learning Centre does not have enough parking to accommodate its clients. By placing double yellow lines down Chadwick Mews X believes the residents are again going to be in a position that they are unable to access their own private parking spaces because the patrons of the Open Learning Centre will move down into the estate.</p> <p>X feels that the facilities and parking provision at the Open Learning Centre need addressing rather than the introduction of yellow lining presently.</p>	<p>Onsite observations by Council Engineers have confirmed ongoing parking at the junction of Chadwick Mews with Rectory Lane. This parking is obstructing vehicular and pedestrian movement at this junction in such a way as to cause a road safety issue</p> <p>Parked vehicles on both sides of the carriageway in Chadwick Mews have been observed to restrict access for emergency vehicles whilst also obstructing access and egress to residents exiting this residential cul-de-sac.</p> <p>The No Waiting At Any Time restrictions have been proposed around the access roads and to protect the visibility splays. They have also been proposed to prevent parking on both sides of the road obstructing through traffic.</p> <p>We recognise that the capacity of the Car Park facilities at the Open Learning Centre can at times be insufficient for the demand and that this has led to parking practices causing obstruction and leading to the proposals. Unfortunately as highway authority it is not possible for us to simply construct additional parking spaces. As Highway Authority, our primary concern must be to ensure that the public highway is safe and passable for road users. It is believed the restrictions will achieve this.</p> <p>It is our believe that overspill parking from the Open Learning Centre has in the past been respectful of the private parking and we have no reason to believe this will change with the addition of the waiting restrictions.</p>	Proceed as advertised

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr I Mc Cracken - No comment received

Cllr P Heydon - No comment received

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2017		
	Crowthorne Road / Wildridings Road / Kyle Close – ‘Prohibition of Waiting" Restrictions		
Date Advertised:	26.07.17	No. of Objections Received:	5

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X XXXXXX Kyle Close	<p>The resident appreciates the proposal but fears that shoppers will park in Kyle Close after 11am especially when the Town Centre is fully open, thus moving the demographic of the car parking but not resolving the issue.</p> <p>The resident has noticed that issues occur in Kyle Close when people park both sides of the road and asks if it may be possible to introduce a no waiting at any time restriction on one side of the road instead of the proposed 1 hour solution?</p> <p>The resident also feels that the area opposite Ingleton seems very close to the junction and bus stops. Could other areas be increased and this one removed?</p>	<p>The waiting restriction proposal was designed to alleviate issues raised by residents and local members with regards to inconsiderate and obstructive parking in Crowthorne Road, Kyle Close and Wildridings Road on a bus route.</p> <p>Since the introduction of Residents Parking close by to the town centre areas, long stay commuter type parking has increased in Crowthorne Road, Kyle Close and in Wildridings Road.</p> <p>The use of a single yellow line waiting restriction between 10 am – 11 am has been used to great effect in other areas of the Borough to prevent on mass all day parking.</p> <p>Introducing a No Waiting At Any Time restriction to one side of the highway only in Kyle Close may not be favourable with residents as this would significantly reduce the amount of available on-street parking during evenings and at weekends, and it would be likely further objections may be received.</p> <p>The Councils primary duty is to ensure that traffic is able to traverse the highway in a safe reasonable manner, so a balance must always be struck between the need for parking and the safe movement of traffic. It is for this reason that these restrictions have been proposed.</p> <p>Since receiving objection to the original proposal from residents regarding the introduction of a 2 hour limited waiting area for visitor parking in Wildridings Road opposite and adjacent to Ingleton, an amendment to install No Waiting At Any Time has been proposed to remove parking at this location. Residents in a close proximity to this length of Wildridings Road have off road visitor parking and there are</p>	Modify the proposal as shown on DWG 5144-006-A

		<p>some other lengths of unrestricted parking nearby. These residents have been re consulted regarding the possibility of amending the scheme to remove the 2 hours limited waiting and replace it with Double yellow lines. No further comments have been received and so this amendment will be made.</p> <p>It is not possible under current statute to add restrictions to an order without re-advertising. However, as with all waiting restriction schemes, the situation will be monitored and if displaced vehicles do result in additional lengths of parking causing obstruction or road safety problems, restrictions can be considered at that time.</p>	
<p>X XXXXXXXXXX Frog Lane</p>	<p>X has contacted both the Council and Thames Valley Police regularly regarding dangerous parking on Wildridings Road especially around the junction which heads towards Downshire Way. People park very close to the junction causing real visibility issues for road users.</p> <p>X welcomes the proposal for 'no waiting at any time' though has the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels the proposed 2 hour restriction will still cause visibility issues. Vehicles speeding, as well as exiting from side roads, will lead to a nasty accident when cars are permitted to continue parking on Wildridings Road. All residents along this stretch have their own parking facilities so she does not see that it serves any purpose to permit parking on Wildridings Road. • Introducing parking restrictions on Wildridings Road will lead to increased parking in the surrounding side roads therefore the proposed no waiting at any time needs to be extended further into the side roads than as noted in the proposal. She observes parking that is within 10 metres and also opposite junctions to Wildridings Road which is a danger. • Feels that the area outside the Downshire Resource Centre and Westwick Hall should be included as well with a no waiting at any time restriction. 	<p>The waiting restriction proposal was designed to alleviate issues raised by residents and local members with regards to inconsiderate and obstructive parking in Crowthorne Road, Kyle Close and Wildridings Road on a bus route.</p> <p>Since the introduction of Residents Parking close by to the town centre areas, long stay commuter type parking has increased in Crowthorne Road, Kyle Close and in Wildridings Road.</p> <p>The Councils primary duty is to ensure that traffic is able to traverse the highway in a safe reasonable manner, so a balance must always be struck between the need for parking and the safe movement of traffic. It is for this reason that these restrictions have been proposed.</p> <p>Since receiving objection to the original proposal from residents regarding the introduction of a 2 hour limited waiting area for visitor parking in Wildridings Road opposite and adjacent to Ingleton, an amendment to install No Waiting At Any Time has been proposed to remove parking at this location. Residents in a close proximity to this length of Wildridings Road have off road visitor parking and there are other lengths of unrestricted parking available nearby. These residents have been re consulted regarding the possibility of amending the scheme to remove the 2 hours limited waiting and replace it with Double yellow lines. No further comments have been received and so this amendment will be made.</p> <p>Three other proposed lengths of 2 hour limited waiting along Wildridings Road and in Crowthorne Road have been located in a staggered position where the road width and visibility is sufficient for traffic to safely pass, and re-pass the carriageway. A level of parking will act to reduce the overall vehicle speeds.</p> <p>It is not possible under current statute to add restrictions to an order without re-advertising. However, as with all waiting restriction schemes, the situation will be monitored and if displaced vehicles do result in additional lengths of parking causing obstruction or road safety problems, restrictions can be considered at that time.</p>	<p>Modify the proposal as shown on DWG 5144-006-A</p>

<p>X XXXXXX Lauradale</p>	<p>The resident thanks the Council for sending through the proposals. Their initial reaction is that the parking problem may go away once the Bracknell Regeneration is completed and requests whether the situation could be reviewed in 12 months time.</p> <p>The resident states that they assume that the ratio and capacity of parking spaces for employees will be increased as part of the Regeneration project and empathises with individuals trying to do a job of work, yet are frustrated by their efforts to get to their place of work.</p> <p>The resident confirms there have been no parking issues on Crowthorne Road between Lauradale and Netherton, with the exception of the afternoon school run. They don't believe any amount of walk to school encouragement will solve that problem, it's a transitory event and would not like to think that parents might be penalised for this daily task by removing on street parking.</p> <p>The resident believes the main problem at the entrance to Lauradale is where the people who live in the multi-occupancy residence park their cars. There is occasional non-resident day time parking in Lauradale, but feels the latest proposal will make the problem worse not better.</p>	<p>The waiting restriction proposal was designed to alleviate issues raised by residents and local members with regards to inconsiderate and obstructive parking in Crowthorne Road, Kyle Close and Wildridings Road on a bus route.</p> <p>Since the introduction of Residents Parking close by to the town centre areas, long stay commuter type parking has increased in Crowthorne Road, Kyle Close and in Wildridings Road.</p> <p>Parking capacity within Bracknell Town Centre has increased during recent regeneration with the construction of the Avenue Car Park alongside three existing multi-storey car parks and four pay and display car parks to make provision for additional employees and town centre visitors.</p> <p>Parking surveys by Council Engineers along Crowthorne Road in the area between Lauradale and Netherton have confirmed parking that was obstructive to the side junctions, therefore No Waiting At Any time restrictions have been proposed at the junctions and where the road is narrow on a bend and bus route with pedestrian dropped kerb crossing point where parking is unsafe.</p> <p>The Wildridings Primary School has a travel plan in place and there is available parking within a safe walking distance to School to make provision.</p>	<p>Modify the proposal as shown on DWG 5144-006-A</p>
<p>X & X XXXXXXX Crowthorne Road</p>	<p>X feel that speeding is more of an issue than parked cars which could be curbed with the installation of a speed camera.</p> <p>X state that parked cars are only an issue when turning left on to Wildridings Road from Crowthorne Road or near the football field. They believe that a layby at this position, especially during practice time would be beneficial.</p> <p>X add there is very little on-street parking overall in Crowthorne Road. People seldom park between Springhill and the Green Man public house, with the occasional meeting or party is held at the latter where on-street parking is observed. They state that only four houses have adequate parking off-street and they do not see the sense to prevent parking between Wyvern Close until well past the Green Man Pub.</p>	<p>The waiting restriction proposal was designed to alleviate issues raised by residents and local members with regards to inconsiderate and obstructive parking in Crowthorne Road, Kyle Close and Wildridings Road on a bus route.</p> <p>Since the introduction of Residents Parking close by to the town centre areas, long stay commuter type parking has increased in Crowthorne Road, Kyle Close and in Wildridings Road.</p> <p>Parking surveys by Council Engineers along Crowthorne Road in the area between Springhill and Oxenhope has confirmed parking that was obstructive to the side junctions. Therefore, No Waiting At Any Time restrictions have been proposed at the junctions and where the road is narrow on a bend and bus route, with pedestrian dropped kerb crossing points and parking is deemed unsafe. There is alternate parking provision to residents and private business premises nearby in adjacent side roads to Crowthorne Road.</p> <p>The Councils primary duty is to ensure that traffic is able to traverse the highway in a safe reasonable manner, so a balance must always be struck between the need for parking and the safe movement of traffic. It is for this reason that these restrictions have been proposed.</p>	<p>Modify the proposal as shown on DWG 5144-006-A</p>

<p>X XXXXXXXX Wildridings Road</p>	<p>X would like to object to the length of 2 hour waiting restriction to the left of X property and would rather it be double yellow line restrictions in line with the rest of the road. X has provided the Council with photos that illustrate X objections as listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor visibility when exiting from X driveway behind parked vehicles. • Inability to reverse onto driveway therefore even more dangerous if you have to reverse off into path of oncoming vehicles • The proposed parking is dangerous and would introduce a significant road safety concern. X would be unable to physically get off of X driveway, or reverse into X driveway without having to blindly use the opposite side of the road. • The road is on a bend and hill which further reduces the forward visibility. Having any vehicle parked in this location removes visibility and is dangerous. • Wildridings Road should be no parking anywhere, in line with other roads. All our houses (residents/ neighbours) have off-road driveways to park on that is sufficient for visitors • There is sufficient visitor parking nearby in Frog lane, or indeed alternative pay and display to park in the pub/ hotel at Downshire Arms. • The bus has a mobility raised kerb and allowing the parking will prevent buses from approaching the bus stop and stopping parallel to the kerb which it needs to do for wheelchair access. There are a few residents in wheelchairs who use this service. • Elderly passengers use the bus stops (both sides of the road) and then cross over the road in this location at the dropped kerb tactile pavement crossing point. The parking will prevent them doing so safely due to limited visibility to drivers/ pedestrians introducing a further road safety issue. Many of them do not feel safe in the underpass. There has been an attack down there they will effectively be walking out from behind parked vehicles • The hill at this point in the road can often cause drivers to be blinded by the sun shine (due to its raised position) and road users may miss the parked vehicles, or fail to see if it is safe to cross to the other side (off-side) of the road to pass parked vehicles. 	<p>The waiting restriction proposal was designed to alleviate issues raised by residents and local members with regards to inconsiderate and obstructive parking in Crowthorne Road, Kyle Close and Wildridings Road on a bus route.</p> <p>Since the introduction of Residents Parking close by to the town centre areas, long stay commuter type parking has increased in Crowthorne Road, Kyle Close and in Wildridings Road.</p> <p>The Councils primary duty is to ensure that traffic is able to traverse the highway in a safe reasonable manner, so a balance must always be struck between the need for parking and the safe movement of traffic. It is for this reason that these restrictions have been proposed.</p> <p>Since receiving objection to the original proposal from residents regarding the introduction of a 2 hour limited waiting area for visitor parking in Wildridings Road opposite and adjacent to Ingleton, an amendment to install No Waiting At Any Time has been proposed to remove parking at this location. Residents in a close proximity to this length of Wildridings Road have off road visitor parking and there are other lengths of unrestricted parking available nearby. These residents have been re consulted regarding the possibility of amending the scheme to remove the 2 hours limited waiting and replace it with Double yellow lines. No further comments have been received and so this amendment will be made.</p> <p>Three other proposed lengths of 2 hour limited waiting along Wildridings Road and in Crowthorne Road have been located in a staggered position where the road width and visibility is sufficient for traffic to safely pass, and re-pass the carriageway. A level of parking will act to traffic calm where it is safe to do so and will help reduce the overall vehicle speeds.</p>	<p>Modify the proposal as shown on DWG 5144-006-A</p>
--	--	---	--

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr Mrs D Hamilton - Is glad that the amended plans have taken into account views of resident objections . She asks how the restrictions will be enforced as unless there is a deterrent people will just park there

Council response - Unfortunately the Council does not have the power to enforce via CCTV therefore the restrictions will be enforced by our Civil Enforcement Officers. Whilst they have standard routes that they patrol that cover the Borough, residents are also able to report in offending vehicles and an Officer can be asked to visit if resources allow.

Cllr M Skinner - Understand the residents concerns as he also has issues with restrictions where they have impact on parking but he also appreciates the need for control on our roads, for all of the reasons they are there.

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2017		
	Lime Walk – ‘Prohibition of Waiting’ Restrictions		
Date Advertised:	26.07.17	No. of comments received:	2 objections, 1 in support

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXX Darwin Place	<p>X supports the proposal but feels that it should only be in place from Monday to Friday.</p> <p>A Saturday restriction would restrict local residents from parking on the road when they are more likely to have visitors.</p> <p>X asks if the restrictions could either be reduced to Monday to Friday only or introduce a residents parking scheme?</p>	<p>The Council has received numerous complaints over the last several months concerning parking levels in Lime Walk and this proposal was developed as a result of these and observed parking. Whilst the Council sympathises with X's concerns, the scheme has been developed to curtail and control long term commuter parking that is occurring in Lime Walk. With the opening of the Lexicon it is likely if Saturdays were removed from the restrictions shoppers and shop workers would quickly utilise this area of unrestricted parking leaving it unavailable for adjacent residents. It is the Council's understanding that residents of Darwin Place are able to park an additional vehicle in the car park of the adjacent Harvester restaurant.</p> <p>The Council has just completed a residents parking scheme trial in Bracknell Town Centre and are currently assessing the impact of this. There are no plans for further residents parking areas at this time.</p>	Proceed as advertised
X XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX Choice Care Group	<p>Choice Care Group welcome the proposed parking restrictions as they regularly receive complaints from local residents stating that the parked cars in Lime Walk are employees of their company when in fact this is not the case.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	Proceed as advertised
X X XXXXXXXX Darwin Place	<p>X states the proposal to remove parking from Lime Walk would have an adverse effect on the residents of Darwin Place.</p> <p>X explains that each property has a single parking space on the driveway as well as a parking space provided in the Harvester car park. For properties that have 3 or more cars, which is to be expected with 4 bedroom properties, Lime Walk is the only other available space to residents for parking.</p>	<p>The Council has received numerous complaints over the last several months concerning parking levels in Lime Walk and this proposal was developed as a result of these and observed parking. Whilst the Council sympathises with X's concerns, the scheme has been developed to curtail and control long term commuter parking that is occurring in Lime Walk. With the opening of the Lexicon it is likely the limited waiting restrictions were removed from the proposal, shoppers and shop workers would quickly utilise this area of unrestricted parking leaving it unavailable for adjacent residents.</p>	Proceed as advertised

		<p>The scheme has been designed to prevent obstructive parking whilst maintaining on street parking for residents and their visitors where possible. This parking has been limited to 2 hours between 8am and 6pm Monday to Saturday to prevent long term parking during these hours. This will hopefully keep spaces available for residents, which will of course be able to use this parking unrestricted outside of these hours.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr Mrs I Mattick – No comment received

Cllr Mrs A Merry – No comment received

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2017		
	Bull Lane – ‘Loading/Unloading’ Restrictions		
Date Advertised:	26.07.17	No. of Objections Received:	3

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXXX Bull Lane	X fully agrees with the proposals. X hopes that parking enforcement officers will be sent down to back this up!	Comments noted.	Proceed as advertised
X X XXXXXX	<p>Email complains that our ideas consistently make matters worse rather than dealing with the problem at hand which is the parking and the speed limit.</p> <p>The resident feels the road has become more of a rat run in recent years with cars travelling at increased speeds and that it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured.</p> <p>The long parking bays which were introduced as part of the residents parking scheme, a scheme which no longer applies, mean that traffic is reduced to a single lane for longer distances as they get past them. Cars are travelling faster to get past the parked cars so that they don't have to stop and give way to oncoming traffic.</p> <p>Could we at least reduce the length of the parking bays to increase the number of pull in places?</p> <p>X suggests that the junctions of Bull Lane, Shepherds Lane and Sandy Lane should all have double yellow lines to prevent parking at the junctions.</p>	<p>In 2015 the Council carried out a speed survey in Bull Lane which recorded average speeds of approximately 25mph in the section between Millennium Way and Shepherds Lane. Based on this and the good road safety record of the road, it is considered the existing speed limit of 30mph is appropriate and there are no plans for the introduction of speed reduction measures at this time.</p> <p>All of the lengths of parking in Bull Lane are placed on sections of the road where there is good forward visibility. Reducing the lengths of parking would remove available parking for local residents who have no off-street parking provision and therefore it is likely any such proposal would be unpopular.</p> <p>Parking within 15metres of a junction is prohibited under The Highway Code and the Police are able to take enforcement action against cars parked in this fashion. The Council does place restrictions on junctions where vehicles are repeatedly causing a safety issue as this allows the Council's own Parking Enforcement Team to take action. Whilst the Council sympathises with X's concerns over the parking on the junctions of Shepherds Lane and Sandy Lane with Bull Lane, it is not aware that it is a level that would warrant additional restrictions than those already in force.</p>	Proceed as advertised
X X XXXXXX Horsneile Lane	The resident doesn't object to the proposal but thinks the times in the morning require adjustment.	The current restrictions have been in force for a number of years and we believe that they cover the time period when the majority of parking issues are occurring. As with any new parking restriction	Proceed as advertised

	<p>X observes school traffic starts to build around 8am and peaks at 8.35am. The road usually clears by 9am. Therefore the proposal of 8.30 to 9 seems wrong and thinks that it should be 8 till 9.</p> <p>X also states that the Albert Road car park is getting busier now with the opening of M&S as well as builders vehicles which is having a knock on effect to the drop off area for school kids. This may be worse once the town centre has opened fully.</p> <p>X hopes his observations are useful.</p>	<p>scheme, the Council will monitor the parking patterns after their installation and should changes be required these can be considered in due course.</p> <p>The parking in the residential areas bordering the town centre are being monitored following the opening of The Lexicon. Should any parking issues arise they can be considered and any possible changes arising will be considered for inclusion in a future Traffic Regulation Order.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr Mrs T McKenzie-Boyle – No comment received

Cllr G Birch – He is aware of the problem of parking on the junction of Shepherds Lane and (opposite) Sandy Lane with Bull Lane. He reports there is often either a car or a van parked there extending the length of parking and causing a problem at the junction. This is often a problem in the morning, and later evening.

Cllr A Finch – No comment received

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2017		
	St Christopher's Garden – 'Emergency Vehicles Only' Restrictions		
Date Advertised:	26.07.17	No. of Objections Received:	1

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXX St Christopher's Garden	X states the car park for the flats is very small which means that parking over spills in to the road. The removal of bays would reduce the much needed space for parking.	<p>The 'Emergency vehicles only' restriction has been requested by the management of the retirement flats. Firstly, the existing disabled parking bay is no longer required by any of the current residents. Secondly, they have numerous visits by emergency vehicles who have issues parking near to the entrance of the flats due to parking in the road, therefore they have requested the disabled parking bay be removed and replaced with an 'Emergency vehicles only' bay.</p> <p>The proposed 'Emergency vehicles only' bay would be in the same position as the existing disabled parking bay so there would be no loss of general parking in the lay-by.</p>	Proceed as advertised

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr T Virgo – Has expressed support for the scheme (via phone)

Cllr Mrs D Hayes – No comment received

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2017		
	Emmets Nest – ‘Prohibition of Waiting" Restrictions		
Date Advertised:	26.07.17	No. of Objections Received:	1

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXXXX Emmets Nest	<p>X supports the idea of the proposal, but would like the lining to be extended to the start of the dropped kerb at the second house.</p> <p>Customers of the new barber shop park in Emmets Nest with two wheels up on the footway which makes it unusable for pedestrians. Staff from the Co-op also park in Emmets Nest.</p> <p>X is also concerned that emergency services would not be able to gain access to properties further up the street.</p>	The Council will continue to monitor the parking situation in Emmets Nest and should the situation persist, then additional restrictions may be considered. In the short term, Thames Valley Police can enforce parking that is obstructive on both the footway and highway.	Proceed as advertised.

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr Mrs S Peacey – No comment received

Cllr I Leake – No comment received

Cllr J Harrison – No comment received

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2017		
	Harmans Water Road – ‘Prohibition of Waiting’ Restrictions		
Date Advertised:	26.07.17	No. of Objections Received:	3

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X XXXXXXXXX Harmans Water Road	<p>X wishes to strongly object to the proposal as this is where X has to park, as X does not have either a garage or driveway. The side roads are too far away especially when carrying heavy shopping.</p> <p>Parking is rarely available in the bays opposite her house as people park there who do not live in Harmans Water Road. Could these be made residents parking only?</p> <p>X feels that residents shouldn't be punished because of parents dropping off their children parking inconsiderately.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines are proposed to ensure that the highway is able to be negotiated by all vehicles. Currently the double yellow line terminates adjacent to the end of the traffic island. Vehicles parking in between the bus stop and double yellow lines will obstruct the highway.</p> <p>If vehicles park too close to the island then they would obstruct the highway. This may in turn force vehicle the wrong side of the traffic island.</p> <p>Proposed restrictions have been tracked using AutoCAD software to ensure that the new length of double yellow lines are kept to a minimum whilst also providing enough space for a bus to negotiate a parked vehicle without resorting to passing the traffic island on the wrong side of the road.</p> <p>These restrictions will displace a maximum of 4 vehicles however the improvement to road safety at the traffic island and maintaining highway that is passable by all vehicles outweighs the negative aspects caused by these restrictions.</p>	Proceed as advertised.
X XXXXXXXXXXXXX Harmans Water Road	<p>X believes that extending the double yellow lines will increase the parking issues on this road.</p> <p>X understands that the extension is the result of buses struggling to get around parked cars and the central traffic island. However, she believes there are two other ideas that may help with this situation –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • removal of the traffic island would allow more room for movement • there are 2 footways from the road to the houses, one could be 	<p>These restrictions will displace a maximum of 4 vehicles however the improvement to road safety at the traffic island and maintaining highway that is passable by all vehicles outweighs the negative aspects caused by these restrictions.</p> <p>Harmans Water Road is used by many children to walk to school as well as people visiting local shops. There has been a history of speed related accidents and pedestrian accidents. The traffic islands are part of a speed management strategy along Harmans Water Road to</p>	Proceed as advertised.

	removed and parking bays be built in its place.	<p>encourage motorist to travel at a speed that is appropriate and safe. The island would therefore not be removed to accommodate extra vehicles.</p> <p>The main footpath is a shared footway cycleway that provides a safe route for pedestrians to walk and cycle whilst the narrower footpath adjacent to the houses is not suitable to accommodate both therefore removal of the footpaths would not be recommended.</p>	
X XXXXXX Harmans Water Road	<p>X would like to object to the proposal to extend the double yellow lines outside X property.</p> <p>Firstly, no buses run in a westbound direction, so X does not accept the argument that buses are unable to negotiate that section and therefore questions the need to extend the lines?</p> <p>Secondly, X feels that consideration should be given to the residents who don't have recognised parking spaces. Out of the 6 properties only three of them drive or own cars therefore objections will not be received from those properties without cars.</p> <p>X has no objection to the extension of the lines on the opposite side of the road as this will help the buses.</p>	<p>The proposed double yellow lines are to keep the highway passable not only for busses but also larger vehicles in both directions. If vehicles park to close to the island then they would obstruct the highway. This may in turn force vehicle the wrong side of the traffic island.</p> <p>The 171 and 172 bus services run Westbound evening and weekends when parking is at its peak.</p> <p>If vehicles park to close to the island then they would obstruct the highway. This may in turn force vehicle the wrong side of the traffic island.</p> <p>Proposed restrictions have been tracked using AutoCAD software to ensure that the new length of double yellow lines are kept to a minimum whilst also providing enough space for a bus to negotiate a parked vehicle without resorting to passing the traffic island on the wrong side of the road.</p> <p>These restrictions will displace a maximum of 4 vehicles however the improvement to road safety at the traffic island and maintaining highway that is passable by all vehicles outweighs the negative aspects caused by these restrictions.</p>	Proceed as advertised.

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr Mrs I Mattick – No comment received

Cllr Mrs A Merry – No comment received

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (CONTROL OF ON-STREET PARKING) (No. 1) ORDER 2017		
	Terrace Road North – ‘Prohibition of Waiting’ Restrictions		
Date Advertised:	26.07.17	No. of Objections Received:	9

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify / Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXXX Terrace Road North	X welcomes the fact that the problem is being looked at but X feels that the proposed lining will be in the wrong place. X feels that the lining should be placed on the opposite side to the pub.	Originally it was planned to introduce restrictions to both sides of the carriageway. However after consultation with local councillors it was agreed to keep restrictions to a minimum as the demand for road side parking was already at a premium. The restrictions are on the same side of the road as the public house to both prevent double parking whilst protecting the public house access. This proposal introduces a passing place on Terrace Road North whilst maintaining as much on street parking as possible.	Proceed as advertised.
X X XXXXXXX Terrace Road North	X is concerned that a 30min bay is not going to be used by customers of the chemist who X feels will continue to park on the pavement. X asks if resident's could use the 30min bays outside of the chemist opening times otherwise there will be a loss of 3 parking spaces.	The restrictions outside the chemist will be altered to only apply between the hours of 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Friday as to allow residents to park outside of these hours.	Modify proposals as per drg 5144/016A
X X XXXXXXX Terrace Road North	X comments on the proposal rather than an objection – X feels that the road should be looked at in its entirety rather than specific areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • X fully agrees there are parking issues near the Victoria Arms and the chemist. X frequently witness buses struggling to get past. • X states that other Issues include parking on double yellow lines near the roundabout exist. • X adds that parking issues are increasing along the length of the road. The layby is being used as a dumping place for large commercial vehicles • X adds people who have off street parking have reduced visibility when trying to exit their driveways due to the parking on both sides of the road. 	The parking proposals have been kept to a minimum so to keep as many road side parking spaces as possible. The restrictions proposed outside the chemist will be altered to only apply between the hours of 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Friday as to allow residents to park outside of these hours. Therefore the restrictions will only reduce the on street parking by 2 vehicles permanently keeping the impact to the rest of Terrace Road North to a minimum.	Modify proposals as per drg 5144/016A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> X concludes by voicing X concern that the parking restrictions will force cars further up the road increasing the problems further. 		
X X XXXXXX	<p>X is concerned with the knock on effect the restrictions will have further up Terrace Road North.</p> <p>They regularly experience issues with cars that park on both sides of the road and the addition of the limited waiting bays will only force more cars to park further up the road.</p> <p>X states the opening of the new Co-Op has already increased the problem as well as the village car park becoming pay and display.</p> <p>X asks if the yellow lines outside the pharmacy be extended along that side of Terrace Road North only so that parking can still be allowed on the opposite side of the road.</p>	<p>The parking proposals have been kept to a minimum so to keep as many road side parking spaces as possible. The restrictions proposed outside the chemist will be altered to only apply between the hours of 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Friday as to allow residents to park outside of these hours.</p> <p>Therefore the restrictions will only reduce the on street parking by 2 vehicles permanently keeping the impact to the rest of Terrace Road North to a minimum.</p> <p>Unfortunately the Oakmede car park is a privately owned car park. The council has no jurisdiction over the introduction of parking charges.</p> <p>The parking situation at the new Co-Op store is a separate issue that Binfield parish council are currently In discussion with the Manager about.</p>	Modify proposals as per drg 5144/016A
X X XXXX	<p>X strongly objects to the proposal for the following reasons–</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pharmacy already has 3 parking spaces The properties have been there longer than the pharmacy so why should residents suffer the loss of valuable parking Struggles to understand why the bays are 24 hours when the pharmacy is only open 9 to 6 Proposes the pharmacy is moved from its current location to the village Oakmede Centre Feels that no matter how many bays are provided, customers will still park over pavements and yellow lines Wants to know how this is going to be enforced Can the bays be 30 mins only or residents parking bays 	<p>The chemist does have 3 spaces at its disposal already however parking observations have concluded that these spaces are often insufficient causing parking on double yellow lines in inappropriate areas.</p> <p>The parking proposals have been kept to a minimum so to keep as many road side parking spaces as possible. The restrictions proposed outside the chemist will be altered to only apply between the hours of 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Friday as to allow residents to park outside of these hours.</p> <p>Therefore the restrictions will only reduce the on street parking by 2 vehicles permanently keeping the impact to the rest of Terrace Road North to a minimum.</p> <p>Parking will be enforced by the Council's parking enforcement officers.</p>	Modify proposals as per drg 5144/016A
X & X XXXXXXXX Terrace Road North	<p>X feel that the waiting restrictions should be between 8.30 and 6.30 not 24/7.</p> <p>X live in one of the properties next door to the chemist and between 9 and 6 there is a constant stream of cars that park outside their property. Overall this doesn't concern the residents, but the fact that people park mostly on the footway blocking pedestrians, particularly elderly and parents with pushchairs does.</p>	<p>The parking proposals have been kept to a minimum so to keep as many road side parking spaces as possible. The restrictions proposed outside the chemist will be altered to only apply between the hours of 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Friday as to allow residents to park outside of these hours.</p> <p>Alben Road is private and not part of the Bracknell Forest Council adopted highway. As it is a private road neither the Council or police has jurisdiction and therefore cannot enforce non residential parking.</p>	Modify proposals as per drg 5144/016A

	X would like it confirmed that Alben Road is privately owned and that non-residents shouldn't park down there.		
X X X XXXXXX Terrace Road North	<p>X understands why the issue has been brought to our attention but would like to object to the proposal in its current form. X feels that the proposal unfairly penalises local residents.</p> <p>X states there are two problems in that there is a lack of parking spaces for the customers of the chemist and illegal parking committed by the customers of the chemist.</p> <p>X feels that a better solution to the problem would be to target the car park at Oakmede Place, as since they have introduced car park charges both the staff who work there and the customers use surrounding roads to park in to avoid the charge. X also feels that the opening of the Co-Op has led to more people parking around the area as there is inadequate parking outside the store for staff.</p> <p>X states that to make the proposed bays 24 hours a day Mon to Fri and purely for customers of the chemist is unfair on local residents when the store is only open 9am till 6pm Mon to Fri and 9am till 1pm on Sat.</p> <p>X suggest the following alternatives –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the parking restrictions only between the opening hours of the store • Write to the chemist, Co-Op and Oakmede requesting that they make proposals for staff parking • Make the bays 30mins and resident permit holders only • Reduce parking charges at Oakmede to encourage greater use • Use the set-up costs of the proposal to fund training of local residents and employees of the chemist to have some powers of enforcement over illegal parking 	<p>The chemist does have 3 spaces at its disposal already however parking observations have concluded that these spaces are often insufficient causing parking on double yellow lines in inappropriate areas.</p> <p>The parking proposals have been kept to a minimum so to keep as many road side parking spaces as possible. The restrictions proposed outside the chemist will be altered to only apply between the hours of 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Friday as to allow residents to park outside of these hours.</p> <p>Therefore the restrictions will only reduce the on street parking by 2 vehicles permanently keeping the impact to the rest of Terrace Road North to a minimum.</p> <p>The parking situation at the new Co-Op store is a separate issue that Binfield parish council are currently In discussion with the Manager about.</p>	Modify proposals as per drg 5144/016A
X XXXXXX	<p>X feels disappointed at the sudden prompting and reasoning for the proposal and feels there is a more balanced solution to overcome the poor parking situation.</p> <p>X states that the proposal implies that local residents are the cause of the long term parking issues. X vouches that most of them work and commute between the hours of 8.30am and 6pm leaving ample space for customers of the chemist. X also states that they park considerately and safely leaving space at junctions, roundabouts and driveways whilst avoiding the yellow lines.</p> <p>X adds customers using the pharmacy elect to park illegally as they are only going to be a little while even when space is available in the designated bays, therefore the proposal will still not help as customers will probably ignore the bays and continue to park on the yellow lines and blocking the footway.</p>	<p>The parking proposals have been kept to a minimum so to keep as many road side parking spaces as possible. The restrictions proposed outside the chemist will be altered to only apply between the hours of 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Friday as to allow residents to park outside of these hours.</p> <p>Therefore the restrictions will only reduce the on street parking by 2 vehicles permanently keeping the impact to the rest of Terrace Road North to a minimum.</p> <p>The majority of visitors for the chemist will choose to park legally in a parking bay rather than risk a fine parking on double yellow lines. With the bays having a short stay period, there should be a quick turn-over of parking with spaces available and illegal parking kept to a minimum.</p>	Modify proposals as per drg 5144/016A

	<p>X also adds other factors affecting the problem is that there is inadequate parking for the Co-Op, the new pay and display charges at Oakmede and pickup/drop off times for the scout hut and local school.</p> <p>Staff parking had originally been agreed down the side of the property to the bungalow but since they were sold separately, staff park in the bays or up the road. Multiple planning oversights have led to lots of problems with parking.</p> <p>X suggests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit holder bays with 30mins for non-permit holders • Painting parking bays on the road 	<p>The parking situation at the new Co-Op store is a separate issue that Binfield parish council are currently In discussion with the Manager about.</p> <p>The alteration of the restriction time of the bays will allow residents to park at evening and weekends. A resident parking scheme would have little positive effect as a Terrace Road North does not experience an influx of visitors from outside the local area. So a permit scheme is not recommended.</p> <p>Parking bays have a regulation that dictates their minimum size. Painting individual bays would effectively reduce the amount of kerb side spaces as motorist that self regulate their parking will park closer and more efficiently.</p>	
<p>X XXXXXX Terrace Road North</p>	<p>X objects to the proposal of time limited bays as this will not solve the issue at hand and will unfairly impact on local residents.</p> <p>X states that inadequate parking at the chemist and the Co-Op as well as the introduction of charges at the Oakmede car park has led to increased parking issues in surrounding roads. Long term parking is not an issue.</p> <p>X adds that Inconsiderate and lazy parking from customers of the pharmacy means that even when space is available opposite, customers choose to park outside the chemist on double yellow lines and blocking the footway. More enforcement really is required.</p> <p>The proposed bays will disadvantage local residents rather help the issues at hand.</p>	<p>The parking proposals have been kept to a minimum so to keep as many road side parking spaces as possible. The restrictions proposed outside the chemist will be altered to only apply between the hours of 8:30am to 6:30pm Monday to Friday as to allow residents to park outside of these hours.</p> <p>Therefore the restrictions will only reduce the on street parking by 2 vehicles permanently keeping the impact to the rest of Terrace Road North to a minimum.</p> <p>The majority of visitors for the chemist will choose to park legally in a parking bay rather than risk a fine parking on double yellow lines. With the bays having a short stay period, there should be a quick turn-over of parking with spaces available and illegal parking kept to a minimum.</p> <p>The parking situation at the new Co-Op store is a separate issue that Binfield parish council are currently In discussion with the Manager about.</p> <p>Unfortunately the Oakmede car park is a privately owned car park. The council has no jurisdiction over the introduction of parking charges.</p>	<p>Modify proposals as per drg 5144/016A</p>

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr Mrs S Peacey – No comment received

Cllr I Leake – No comment received

Cllr J Harrison – No comment received