

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – ANNEX H

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (WAITING RESTRICTION AND PERMIT PARKING) ORDER 2014		
	ZONE B		
Date Advertised:	10th April 2014	No. of Objections /Comments Received:	8 objections

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.
Mr & Mrs [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Shepherds Lane	<p>Mr & Mrs [REDACTED] support the principle of permit parking however they object to allowing parking on the junction of Shepherds Lane & Folders Lane/ Bull Lane. They state that the recently introduced parking restrictions on the junction are not adhered to and the Council Parking Attendants do not enforce them.</p> <p>They also object as the current parking restrictions allow 1 car to park to the east of their driveway, very near to the junction which causes danger to both them and other road users. They cannot safely leave their driveway as any vehicle parked in this position blocks their visibility and also blocks visibility for pedestrians trying to cross at the junction. Additionally, if a car is parked in this position, it stops traffic flowing freely. Mr & Mrs [REDACTED] feel that the space in the existing restrictions should be removed as they feel traffic will only increase with the regeneration of the town centre.</p> <p>Mr & Mrs [REDACTED] feel that the junction of Shepherds Lane & Folders Lane/Bull Lane should be re-examined as they feel further restrictions are needed.</p>	<p>Parking on the junction of Bull Lane and Folders Lane is currently prohibited Monday to Friday 8am to 6.30pm. It is proposed to add a further restriction to prevent parking on Sunday between 10am and 4pm, to match the surrounding proposed Residents' Parking Scheme. The existing and proposed restrictions will be enforced by the Councils Parking Attendants and appropriate resources are catered for within the scheme.</p> <p>The request for the restrictions to be extended to the east of the driveway cannot be considered as part of this Order. Additional restrictions cannot be added after the statutory consultation as they would constitute a significant change. Therefore, this issue, together with any others that may arise, will be monitored throughout the trial period and additional restrictions included within further Orders if considered necessary.</p>	Proceed as advertised
Mr [REDACTED]	<p>Mr [REDACTED] begins by stating that he feels that the proposals will go ahead despite the views of the residents. He says he has spoken to local residents and the majority are not in favour of the proposals.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] feels that the figures given from the initial Residents Parking survey are misleading as the reality is that local residents are not in favour of the proposals.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] states that he believes the Council should admit that they plan to charge for the Residents Permits once the 2 year trial is over and that</p>	<p>The proposal for a Residents' Parking Scheme has been consulted upon both informally and now formally. The Council is following the legal process to introduce parking restrictions and all objections are being considered.</p> <p>The response to the informal consultation was very positive. This has been mirrored in the formal consultation to which there have only been 30 objections, of which the majority are not against the Residents' Parking Scheme, but are requesting minor alterations to the proposals.</p>	Proceed as advertised

	<p>they should publish the figures with regards to the running of the scheme.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] says that the proposals will not solve the parking issues on Bull Lane as there are not enough parking spaces and the issues with the "school run" will continue as parents will continue to drop off their children and not be caught by the parking attendants.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] is not happy that he will have to pay for his friends & relatives to park outside after the two year trial is over and even then they will only be able to park for 4 hours.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] concludes by stating that he does not have a drive (and cannot get one) so will have no choice but to be part of the residents parking scheme. He believes that money making is the Council's only objective.</p>	<p>The aim of the Residents' Parking Scheme is not to address existing parking pressures that are experienced within various roads surrounding the town centre, but instead to prevent additional parking pressures related to the construction and future use of the town centre. The Council are currently consulting Local Members regarding areas within the Borough where residential parking pressures are high with an aim of prioritising future capital spend on addressing these issues where possible.</p> <p>The cost of the permits has been set for the first two years of the trial. This included both 4 hour and 24 hour visitor parking permits which will be free of charge.</p>	
<p>Mr [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Albert Road</p>	<p>Mr [REDACTED] welcomes the proposed residents' parking scheme but wishes to object to the proposed parking prohibition period for Albert Road.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] states that the proposal would mean he is unable to park outside his house during the day which would prevent him from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The safe collection / drop off of his family and shopping outside his own home • The safe collection / drop off of deliveries and post to his home by businesses and friends • The safe loading of his car with garden waste and general rubbish to take to the council tip • Parking of his car outside my home to be able to perform maintenance and cleaning <p>Mr [REDACTED] realises the need for traffic management due to the school traffic and living opposite the car park entrance, and suggests the Council take this opportunity to address the very serious problems these factors cause the local area.</p> <p>Despite many approaches to the school and Council, the Council have failed to implement any solutions to improve the flow of traffic caused by the school run and prevent people from using his garage area (opposite Garth School) as a convenient parking spot.</p> <p>On a daily basis people park on Mr Creber's garage drive or use this area as a turning circle preventing him and his neighbours from using their own property. The area is in grid lock and any parked car or lorry causes chaos as did the rubbish lorry the other day when it arrived earlier than usual during the school run.</p> <p>Therefore, the Council's latest proposal to restrict his parking even further combined with the Council's abject failure to address the daily traffic management issues, means his only option is to submit an objection to</p>	<p>The existing restrictions outside this property are No Waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6-30pm,. The proposal is to introduce the additional Sunday restriction to protect Albert Road from Sunday working and leisure activities related to the new town centre. If these restrictions were not introduced this length of Albert Road would become a first point of call for drivers wishing to park near the town centre and avoid paying to use a car park. This length of road could become obstructed with significant numbers of vehicles parked.</p> <p>The Council are in regular contact with local schools, including those in proximity to Albert Road with the aim of identifying and assisting in providing safe alternatives for pupils to travel to school to assist in reducing the reliance on driving and the pressures this brings.</p> <p>The addition of a new school building on the Garth school site will be assessed through the planning application process.</p> <p>Of the suggestions made by the objector, numbers 1-4 all fall outside of the scope of this consultation and are solutions that cannot be progressed by the Transport Development team at this time.</p> <p>The existing and proposed restrictions will be enforced by the Councils Parking Attendants and appropriate resources are catered for within the scheme.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

	<p>this proposal.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] also understands that a new building will be built on what is the current school car park, which will only add to the problem – have the Council planned for this yet?</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] makes several suggestions:</p> <p>[1] Remodel the entrance of the Albert Road car park so that cars can enter and exit from Millennium Way and remove the existing entrance, thereby removing all traffic congestion from Bull Lane, Horsneile Lane and Albert Road</p> <p>[2] Remodel the school entrance to provide a proper drop off zone within the school premises</p> <p>[3] Remove car park charges to encourage people to actually use the car park - the charges are outrageous and no wonder people park in local roads to avoid paying them</p> <p>[4] Ban parents from dropping their children off - make them walk or cycle</p> <p>[5] Have police and traffic wardens enforcing the current parking restrictions at school drop off and pick up times - the new parking scheme will make no difference whatsoever to parents unless it is enforced</p>		
<p>Mr [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Binfield Road</p>	<p>Mr [REDACTED] objects to the proposals for a 30 minute limited waiting bay outside number 83 Binfield Road. He believes it should be changed to a shared use bay for residents parking as well.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] also asks if the access to the rear of his property has been taken into account and suggests the implementation of “No waiting at any time” or 30 minute limited waiting on the access road.</p>	<p>These restrictions are outside a commercial building and so are required to maintain parking for potential shoppers and maintain a passing trade. If the restriction were converted into shared use it is likely that permit holders would use this space preventing shoppers from using the spaces.</p> <p>The rear area to these properties has not been included within this order. Additional restrictions cannot be added after the statutory consultation as they would constitute a significant change. Therefore, this issue, together with any others that may arise, will be monitored throughout the trial period and additional restrictions included within further Orders if considered necessary.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

<p>Mr [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Shepherds Lane</p>	<p>Mr & Mrs [REDACTED] state that they were pleased to hear of the proposals for Residents Parking however they are disappointed that their section of Shepherds Lane is not included in the proposals as the parking bays near to their home is often used by residents from other roads.</p> <p>Mr & Mrs [REDACTED] would like to know if there any plans for their section of Shepherds Lane to be included in Residents Parking in the future and if not, then why?</p>	<p>The trial period proposed is for two years. Therefore no additional areas will be considered until such time that conclusions can be drawn from the trial.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>Mr [REDACTED] Daventry Court</p>	<p>Mr [REDACTED] states that he had no objection to the Residents Parking proposals until a neighbour informed him that only the entry road to Daventry Court was to be included.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] believes that parking in the private car parks accessed from Daventry Court will increase as there are already non-residential drivers that park there to access the town centre. There is currently no signage or markings to differentiate the private areas from the rest of the road.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] believes the Council has made a mistake in stating that the parking areas are private. He believes that a number of administrative errors were made when the road was built that have led to the areas being made "private".</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] does not understand why the Council are proposing restrictions on the entrance road but not the parking areas.</p> <p>Finally, Mr [REDACTED] asks the Council to provide him with details of the ownership of the parking areas, if they are privately owned, so that they can be approached to install signs/road markings.</p>	<p>These car parks are not public highway and we believe are allocated to individual private properties within Daventry Court. As such the Residents' Permit Scheme cannot incorporate this parking area. However, as these parking areas are on private and, the owner can erect signs to inform the general public or indeed undertake enforcement.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>
<p>Mrs [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Daventry Court</p>	<p>Mrs [REDACTED] states that some time ago the residents put pressure on the Council to install single yellow lines on both sides of the entrance road into Daventry Court. This prevents office workers using this road instead of the pay and display public car park in Albert Road. She states that the entrance to Daventry Court is "blind" and parking cars anywhere along this short roadway can cause a major hazard when entering or leaving the court. Mrs [REDACTED] strongly objects to the change that will allow residents parking on the entrance road and believe the same restrictions which are currently in operation should continue to apply or an accident may well happen and that was why the lines were painted in the first place.</p> <p>In addition, whilst Mrs [REDACTED] appreciates the Residents Parking Permits will only valid for the public highway, some confusion is arising in Daventry Court over the lower private car park (serving No's 26 to 43) which is not adopted by the Council. Some homeowners seem to think</p>	<p>The existing waiting restrictions in Daventry Court were previously introduced to prevent visitors to the town centre parking in the residential street outside the Albert Road Car Park. It was felt that if the proposed RP scheme were to go ahead, visitors to the town centre would no longer be able to legally park in this location and so the restrictions could be removed enabling the local residents to use this road side space to park. However, the objectors, and other residents through comment have requested that these restrictions remain as they believe any parking in this area results in unsafe driving practices. It is proposed therefore to maintain the existing restrictions.</p> <p>These car parks are not public highway and we believe are allocated to individual private properties within Daventry Court. As such the Residents' Permit Scheme cannot incorporate this parking area. However, as these parking areas are on private the land, the owner</p>	<p>Modify the Order to maintain the existing restrictions, as shown in Annex M</p>

	<p>that being given two permits means they have the right to park two cars in this car park. Mrs [REDACTED] adds that her deeds state that she actually only has the right to park ONE car in this car park. She requests that the Council is mindful of this and if/when any permits are issued it is made very clear to all Daventry Court residents that the permit is only for the public highway and does NOT apply to the private car park.</p>	<p>can erect signs to inform the general public or indeed undertake enforcement.</p> <p>If the Residents Parking Scheme is progressed, the rules of using a permit, including the fact that it only applies to the public highway, will be made clear.</p>	
<p>Mrs [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Daventry Court</p>	<p>Many years ago, Mrs [REDACTED] spent much time and effort in getting the Council to implement waiting restrictions from the junction of Albert Road with Daventry Court to end of the public highway section of Daventry Court. Since this was agreed on the basis of danger and safety, she is now very concerned at the proposal to remove for the use of permit holders in Zone B and strongly objects.</p> <p>Additionally, Mrs [REDACTED] states that confusion has arisen amongst some residents that these permits give permission to park two cars when it clearly states on the deeds that each house has the right to park one car within these areas. Mrs [REDACTED] appreciates that this is referring to the public highway section but feels that this should be made clear, by the Council, when these permits are issued to each house within Daventry Court.</p>	<p>The existing waiting restrictions in Daventry Court were previously introduced to prevent visitors to the town centre parking in the residential street outside the Albert Road Car Park. It was felt that if the proposed RP scheme were to go ahead, visitors to the town centre would no longer be able to legally park in this location and so the restrictions could be removed enabling the local residents to use this road side space to park. However, the objectors, and other residents through comment have requested that these restrictions remain as they believe any parking in this area results in unsafe driving practices. It is proposed therefore to maintain the existing restrictions.</p> <p>These car parks are not public highway and we believe are allocated to individual private properties within Daventry Court. As such the Residents' Permit Scheme cannot incorporate this parking area. However, as these parking areas are on private the land, the owner can erect signs to inform the general public or indeed undertake enforcement.</p> <p>If the Residents Parking Scheme is progressed, the rules of using a permit, including the fact that it only applies to the public highway, will be made clear</p>	<p>Modify the Order to maintain the existing restrictions, as shown in Annex M</p>

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr Miss P Brown raised some additional questions which have been answered outside the scope of this report.

No comment was received from Cllrs A Finch & Ms K Miller.