

OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – ANNEX J

Scheme:	BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (WAITING RESTRICTION AND PERMIT PARKING) ORDER 2014		
	ZONE E		
Date Advertised:	10 th April 2014	No. of Objections /Comments Received:	1 objection

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.
<p>Mrs ■■■■■ ■■■ Drayton Close</p>	<p>Mrs ■■■■■ does not support the residents parking proposals for Drayton Close when all that is needed are term time restrictions to cover when parents drop off and pick up their children.</p> <p>Mrs ■■■■■ has lived in Drayton Close for nine and half years and has never had a problem with people parking for the town centre.</p> <p>Mrs ■■■■■ states that Drayton Close road space for 4 small cars and maybe 2 spaces for large cars if you do not count the turning circles. With 18 houses in the road, of which at least three are multi-let and having roughly 20 people living between these three houses alone, this road physically does not have the room for the potential and actual numbers of cars they currently have. She states that the police suddenly started to put letters on residents' cars on the pavements warning of obstruction. If all of the residents were to park tidy, in drives and in the few road spaces there would be no room for emergency vehicles or the rubbish cart – never mind all the cars (none of this takes into account visitor parking!)</p> <p>Mrs ■■■■■ asks what about when there is a football or cricket match or a school fete? Where are the parents going to park their cars when they take their young children into school and come back to collect them again?</p> <p>Mrs ■■■■■ states that the new town centre is designed to bring people into Bracknell but believes that it is an ill thought out line your pockets scheme designed to make residents leave, providing of course, they could still sell their properties with this ill-advised and unnecessary scheme in place.</p> <p>Mrs ■■■■■ adds that in the figures the Council published, it was stated that 55% of those asked said they would not support the scheme if charges were in place. She continues that this figure is more than the</p>	<p>The proposed Residents' Parking scheme is aimed at addressing future parking demands associated with the town centre construction and use. The town centre parking demand is therefore not necessarily witnessed on street at present. The proposals are aimed at reserving the parking within this estate for the residents and so football and cricket match parking, together with school related parking would also be prevented. The cost of the scheme cannot be guaranteed to remain the same in the future, however the Council have committed to a 2 year trial in which the costs of the permits will remain the same. The resident's permits will enable the residents of Drayton Close to park within the whole of the parking zone.</p> <p>The proposals have been discussed with the St Josephs School and the Boroughs School Travel Plan Officer is working closely with the school to identify other sustainable travel option.</p> <p>Whilst 55% of responses received to the informal consultation indicated that they would not support a proposed Residents' Parking Scheme if there were a charge for permits, 87.5 % of responses showed that they had 2 or less vehicles requiring a permit. In other words 87.5% would not have an associated charge with the introduction of residents parking. Furthermore, only 2.6% of responses indicated that they needed to park a third vehicle on street. The residents parking scheme has been proposed with the first 2 permits being free of charge together with the visitor permits.</p> <p>The 80% responses in favour of a residents parking scheme equates to 261 responses.</p> <p>The operation date of October 2104 is a target implementation date based on the proposals being approved. If the proposal is not progressed the scheme will not be implemented in October 2014.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised</p>

50.1% required to negate this scheme. The Council are making charges ergo this scheme, if allowed to go ahead, would be illegal.

She asks how many responses equate to the 80%?

She asks If allowed to go ahead what plans the Council have in place after the two-year trial is over regarding prices. She believes that there should be a public consultation at this point and not a back room discussion.

What is needed is cheap and affordable car parks in and around town, allowing and encouraging people to park close to the amenities and encouraging them to make a day or an evening of it. Not rush in and out or pass Bracknell by altogether because it is not consumer friendly!

Mrs [REDACTED] adds that the Council also states in its letters to residents that we have until 1 May 2014 to send our objections in writing to the council to the scheme, yet it has already been published online that the scheme will be going live in October. This follows that bypassing 'developing more detailed proposals for formal consultation, probably during spring 2014' as per the Council's letter to residents in December 2013. Is the Council also going to bypass resident's objections, as they obviously do not matter, as the scheme will be going live in October regardless? Again showing your voters it is all about the council and a money making exercise and the residents and their needs be damned. The scheme has many flaws and has not been fully thought out.

Mrs [REDACTED] states that the operation times are unacceptable and unnecessary. Most people will be out at work for the majority of the time it is in place and in our road, we only need a maximum of two to three hours a day – school pick up and drop off times.

The fees now might be (almost) reasonable but as other boroughs have shown after the trial period the costs go up considerably and unreasonably along with the car park fees (see Guildford, Hounslow, Woking, Camden amongst others), then the fees are not so easily managed but by then it is too late. At the moment, residents will be looking at a starting fee of £60, as per current car park fees (following the Council's guidance on extra visitors' passes being at current car park prices for time limit).

Mrs [REDACTED] states that there are no parking problems in the road per se, school times only. The parking charges will always go up every year, why should residents have to pay to park outside their own house when they do not have a problem from town parking? Mrs [REDACTED] adds that all this tells her is that the Council is planning on increasing parking charges dramatically when the new town is finished, thus forcing visitors out of the town car parks and into surrounding residential roads, in which case, if this scheme were not already in place, the Council would lose a substantial amount of revenue. What happens when residents and visitors, due to lack of space in their own roads, park in roads not currently in the scheme? Do the council rub their hands together because their plan is working and extend the scheme to cover

The times of operation were consulted upon as part of the informal consultation. The timings within the proposed RP Scheme are based on the existing waiting restriction times around the town centre and aim at assisting residents in finding a place to park within their zone when returning home. We appreciate that currently the major parking pressure in this area is school parking, however it is anticipated that parking pressures around the town centre will increase in line with the town centre redevelopment.

The enforcement of the RP Scheme restrictions will be enforced by the Councils Civil Enforcement Officers, and that appropriate resource levels will be applied.

The Council receive numerous parking complaints as parking is at a premium throughout the Borough. However, this scheme is not intended to address existing parking issues but to prevent future issues related to the town centre.

these roads too? Showing again that it is money-making exercise for the Council and not for the benefit of the residents.

Mrs [REDACTED] asks who will be in charge of enforcement? The council or an outside contractor? Will the Council do it at the start until you fatten it up and then are able to sell it on at a greater profit to an outside contractor?

How many parking complaints have you received, in particular relevant ones (not just all the parking complaints lumped in together) in the two years preceding the consultation period?

Mrs [REDACTED] states that the value of her house will go down because she does not have a problem with parking from visitors to town and the Council is enforcing an unnecessary expense on us. This is not what she moved to Bracknell for, choosing a quiet 18-house cul de sac. Close to town but not interfered with by town. We hear nothing, we get no traffic because there is only one way into our road – through Larges Lane and then Goodways Drive, you have to go past the road, round the roundabout and back up again to get to Larges Lane and most people don't bother. She states the road gets a little bit of extra traffic/parking with football and cricket matches but that is acceptable, as we knew the grounds were there when we bought the house. This scheme however is the Council intruding on our lives unnecessarily because they want to make more money and they do not care how they go about it. This is an unethical scheme and has not been developed correctly or with full thought for the ramifications it will cause small, extremely packed roads like ours.

Mrs [REDACTED] asks is the Council aware that in Spelthorne 26,000 people voted against this kind of on street-parking scheme. This is not a popular scheme with the voters and maybe with election year coming up you should think about that too.

Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:

Cllr R Angell indicated his agreement with the proposals.

No comment was received from Cllr M Sargeant.