

**READING BOROUGH COUNCIL
REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT, CULTURE & SPORT**

TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE		
DATE:	10 MARCH 2016	AGENDA ITEM:	10
TITLE:	WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW - OBJECTIONS TO WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2015 (B) & REQUESTS FOR WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2016 (A)		
LEAD COUNCILLOR:	COUNCILLOR TONY PAGE	PORTFOLIO:	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT
SERVICE:	TRANSPORTATION & STREETCARE	WARDS:	BOROUGHWIDE
LEAD OFFICERS:	JIM CHEN	TEL:	0118 937 2198
JOB TITLES:	NETWORK ASSISTANT ENGINEER	E-MAIL:	<u>Jim.chen@reading.gov.uk</u>

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 To inform the Sub-Committee of objections received in respect of the traffic regulation order, which was recently advertised as part of the waiting restriction review programme 2015B and including the proposal for a car club bay on Rectory Road. This involved proposed implementation and amendments of waiting restrictions at various locations across the Borough, and it is for Members to conclude the outcome of the proposal.
- 1.2 To provide members of the Sub-Committee with the forthcoming list of requests for waiting restrictions within the Borough that have been raised by members of the public, community organisations and Councillors, since September 2015.
- 1.3 To recommend that the list of issues raised for the bi-annual review is fully investigated and Ward Members are consulted. Upon completion of the Ward Member consultation, a further report will be submitted to the Sub-Committee requesting approval to carry out the Statutory Consultation on the approved schemes.
- 1.4 APPENDIX 1 - Summary of letters of support and objections received to WRR2015B along with officer comments.

APPENDIX 2 - Requests for waiting restrictions review programme 2016A

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Members of the Sub-Committee note the report.
- 2.2 That objections noted in Appendix 1 are considered with an appropriate recommendation to either implement, amend or reject the proposals.
- 2.3 That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to seal the resultant Traffic Regulation Order and no public inquiry be held into the proposals.
- 2.4 That the objectors be informed of the decision of the Sub-Committee accordingly.
- 2.5 That the requests made for waiting restrictions as shown in Appendix 2 be noted and that officers investigate each request and consult on their findings with Ward Members.
- 2.4 That, should funding permit, a further report be submitted to the Sub-Committee requesting approval to complete the Statutory Consultation on the approved schemes.

3. POLICY CONTEXT

- 3.1.1 The provision of waiting/parking restrictions and associated criteria is specified within existing Traffic Management Policies and Standards.

4. THE PROPOSAL

Objections to Car Club bay on Rectory Road

- 4.1 It was agreed in Traffic Management Sub-Committee in January 2016 that due to the level of representation made by residents on the statutory consultation carried out in December 2015 of a proposed car club bay on Rectory Road, that alternative car club bay location that would not result in the loss of resident parking spaces be considered.
- 4.2 An alternative location for the car club bay was identified on the north side of Rectory Road and a further statutory consultation for the proposal was carried out.
- 4.3 Full details of the objections and any correspondence in support of the proposals are attached to this report (Appendix 1).

Objections to Traffic Regulation Order - 2015B

- 4.4 Approval was given at the Traffic Management Sub-committee in September 2015 to carry out investigations at various locations, in relation to waiting restriction requests, made by councillors and residents.

- 4.5 Investigation was carried out and a recommendation for each scheme was shared with ward councillors in December 2015 for their comments.
- 4.6 A further report went to the Sub-committee in January 2016 to seek approval to carry out statutory consultation. The statutory consultation process took place between 11th February 2016 and 10th Mar 2015. Full details of the objections and any correspondence in support of the proposals are attached to this report (Appendix 1).
- 4.7 The Sub-committee can agree, overrule or modify any objection to a lesser restriction that originally proposed. Where there is agreement to an objection the recommendation shall be to remove the proposal from the programme. Where an objection is overruled, the proposal will be to introduce the proposal as advertised and where the proposal is modified to a lesser restriction this shall be noted and advertised accordingly.

Bi-annual waiting restriction review - 2016A

- 4.8 It is recommended that the list of issues raised for the Bi-annual 2016A review as shown in Appendix 2 is fully investigated and Ward Members are consulted. This part of the waiting restriction review enables Ward Councillors to undertake informal consultations, which ensures any new restrictions have the support of residents and are reflective of what the community has requested, prior to the commencement of statutory consultation. This may mean that requests may be amended or removed if they are not appropriate or have no councillor/resident support. They are then subsequently removed from the list and no further action taken.
- 4.9 For requests that are approved to be taken forward to statutory consultation, a further report will be submitted to the Traffic Management Sub Committee, seeking approval to carry out statutory consultation with accompanying drawings of the proposed schemes.

5. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

- 5.1 To promote equality, social inclusion and a safe and healthy environment for all.

6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

- 6.1 That persons requesting waiting restrictions be informed that their request will form part of the bi-annual waiting review programme (A or B) and are advised of the timescales of the project.
- 6.2 Any Statutory consultation will be carried out in accordance with the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 Any proposals for waiting restrictions are advertised under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

8. EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

8.1 In addition to the Human Rights Act 1998 the Council is required to comply with the Equalities Act 2010. Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 requires the Council to have due regard to the need to:-

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimization and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

8.2 The Council has carried out a equality impact assessment scoping exercise, and considers that the proposals do not have a direct impact on any groups with protected characteristics.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The works will be funded from within existing transport budgets.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

10.1 Traffic Management Sub-Committee reports

WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2015B - OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER
APPENDIX 1 - Summary of letters of support and objections received to Traffic Regulation Order

UPDATED: 10/03/2016

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
<p>CA8/4046 - Cardinal Close and Wolsey Road</p> <p>1) Support, Resident Cardinal Close</p> <p>2) Support, Resident Cardinal Close</p> <p>3) Support, Resident Cardinal Close</p> <p>4)Objection, Resident Cardinal Close</p> <p>5)Support, Resident Cardinal Close</p> <p>6) Objection, Resident St Stephens Close</p>	<p>1) Two residents give their full support and would like them implemented as soon as possible.</p> <p>2) Resident approves the plans.</p> <p>3) Resident agrees with the notices.</p> <p>4) Resident says the plans are being pushed through by some of the other residents but it does not represent the views/wishes of all the residents.</p> <p>5) Resident says any change to the current system would be most welcome.</p> <p>6) Residents of St Stephens Close have repeatedly applied for permit restrictions so this resident is surprised that the Council has not included their 12 properties in this proposal. The resident says they suffer from the same issues as Cardinal Close and Wolsey Road. If St Stephens Close does not have any restrictions it will increase random parking on their road by people visiting the promenade.</p>	<p>Summary of objections: 15 in favour and 13 against the proposed scheme (with one comment)</p> <p>5 objections from residents of St Stephens Close & Claydon Court - mainly because they are not included in the RP proposal.</p> <p>8 objections from residents of Cardinal Close</p> <p>15 support from residents of Cardinal Close</p> <p>1 comment from a resident of Cardinal Close in support but feels RP could be extended with less DYL.</p> <p>Although there are various suggestions to alter the proposal all would change the space available for permit parking. Any change to the number of spaces available for permit parking may affect the way that residents feel about the</p>

<p>7)Support, Resident Cardinal Close</p> <p>8)Objection, Resident St Stephens Close</p> <p>9) Objection, Resident Cardinal Close</p> <p>10) Objection, Resident St Stephens Close or Claydon Court</p> <p>11)Objection, Resident St Stephens Close</p>	<p>7) Resident says this is great news and it certainly has their approval.</p> <p>8) Two residents say they would like to support it but St Stephens Close is not included in the scheme. They were not allowed permits previously so do not understand why Cardinal Close is being considered. There are only 12 properties so if they were added they do not think it will greatly affect the proposal.</p> <p>9) They appreciate the fact that something needs to be done about the parking, but is disappointed in the scheme proposed. There will be insufficient width of road in which the resident can turn into the garaging area whilst his neighbours can park in their privately owned garage forecourt. Feels that their concerns are being ignored.</p> <p>10)Resident says that properties in St Stephens Close or Claydon Court have not been included. All 30 properties have limited parking so if this goes through the parking stress will pass to other areas. Resident is concerned about safety and believes it is not fair on other residents. They have no objection if St Stephens Close is included in the scheme.</p> <p>11)Resident has suggested changing some of the proposals e.g. make the 8 slot layby outside St Stephens close a shared use bay, extend DYL at corner of the Willows to the small grass common area or put DYL adjacent to the garages. Few cars will fit in the garages as they are very narrow. Other cars also block people in so restrictions would give more control to residents. Current proposals will make life unbearable for residents of St Stephens Close and Claydon Court.</p>	<p>proposal. Currently residents directly affected by permit parking favour the proposal by almost 2:1. Therefore, the recommendation is to implement the changes as advertised.</p>
---	--	--

12)Objection, Resident Cardinal Close	12)The resident feels that the permit bays will result in more cars parking on the garage forecourts and exasperate the issue that the garage holders are having. Suggests that two out of the three permit bays be removed so that there is enough space to access the garages.	
13) Support, Resident Cardinal Close	13)Resident agrees with the proposal.	
14)Support, Resident Cardinal Close	14)Resident agrees with the proposal.	
15) Support, Resident Cardinal Close	15)Resident supports the proposal.	
16) Support, Resident Cardinal Close	16)Resident supports the proposal	
17) Support, Resident Cardinal Close	17)Resident support the proposal	
18) Objection, Resident Cardinal Close	18)Resident states that the proposals would further reduce accessibility of the garages and forecourts on the eastern side. The resulting road blockages would have highway implications especially for pedestrians. A parking scheme with permits would be better. It would also be better if three or four bays opposite the garages be removed to allow for adequate turning. The bays could be substituted by additional bays at the end of the cul de sac.	
19) Objection,	19)The proposals have not been thought through or been	

Resident Cardinal Close	brought widely enough to the attention of the affected residents. The implications should have been explained to each household. The 50 houses in Cardinal Close will be badly affected as it will restrict the number of parking spaces and ban commercial drivers. There is no proof that the road is being used by commuters.	
20) Objection, Resident Cardinal Close	20) Resident objects to the space at the south east end (near no's 32 and 33) being included. If the spaces are left as they are then it would provide additional space for residents and still allow enough room for vehicles to turn around.	
21) Support, Resident Cardinal Close	21) Resident supports the proposal	
22) Support, Resident Cardinal Close	22) Resident supports the proposal	
23) Support, Resident Cardinal Close	23) Resident supports the proposal	
24) Support, Resident Cardinal Close	24) Resident supports the proposal	
25) Objection, Resident Cardinal Close	25) Four parking spaces must be retained at the end of Cardinal Close. They need the spaces by properties 32 and 33. The parking at the end of Wolsey Road should also be shared use at all times. This would allow practical visitor parking on evenings and weekends. Alternatively the times could be amended as the proposals mean there is no visitor parking for one hour between 5.30pm and 6.30pm	

<p>26) Comments, Resident Cardinal Close</p> <p>27) Objection, Resident Cardinal Close</p> <p>28) Support, Resident Cardinal Close</p> <p>29) Objection, Resident Claydon Court</p>	<p>Mon-Fri.</p> <p>26) Resident supports the proposal except for the bend of Cardinal Close where the bays should be extended up to Wolsey Road, and also the area outside no's 32 and 33 where resident parking should be extended.</p> <p>27) Further restrictions which are not resident's permits would make the situation impossible for residents. The new footbridge has made access to the station easier so parking is more difficult.</p> <p>28) Very much in favour of the proposed new permit parking plans.</p> <p>29) A resident of Claydon Court wants to object as parking is already a struggle for residents owing to the increasing number of people using the area as a public car park. If public parking is restricted in adjacent streets it will have further negative impact upon residents of both Claydon Court and Cardinal Close.</p>	
---	--	--

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
<p>CA/4046 - Rectory Road Car club bay</p> <p>1) Comments Resident of Hemdean Road</p> <p>2) Objection Ms E H</p>	<p>1) Suggestion to make Rectory Road a one-way street, this would solve the safety issues as there would no longer be any on-coming traffic. And extend RP bay on both sides of Rectory Road on Hemdean Road end.</p> <p>2) Parking spaces should only be made available to residents to alleviate parking pressure. The proposal to shorten the existing waiting restriction at the junction to</p>	<p>In response to the previous statutory consultation this is an alternative location for a car club bay that would not result in the loss of resident parking space.</p> <p>The existing "no waiting at any time" on the north side of Rectory Road runs</p>

<p>3)Objection Resident of Priory Avenue</p>	<p>accommodate car club bay is likely to cause accidents and cause further traffic flow issues. Rectory Road is already at capacity for road traffic and parking. The proposal is not sensible and also potentially dangerous.</p> <p>3) I wish to strongly object against the position of a car club bay on Rectory Road. The road is busy throughout the day, especially during the morning rush hour and the yellow lines are there as a safety measure to provide room for vehicles to turn in and out. The proposed car club bay is almost opposite the entrance to the building site, this will add further congestion to the road and may also result in traffic accident. Car Club bay should be considered in the Chester Street car park.</p>	<p>from its junction with Hemdean Road for a distance of 17 metres. The proposed car club bay will take up approximately 5-7 metre of the existing waiting restriction, this will ensure at least 10 metres of DYL be retained at the junction; in line with the Highway code.</p>
<p>4)Objection Resident of Rectory Road</p>	<p>4) Vehicles are forced to commit to turn right from Hemdean Road without full visibility and are usually on the wrong side of Rectory Road when making the turn. Removing the yellow lines and in effect occupying that space will exacerbate an already dangerous junction. The proposed car club bay threatens to remove the already very limited visibility to my drive and make access very even more difficult. Car club bay should be sited in Chester St car park.</p>	<p>The car club bay scheme is aimed at reducing car ownership in this area where we already have some interest for such a facility. In addition there is a new development (the old bakery site) that has very limited parking provision. A car club in this location will provide new residents with access to a car in an area where demand for kerb side space is already significantly oversubscribed. This provides a choice for residents and designed to relieve parking pressure in this area.</p>
<p>5)Objection Resident of Rectory Road</p>	<p>5) This is a busy road with no capacity to accommodate a permanent car club bay, especially with the development on the corner of Hemdean Road will no doubt generate even more traffic. Hemdean Hill, Hemdean Rise or Chester Street car park provide better alternative locations.</p>	<p>It is therefore recommended to introduce the car club bay on Rectory Road as advertised.</p>
<p>6) Objection, Resident of Rectory road</p>	<p>6) Parking in Rectory Road is at capacity and the proposed loss of this space will exacerbate the existing parking pressure for residents. We are also concerned about the increase in traffic movements that car club provision will entail, particularly if the scheme is expanded so that</p>	

<p>7) Objection, Resident of Rectory Road</p>	<p>space for more than one vehicle will be required. The potential impact of expansion of the scheme does not appear to have been considered. Because the south end of Hemdean Road is buses only we already experience heavy volumes of through traffic and numerous traffic movements associated with the existing parking provision. This proposal, despite being a "social enterprise" is a commercial business and we do not accept that the public highway should be used for this purpose, to the inconvenience of residents. There are large car-parks reasonably close by (behind Caversham Precinct and off Chester Street) with ample space to accommodate a car club bay which would be more appropriate locations for this venture.</p> <p>7) The proposed space removes over a third of the refuge point for cars coming down Rectory Road, with a view of turning into Hemdean Road, this is likely to increase risk of accident and gridlock. The existing waiting restriction near the junction serve a safety purpose and it is not acceptable to be shortened to create a car club bay. Anything that reduces the passing opportunity would be dangerous and will lead to traffic backing up in both directions. Whilst this proposal appears to be portrayed as 'good for the people, traffic and the environment', it is in fact a car rental service, and as such commercial operation - which should be funded & financed accordingly. There are large car-parks close to Caversham centre (behind Caversham Precinct and off Chester Street) with space to accommodate a car club bay. Carvenient Car will be making profit out of this venture, so they should look to accommodate the cost of hiring one of these bays and not look to take up part of the public highway, which will impact on the local residents. If this venture is a commercial success, which Carvenient Car are hoping for, then they will be looking to expand it, yet there is no reference to any expansion of the scheme, nor the</p>	
---	--	--

	potential impact to the residents.	
--	------------------------------------	--

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
CH/4046 - Wellington Avenue and Northcourt Avenue		
1)Objection and Support, Resident	1) Resident says they support the consultation, but they do not believe it has taken into account the impact on the Ennerdale Road/Northcourt Avenue junction. During University term time vehicles park right up to the junction, obscuring the line of sight for drivers coming out of Ennerdale Road. The situation will get worse if the proposals go ahead.	<p>Statutory consultation was carried out in August 2015 with a proposal to introduce waiting restriction on the south side of Wellington Avenue. And at the time the majority of the residents objected to the proposal and expressed that the same restriction should be proposed on the north side instead.</p> <p>Many residents have again objected to the revised proposal. It would be difficult to introduce this scheme without the support of residents. It is therefore recommended to only introduce restriction at both ends of the road around the junctions as shown in the revised drawing CH4_A.</p> <p>Update: 10/03/16. The Council has received a petition in favour of this scheme, which has resulted with a total of 12 in favour and 2 against the proposals. The officer recommendation is to implement the restrictions as proposed. It is also recommended that access protection marking are installed across driveways upon implementation</p>
2)Objection, Resident	2) Resident doesn't live on the road but thinks that any permit scheme would push the problem to another road. The real solution would be to work with the university and get them to provide adequate parking or manage their existing parking better because their car park is never full. Current situation is dangerous.	
3) Objection and Support, Resident	3) Resident supports restricted parking on one side of the road but thinks it should be on the South side of Wellington Avenue and not the North side because there will be restricted view of the road ahead, making it more dangerous.	
4)Objection, Resident	4) Resident is relieved that something is being done about the situation but is concerned that the issue will only be pushed further up the road. The same restriction should be added on the T-junction between Ennerdale Road and Northcourt Avenue for safety reasons.	
5)Objection,	5) Resident would like permit parking or restricted 2 hour	

Resident Wellington Ave	<p>parking. The Council is favouring a small amount of residents on the north side that will benefit from the proposals. Resident suggests that if a SYL goes ahead then they should only be on the south side or the proposals for the north side are also applied to the south so that no parking lines are extended from no15 along the length of the south side. The current proposals will make the current situation worse.</p>	of the restriction in response to resident concerns relating to the potential blocking of driveways.
6)Objection and support, Resident Wellington Ave	<p>6) Resident thinks it would be better to allow parking on the north side where there are only 3 driveways. There are parked cars restricting visibility in both directions. Resident approves of the extension of the yellow lines.</p>	
7)Objection, Resident Wellington Ave	<p>7) Proposals do not address all of the issues. Resident suggests bollards to block access from Shinfleid Road, an extension of the DYL and to make parking 2 hours only to prevent university personnel from using it. Resident would like a reduction in council tax as the avenue is being ruined.</p>	
8)Objection and support, Resident Wellington Ave	<p>8) Welcomes the proposal in place. However, the proposed 'No Waiting 9-5' on the north side will do very little to deter the difficulty and danger experienced by residents on the south side. As vehicles would still be able to park on both sides of the road, they will be obscuring residents view making it extremely hazardous to manoeuvre their vehicle. Fails to see how the proposals on the north side of the avenue instead of the south sides would ease the traffic, especially during peak times.</p>	
9)Objection, Resident Wellington Ave	<p>9) It would be extremely useful to have the parking restrictions on the south side of the avenue. Both sides of the road are packed with cars in the week, meaning it's very difficult to move a car in or out of their property; with cars parked either side of the gateway and part way</p>	

<p>10)Support, Resident</p>	<p>across the pavement. With vehicles continuing to enter from Shinfield Road and Northcourt Avenue, they have to have someone stand in the road to restrict traffic flow to allow the car to move out.</p> <p>10)Will allow for smoother traffic, as there is frequently only one lane for the two-traffic, prohibiting an easy access to Northcourt Avenue. Resident is aware this could spread parking problems to other locations and this is already happening at the crossing of Ennerdale Road and Northcourt Avenue as it's close to the university. Cars are parked at this crossing making it difficult and very dangerous to access Northcourt Avenue from Ennerdale Road. Suggests to copy the parking restriction pattern at the crossing from Wellington and Northcourt to the crossing of Ennerdale and Northcourt and to introduce between the two crossing a waiting restriction between 9am-5pm on the east side of Northcourt. Problems on Northcourt are quite serious because it is more difficult to park cars halfway on the pavement because of the presence of trees.</p>	
<p>11)Objection, Resident Wellington Ave</p>	<p>11)Car owners of the south side of Wellington Avenue have considerate difficulty driving out of their driveway on the road as their view is usually obscured by parked vehicles. During the day and university terms the road is full of parked cars and occasionally bulky service and delivery vehicles. Wellington Avenue can get busy during peak time of traffic as is used as a link between Northcourt Avenue and Shinfield Road. The proposal the council put forward last year address the problem nicely allowing daytime parking on the north side with no parking on the south side. However, with this plan neither residents nor visitors would have to forego the convenience of roadside parking in front of their property. Majority of residents on the south side see this as a price worth paying for the benefit of much safer and easier access onto the road. Strongly</p>	

<p>12) Support, Petition in favour of proposals (12 signatures, 11 of which are residents of Wellington Avenue)</p>	<p>urges the plans to be reconsidered and put the restrictions on the south side instead of the north, however thinks the double yellow lines at the junction will improve safety.</p> <p>12) Received a petition on 10/03/16, with 12 signatures, in favour of introducing the scheme as proposed. 3 signatories had previously objected to the scheme.</p>	
---	--	--

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
<p>KE1/4046 - Kentwood Hill</p> <p>1)Objection, Resident</p> <p>2) Objection, Resident Kentwood Hill</p>	<p>1) The resident is pleased that the issue with non-residents parking there all the time will improve with the proposals but is concerned that the problem will only move to the next street without resident parking. They state that many residents are unhappy because the new restrictions will mean they have to move their cars twice a day and cannot go out for the day somewhere. The resident thinks permits would resolve this issue.</p> <p>2) Fully agree with the need to amend parking restrictions but concerned about lack of resident permits or visitors. If these aren't included then this is unacceptable for residents. Parking is only an issue as people park there for the train station or 16 bus service. The 4 hrs will reduce</p>	<p>Residents have expressed their concerns over the proposal on Kentwood Hill as many households have more than 2 cars and would require to park on street. It is therefore recommended to remove this proposal from the programme and that no further action be taken.</p>

3)Objection, Resident	<p>this problem but it shouldn't penalise and impact the residents.</p> <p>3) Proposal is ridiculous as restricting parking to 4 hours will stop other people parking there but it also penalises residents and prevents them parking in front of their homes.</p>	
4)Objection, Resident Kentwood Hill	<p>4) Resident thinks permit scheme should be introduced instead as it will allow residents to park outside their homes.</p>	
5)Objection, Resident Kentwood Hill	<p>5) A change is welcome but the proposed changes will only have a detrimental impact on residents and they would prefer to see permit bays instead.</p>	
6)Objection, Resident	<p>6) Parking is an issue but permits would be better for the residents. Residents need to be able to park during the day and some have multiple cars which are essential for work.</p>	
7)Objection, Resident	<p>7) No issues with the proposals for the west side of the road, but on the east side the 4 hour limited waiting does not provide parking for residents. Some restriction is needed but permits would be better. They do not have driveways and they also need access for deliveries and visitors. If all vehicles are removed from both sides then traffic would speed up and make it worse. Residents have not been properly consulted on this and full time workers cannot attend the civic during office hours.</p>	
8)Objection, Resident	<p>8) Resident welcomes action against people using the road as a free car park but the current proposal will punish residents who would have to keep moving their vehicles to avoid parking fines. Resident permits would be a better solution.</p>	

9)Objection, Resident	9) Resident often parks on this road when they use Tilehurst train station as the station car park has insufficient capacity. The changes would make the issue worse and there aren't any safety issues with the current situation.	
10)Objection, Resident	10)This will not help residents so either change the time to 6hrs between 10-4 or provide resident permits.	
11)Objection, Resident	11)Resident thinks no changes should be made unless the residents are given permits.	
12)Objection, Resident	12)There has been no regard for residents who will need to park in the area. Adding resident parking permits would be a better idea.	
13)Objection, Councillor	13)Councillor supports change but believes that the four hour parking restriction should be reduced to one hour. Residents are happy to apply for parking permits.	
14)Objection, Resident Kentwood Hill	14)Resident would like to have permit parking made available.	
15)Objection and Support, Resident Kentwood Hill	15)Resident supports the west side conversion to no waiting but they do not support the east side conversion to 4 hour parking as it will affect the residents.	
16) Support, Resident Kentwood Hill	16)This proposal is the best solution to a continuing problem which is not only caused by commuters using the railway station but also residents who have multiple vehicles including work vans and cars that don't get moved for many days. There is adequate parking on driveways and the timing of restrictions is fair for all.	
17) Support and objection, Resident	17)Believes it's a good idea and would stop the congestion of travellers parking which use the Tilehurst station and then	

<p>Kentwood Hill</p> <p>18)Objection, Resident</p>	<p>return late at night. This can get frustrating when returning home from work and can't find a space to park. However, feels the restriction of 4 hour stay is not fair on residents either, for families that have multiple cars and can't fit on the drive it's taking their freedom away of parking near their home. Only way to solve this problem is if restriction is implemented is for permits to be issued as most families have more than one car, which will ensure that the residents don't feel like they are being punished. Thought it was a good idea at first but it would hinder the occupants of Kentwood Hill.</p> <p>18)Wishes to object to the proposed restrictions on the eastern side, as reducing the length of any parking stay cannot be argued to be any safer than allowing all day parking. The hill is more restricted for the use of 7.5t or more so large vehicles rarely pass on the hill whereas smaller cars can. If the scheme is implemented it will make Kentwood Hill less safe, a reduction in car parking will increase traffic speeds and increased propensity for traffic to weave in and out of cars therefore reducing visibility and sight lines.</p>	
--	---	--

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
<p>S02/4046 - Shepley Drive</p> <p>1)Objection, Resident Shepley Drive</p> <p>2)Objection,</p>	<p>1) Resident says the opening of the school gate, which no one had been informed of, has put a burden on the residents trying to access their parking areas. The proposal will mean double yellow lines will be outside the resident's house and they believe this will block access and this is unacceptable. They believe the access gate to the school should be closed.</p> <p>2) Resident thinks this will cause more issues than it solves</p>	<p>There has been representation made from both residents and Ward Councillors objecting to proposal to restrict parking around the garaging area, it is therefore recommended to remove scheme for the garage area.</p> <p>Parking within 10m of the junction is in contrary to the highway code and</p>

Resident Shepley Drive	because it will add more cars to the road and prevent emergency vehicles from accessing the area. The parents picking up children are causing the problem and the Council should ban school traffic at this location. Residents should also have a reduced rate for dropped kerbs.	causes visibility issue, it is therefore recommended to implement no waiting at any time around its junction with Restwold Close as advertised.
3)Objection, Residents Shepley Drive	3) 11 cars parked in garage area, couldn't park on the road as was full already with resident cars. There are several parents parking at the top of Shepley Drive and use the new school entrance as they can't park in Silchester Road. Several cars drive up the road parking outside residents houses each morning to drop children off, driving erratically and often performing U turns, using resident's driveways. No reason for change as all residents are able to park. Since the introduction of the new Southcote School entrance there has been more traffic in Shepley Drive at school times and can foresee an accident, and getting worse when new classrooms open and number of pupils increase to 600+.	
4)Objection, Resident Shepley Drive	4) Up to 18 vehicles will be unable to park in Shepley Drive if the proposals go through as well as restricting access for emergency vehicles. Vehicles will also likely park on the pavements. Perhaps only add lines outside the garages.	
5)Objection, Resident Shepley Drive	5) Resident has no issues accessing their garage and there are about 10 cars that park in that area which will be forced to park on Shepley Drive and cause more issues.	
6)Objection, Resident Shepley Drive	6) Resident names four residents who oppose the yellow lines.	
7)Objection, Resident Shepley Drive	7) The situation has arisen from a lack of parking etiquette from parents accessing Southcote School. Apart from one layby all parking is on one side of the road. There is also	

<p>8)Objection, Resident Shepley Drive</p>	<p>an issue with emergency vehicle access. The road is just not suitable for the amount of traffic and parking. The solution would be to close the school gate. Residents were not even consulted on it before it opened.</p>	
<p>8) Proposals will force residents into Shepley Drive itself. The road is already at full capacity and about 12 additional vehicles will be forced to find alternative parking in the road. This will force people to mount kerbs or park in adjoining roads creating problems elsewhere. Increased traffic was caused by the school so perhaps a specific pick up/drop off area for the school might help.</p>		
<p>9)Objection, Resident Shepley Drive</p>	<p>9) Having lived on the road for 6 years there are currently no issues around the garage area. The proposals would cause chaos on Shepley Drive by forcing about 12 cars onto the road. It would affect the value of properties in the area as well.</p>	
<p>10)Objection, Resident Shepley Drive</p>	<p>10)The proposals would force a number of cars on the road and it will cause issues.</p>	
<p>11) Objection, resident</p>	<p>11)Never had any issues, this will have a major impact as it is already at maximum capacity. Have a good community in Shepley Drive, and the proposals could destroy that as people could fight over street parking. Emergency services could experience problems attending an incident, de value properties unable to offer parking, bins have always been emptied so parking is not causing any problems round the garage area. Why should residents be penalised for inconsiderate parents, this should be addressed with Southcote school, and most households have more than 2 vehicles.</p>	
<p>12) Objection, Councillor</p>	<p>12)Councillor Ennis met with local residents concerned that the proposals would force at least 11 vehicles on to the</p>	

13)Objection, Resident	<p>road, which would be very problematic. There has been no problems with bin lorries getting through and residents parking in the garage area are considerate of others. The councillor agrees with the residents, Shepley Drive is too small to take a large number of vehicles that are currently parked in the garage area. Agrees with the proposal of yellow lines at the junction of Restwold close and Shepley Drive.</p> <p>13)Resident never had any issues parking round the garage area; all neighbours respect each other and park in a way that doesn't cause any problems. Every week there is a bin lorry which doesn't have any problems. The garage area isn't being used for the school run hours as it's too far from the entrance. It would create chaos on Shepley Drive itself bringing about 12 vehicles on to the road; also the proposal would affect resale of properties.</p>	
---------------------------	---	--

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
PE3 - Queensway 1)Objection, Resident	<p>1) This is the only place the resident and other registered disabled parents can park to drop off and collect their children from school. No parking provision for disabled parents/carers to drop off and collect if these lines are to be extended. The resident has been parking in this location for approx. 9 years and hasn't had any issues or accidents which the police have assured there is no problem and even helps to reduce the speed for oncoming traffic which make it safer for the children. Residents of No. 24 park overnight which they would no longer be able to do, they have no roadside parking and also have a registered disabled person within the household, therefore being penalised which they need the space. Can't understand why anything needs to be done in this location but if so then provision of Disabled parking space</p>	<p>The fronting of No22 is adjacent to a crossing/pinch point; parking in this small unrestricted area causes obstruction to traffic and is a safety concern to road users. It is therefore recommended to introduce restriction as advertised.</p>

	would be the most sensible action.	
--	------------------------------------	--

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
<p>TH2 - Picton Way</p> <p>1) Support, Resident Picton Way</p> <p>2) Support, Resident Picton Way</p> <p>3) Support, Resident Picton Way</p> <p>4) Support, Resident Picton Way</p>	<p>1) Welcoming the long overdue proposal as is a real risk to the safety of residents which is caused by thoughtless parking from non-resident car owners. Can seem like a blind bend turning into Picton Way from Peppard Road.</p> <p>2) Well aware of the safety issue caused by non-resident parking, many people who park there are using it as a parking spot for businesses in Caversham, Reading and onward travel to London. Perhaps a Park and Ride scheme(s) on the approach road from Oxfordshire is worth considering.</p> <p>3) Resident supports the proposal for safety reasons.</p> <p>4) Since the fly parking on the slope of Picton Way there has been many incidents of 'near misses' which has been an issue for many months, when vehicles are pulling in from Peppard Road direction had to suddenly swerve or suddenly stop to avoid a parked car on the slope or an oncoming vehicle waiting behind the parked car. Hopes these proposals go ahead before an incident occurs and someone gets injured.</p>	<p>It is therefore recommended to implement the restriction as advertised.</p>

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
SO4 - Garston Close 1)Objection, Resident 2)Objection, Residents 3)Objection, Resident 4)Objection, Resident	1) The objector finds the proposal unnecessary, lived there for the past 55 years and no one has parked in front of his driveway or anyone else's. The person who made the complaint told the resident objecting; however he lives on No 15 which is not on the roundabout and part of the entrance for a short time. 2) Will make it difficult for family and friends to visit and has nurses calling regularly if both residents have poor health. 3) Resident has lived there for 55 years and has never had an issue with parking. Due to the schools there are some issues in the morning and the afternoon but it only affects them for 10min per day. They say the person who complained doesn't even live in the 'turning circle' area. The resident does not think such drastic action is necessary. They also have a disabled bay outside their house and are concerned about how it will be affected. 4) Resident has had a car for over 40 years and has never had a problem. Where will visitors park if these proposals go ahead? The changes are not needed at all.	<p>As there has been representation made by residents as well as visitors to the area objecting to this proposal, it is therefore recommended to remove this scheme from the current programme.</p>

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
TI2 - Dunsfold Road 1)Objection, Resident Dunsfold Road	1) The road is narrow and there is a safety issue for emergency vehicles and for residents walking on the pavement. Many residents here are elderly. The double yellow lines were added to improve safety and access for residents so the residents do not need the proposed changes. The safety of the schoolchildren and residents	<p>Due to the number of objections from a relatively small community the recommendation is to remove the proposal from the existing programme.</p>

<p>2)Objection, Resident Dunsfold Road</p>	<p>should take priority over people who want to avoid paying for parking.</p> <p>2) Resident has lived there for a number of years and knows what will happen if they don't have yellow lines. Sport centre users want to avoid paying for their parking so they will use this road and they will block residents in like they did before. There will also be restricted access for emergency vehicles.</p>	
<p>3)Objection, Resident Dunsfold Road</p>	<p>3) Sports centre users will use the road as a free parking area if the restrictions are relaxed. The proposed times align with the peak levels of sports usage and children's parties on the weekends. There will also be restricted access for emergency vehicles. The current 'no waiting at any time' restriction should not inconvenience residents as many have off street parking.</p>	
<p>4)Objection, Resident Dunsfold Road</p>	<p>4) Resident states that there is someone who parks on the road who is not even a resident and residents are too frightened of this person for fear of reprisals. The proposals would lead to a 'scramble' for parking and people from other streets will also park there. Parking permits would be better.</p>	
<p>5)Objection, Resident Dunsfold Road</p>	<p>5) A blue badge holder who visits in the evening may find it difficult to park. Feels the sport centre users will start to park on the road as they won't have to pay parking charges. Dunsfold road is a narrow road, and emergency services may find it difficult to access the school or to the garage area with 24 garages.</p>	

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
<p>KA2 - Canterbury Road</p> <p>1)Objection, Resident</p> <p>2)Objection, Resident Canterbury Road</p> <p>3)Objection, Resident Canterbury Road</p> <p>4)Objection, Resident Canterbury Road</p> <p>5) Objection, Councillor</p> <p>6)Objection, Resident Canterbury Road</p>	<p>1) Another resident has a work van with thousands of pounds worth of tools in it so the vehicle must be parked in front of his house for security reasons.</p> <p>2) Resident lives on Northumberland Ave and doesn't have a driveway. By taking away their ability to park outside their house it will cause a safety issue when getting their children to and from the car. It will also make it impossible to have visitors until after 6.30pm. Resident suggests permit parking.</p> <p>3) Resident would prefer resident permits. The issues are caused by people who do not live on this road.</p> <p>4) Won't be able to park outside their own house when other people park outside theirs who leave their car and go to work for the day. Not too bad in the week but weekends is when the family come home and need to park outside their homes, and would not be fair to park outside someone else's home.</p> <p>5) A number of residents feel that the restrictions will cause parking problems. Some of the households contain more than one generation on this section of Canterbury Road, some may have work vehicles. Some residents need to park on the road and would like to near their home as some houses don't have large drives and have more than one car.</p> <p>6) Currently have slight inconvenience with school drop offs and collections but only for a short time, buses re-route due to local road works which don't happen that often, as</p>	<p>Recommendation is to drop the proposed SYL extension but retain the DYs around the junctions as revised drawing number KA2_A</p>

	<p>the road is wide some park in the road as off road parking is restricted but doesn't cause too much inconvenience. If this scheme is implemented it will remove people's common sense to keep traffic moving. Some residents already park vehicles in neighbouring roads, therefore they will migrate to these roads and narrow them which could cause friction Family and friends who visit will have restricted areas to park which also could cause friction between neighbours and vehicle security will become an issue.</p>	
Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
<p>CA4 - Mill Green</p> <p>1)Objection, Resident Mill Green</p> <p>2) Support, Resident Mill Green</p> <p>3) Support, Resident Mill Green</p> <p>4) Support, Resident Mill Green</p>	<p>1) Unlike Miller Court the residents of Mill Green do not have parking and are cut off from any direct road access. They currently use a patch of land beyond the Boat Yard entrance and they are concerned that the proposals will lead to other vehicles parking there as well. They suggest some permit bays, to allow loading near the boat yard or perhaps to ask the owners of Millers Court to see if the residents could use some of their parking area.</p> <p>2) Resident has resided there for over 29 years and they are in complete agreement with the proposal and it will improve safety for pedestrians, residents and emergency vehicles.</p> <p>3) Resident thinks the changes are a welcome addition because it will improve access to the boat yard, reduce residents from Millers Court from parking there (their car park is always nearly empty), it will improve safety for the children who play in the area, improve emergency vehicle access and increase access to the pavements.</p> <p>4) Resident approves of the proposals. They operate from the boat yard and cars cause delay, inconvenience and make the road unusable.</p>	<p>This section of the road is not wide enough to accommodate parking without causing obstruction to either vehicles or pedestrians.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended to introduce no waiting at any time as advertised.</p>

5)Objection, Resident Mill Green	5) People have stated to park at the park entrance within meters of the junction and the resident has had to call the police previously. There is a bottleneck situation there and it has caused friction. The resident believes that the issues are caused by people visiting the MOT centre or the car dealership nearby, not residents. Resident suggests DYL or a 1-2hr limit on the side of the road near the park, and DYL on the green where there are no houses. Without parking outside their houses elderly visitors cannot park. There needs to be a bay for residents and visitors only. If no permits are granted then no restrictions at all would be better than the proposals.	
6) Support, Resident	6) There are a lot of commuters and other parking and blocking the access. Concerned about the emergency services being able to access the better boating yard.	
7) Support, Resident	7) Has a boat at better boating and often has problems with access, cars often park both sides of the road or in the middle of it, the owners then become very abusive when asked to move.	

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
PA3_A - Wykeham Road	<p>1) Resident of Clarendon Road supports the proposal.</p> <p>2) Resident supports the proposals as it will make the area safer.</p> <p>3) The available parking is already insufficient without the additional proposed restrictions; residents often drive</p>	<p>Parking close to the junction obscure visibility and block pedestrian desire lines. The proposal is to protect these junctions to enhance road safety, whilst not overbearing the area with restrictions.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended to introduce this restriction as advertised.</p>

<p>Road</p> <p>4) Support, Resident Wykeham Road</p> <p>5)Objection, Resident</p> <p>6) Objection, Resident Wykeham Road</p>	<p>round and round to end up parking a long way from Wykeham Road. Have additional strains from visitors to the Roebuck pub and more pubs being owned by residents. To lose yet more parking spaces will force drivers to block up other roads and create an even bigger shortage of inadequate spaces also putting more strain on St Peters Road where parking is already at maximum. The resident thinks it would make more sense to paint marked boxes along Wykeham road to stop space being wasted by careless parked cars.</p> <p>4) The current parking on the corners significantly impairs you visually. As a cyclist, pedestrian and car driver the resident finds it difficult and dangerous on the corners.</p> <p>5) The roads that already have yellow lines on corners have cars flying round them far too fast and no regard to pedestrians or road users. With cars parked near the corners drivers will tend to slow down and see what's ahead and react. As a pedestrian should cross 2 and a half metres from a corner. Also thinks it's illegal to park right on the corner of a junction as cars have got tickets in the past. Thinks a speed limit should be introduced as this is the bigger problem when few cars are parked. One idea is parking permits but most residents would probably object as it would be a nice money earner for the council, and change old street lights to LED.</p> <p>6) Resident wishes to object the proposal of double yellow lines on the junction of Wykeham Road and Auckland Road.</p>	
--	---	--

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
RE5 - Warwick Road and Cintra Avenue		

1)Objection, Resident Warwick Road	1) Resident feels that this will restrict their right to park outside their home. It will affect house prices too. There is no problem on their street from residents but at peak times or during weekend sports events other people park there and they are the ones that should be targeted. Permit parking would be welcome.	Recommendation: Further dialog is required with residents
2)Objection, Resident Warwick Road	2) Most residents have 2 cars and only 1 space off road. These cars would fall foul of the no waiting restrictions. No thought has been given to residents who will have nowhere to park their second vehicles. Resident permits should be introduced instead.	
3)Objection, Resident Cintra Avenue	3) The six flats at Cintra Avenue do not have enough parking to meet the needs of the residents. The proposals would make it impossible for residents to park without penalty. Visitors would have to re-park their cars and people who park there and go to work will probably just return to re-park their cars. The resident would like a different solution to the problem.	
4)Objection, Resident Warwick Road	4) In Warwick Road there isn't really an issue and even visitors manage to park. Access to driveways are generally respected as well. There are more significant issues with the junction with Northumberland Avenue where parking impedes visibility for traffic entering Warwick Road. The proposals will mean there will be no way of distinguishing between residents and non-residents and visitors would not be able to park for long either. At the moment visitors can park along their dropped kerbs. Visitor parking permits would be a better solution.	
5)Objection, Resident Warwick Road	5) The proposals will not improve safety and will impose unreasonable restrictions on residents and visitors. They do not address the root cause of the issue. The school, uni and hospital have been allowed to expand without adequate parking provision. If these institutions could be	

<p>6)Objection, Resident Warwick Road</p>	<p>persuaded to act responsibly and not cause obstructions then the situation would improve. Access protection markings could be added in Warwick Road whilst the 'neck and bollards' should be removed from Cintra Avenue and perhaps extend the A327 south kerb westwards. You could also limit parking on the west side on weekdays only. This would allow two-way traffic along most of Cintra Avenue and avoid the blockage of the A327.</p> <p>6) Not having provisions for residents with two cars will make the proposal fail. Parking permits should be available.</p>	
<p>7)Objection, Resident Cintra Avenue</p>	<p>7) There is not sufficient parking to meet the needs of all the residents. The proposals would make it impossible for residents to park their cars without penalty. Morning visitors would have to re-park their cars and there would already be very little space for them. The proposals also do not reduce the risk of abuse. People who park there for work would likely move their vehicles during the day. The school should not use Cintra Avenue for convenience parking and should create their parking area. The resident suggests two different proposals for the two roads as they have different needs.</p>	
<p>8)Objection, Resident Warwick Road</p>	<p>8) The proposals impose an unreasonable restriction on the residents and their visitors. It will shift vehicles into the next unrestricted road. Obstruction is the real issue here.</p>	
<p>9)Objection, Resident Warwick Road</p>	<p>9) By introducing 'No Waiting Mon-Fri 11am-noon' on the north side and 'No waiting Mon-Fri 12pm-1pm' on the south side would penalise the residents of the road who have at least 2 cars per household, and the retired and elderly resident who may need family and friends to visit or stay all day, and would need to park their car outside the house during the proposed restricted times. It would also penalise the tradesmen. If no better solution can be</p>	

<p>10) Objection, Resident Warwick Road</p>	<p>found then perhaps double yellow lines around the junction of Warwick Road and Northumberland Avenue and double yellow lines across the driveways of each house on both sides which would help residents leave their premises without being blocked by inconsiderate parking of visitors. Would prefer the present parking arrangements to stay.</p>	
<p>11) Objection, resident Warwick Road</p>	<p>10) Parking has become a moderate problem but the inflexible option of the proposed restrictions would cause residents significant difficulties. The resident often has elderly family visiting, has a child carer who would have to take the child out during the day to move the vehicle. The street is not far enough away from the source of day parkers to deter them returning to move their car, the street scene of this largely unchanged Edwardian road will be significantly by line painting and signage along with the environmental and street scene destruction this causes. Does support however, the proposal to add 'No waiting at any time' on the junction of Warwick Road and Northumberland Avenue as there is often very dangerous and inconsiderate parking on the corners.</p>	
<p>12) Objection, Resident Warwick Road</p>	<p>11) A resident would like to object as some houses have no off road parking, many households have 2 vehicles but only 1 space on the driveway, so the second is parked on street, has a disabled son so if has medical staff visiting for more than an hour, will cause undue stress to the family and medical staff. Cars often park on the already existing yellow lines round the corner of Cintra Avenue and Warwick Road, with yet a parking warden yet to attend.</p> <p>12) Regularly has family and friends visiting for longer than an hour, some up to a week or more. Family based in the North East so stay for longer periods of time, proposed plan would mean no day parking for guests, and would be ridiculous to expect anyone to move their car every day to</p>	

	<p>somewhere else for an hour. This would cause even bigger problems overall as the street will become over crowded. A few houses along the road don't have driveways or only enough space for one car, the proposal seems to penalise the residents of the street, but hardly affect those parking for a short period of time to watch sports in the park or pop into town. People who park their cars on the road would find a way round the plan, but for residents would be a nightmare and presumes residents would be home during the day to move their car, which isn't the case as most people work away from their homes. Suggested resident and visitor parking permits as a solution, if not possible just leave the road as it is.</p>	
<p>13) Support, Resident Cintra Avenue</p>	<p>13) Fully support the proposal restrictions on Cintra Avenue as there are real problems with all day parking. However, it would cause problems in Warwick Road unless a permit scheme was introduced. Is it possible to only introduce the scheme to Cintra Avenue?</p>	
<p>14) Support, Resident Cintra Avenue</p>	<p>14) Have no problems with the proposal as long as it makes provision for the residents of Warwick as the scheme would be unworkable. It's clear for the need for some sort of resident permit scheme. This resident has off road parking so wouldn't be expected to be included, but would prefer to see a scheme for 2 hour parking but could live with the current proposal. White lines were painted to show where parking isn't allowed (access protection marking), some of the areas where cars can park are so short no car could park there but people try and consequently block people's driveways, instead asking for double yellow lines instead of the access protection markings.</p>	
<p>15) Objection, Resident Warwick Road</p>	<p>15) Flats on Cintra Avenue don't have sufficient off road parking to meet the needs for all who live there, therefore wouldn't be able to park without getting a</p>	

16) Objection, Resident Warwick Road	<p>penalty. When they have morning visitors will have to re-park their car with likely little space left available. It is likely people who park and work locally will return to re-park their car, and people will get to know they can park for the rest of the day after 1pm which will coincide during busy times with the Abbey Junior School. Feels Warwick road and Cintra Avenue are two different types of roads and suggested two different solutions for either road.</p> <p>16) Resident of Warwick road says residents have 2 cars but only one parking space so have to park on the road. It seems as though someone could move their car from one side of the road to the other to avoid the restriction, which doesn't seem sensible as some parkers work close to the street.</p>	
--	--	--

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
WH4_KA - Longbarn Lane 1) Objection, Surgery Staff Longbarn Lane	<p>1) There will be a negative impact on staff and users of the surgery. Previous requests for on street disabled bays were refused. Taxis and vans and commuters park there all day and this is the reason for the congestion. The surgery has 150-200 patients each day. These proposals just move the problem somewhere else. It is a fast road with little visibility. The green space across from the surgery could be used as a small car park.</p>	<p>The majority of the properties along this section of Long Barn Lane have off-street parking. The proposed waiting restriction will ensure private driveways are not obstructed and allow residents to gain access at all time.</p> <p>The proposed limited waiting bays allow visitors to the surgery up to 2 hours of parking and provide a quick turnaround in an area where demand for parking is high and eliminate all day commercial parking.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended to introduce the proposed restriction as</p>

		advertised.
--	--	-------------

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
KA1 Elgar Road South 1)Comment, Resident Elgar Road South	1) Resident is relieved that some changes are going to be made. They have been increasingly concerned about the safety of their family and other residents as they emerge from their drives to find their view of the south is completely obstructed by parked cars. Many youths on motorcycles also drive quite fast down this road. Resident would like some amendments: extend the current SYL to meet the disabled bay at 256, or extend the planned DYL to meet the existing SYL to the north of Britten Road (with the disabled bay exempt). Resident thinks that leaving a section unrestricted will be dangerous.	The request to extend the proposed waiting restriction on Elgar Road South can be reviewed in the next Waiting Restriction Review Programme 2016B. It is recommended to introduce the restriction as advertised.

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
SO2 - Virginia Way, Service Road 1)Objection, Resident Virginia Way	1) Several parking spaces will be lost. Having spoken to other resident there are no safety issues. The areas outside the bends have been used safely for over 13 years without issue. It would be better to widen the service road. Parking has never been possible along the inside of the service road so adding restrictions there is pointless.	Widening the service road is a very costly exercise, which the Council cannot current provide funding for. There is clear evidence larger vehicles (including refuse lorry) cannot negotiate around the bend without destroying part of the grass verge. It is therefore recommended to introduce the restriction as advertised.

Scheme	Objections/Support/Comments received	Officer response and recommendation
--------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

<p>CA3 - Heron Island</p> <p>1) Objection, Resident Heron Island</p> <p>2) Objection, Resident Heron Island</p>	<p>1) Parking on the island is currently limited and removing the current parking facility on the bridge would only create more parking problems. Never experienced any problems with access due to parking on the bridge, Can't see why the council would spend limited funds on a proposal that would detriment local residents.</p> <p>2) Parking on the island is currently very limited and removing the current parking facility on the bridge would only create more parking problems. Never experienced any problems. Can't see why the council would spend limited funds on this proposal.</p>	<p>The majority of household in Heron Island have ample off-street parking and residents have expressed safety concern over the inconsiderate parking on the bridge.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended to introduce the restriction as advertised.</p>
---	---	---

Scheme	Objections/Support/Comments Received	Officer response and recommendation
<p>BA4 - Kensington Road Car Park</p> <p>1) Objection, Resident Norfolk Road</p> <p>2) Objection, Letter circulating from Battle Primary</p>	<p>1) These proposals would cause chaos and serious parking problems that would affect local residents. Living just metres away from the car park knows the day-to-day problems; residents find it difficult to secure themselves a space in front of their own home because of visitors. Some properties on Norfolk road have 2 cars each will try to park both cars within window view of their house, where the rest have to park on other streets. Some residents and visitors regularly use Kensington Park as alternative for residential parking when the street is full, the restrictions of the car park will push more cars onto the road with limited space to park their cars. The only way this scheme will work is if it includes a clause to exempt residents and their visitors from these charges and restrictions.</p> <p>2) School only has room for 10 cars but have over 40 members, therefore if this scheme was implemented the most of the staff would have nowhere to park other than</p>	<p>The car park is to serve recreation ground users and is not for the purpose of resident parking. Kensington Road is within a resident permit scheme where residents are entitled to apply for up to 2 permits per household.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended to introduce the car park charges in Kensington Road as advertised.</p>

<p>Academy, signed by 49 members of staff.</p>	<p>the two hour parking round by the school, therefore classes could be interrupted for the staff to move their vehicle. This also could have a financial impact on the staff as they may not want to work for a school if they have to pay to park, and many schools in reading finding it difficult to recruit and retain staff. Asks if we could consider an alternative option, if scheme is implemented, to provide staff employed by the school with parking permits to park within the zones. One member of staff has noted that some staff may work up to 8 hours, so if they were to use the car park then they would have to move their car and feels this is unreasonable and unfeasible to manage a large proportion of school staff being forced to move their vehicle before the end of the working day. This member of staff tries to walk and cycle but limited with the weather and a foster carer with RBC so often needs immediate access to the vehicle to transport the children. Kensington Car Park is normally full and has no other option to park the vehicle on the road until spaces are available.</p>	
--	---	--

APPENDIX 2 - REQUESTS FOR WAITING RESTRICTIONS 2016A

Ward	Street	Requested by	Summary of request
Abbey	Milford Road	Business	Request to review parking restrictions and request of APM to deter obstructive and all day parking.
Battle	Battle Square	Ward Councillors & Residents Association	Request for parking review of the entire Battle Square following on from the newly introduced waiting restriction in part of Battle Square.
Battle	Loverock Road	Business	Parking on both sides of the road is causing problem for HGV, request for parking restriction or one-way traffic flow. Request for waiting restriction around access to business unit
Battle	Wood Green Close	Resident	Request for No waiting at any time restriction around the turning head
Caversham	Hemdean Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request of extending existing Resident Permit zone onto Heamdean Road to include properties No.134 to No.152.
Caversham	Marscack Street	Resident	Request of waiting restriction around junctions to deter dangerous parking
Church	Winton Road/Brybur Close	Resident	Request of considering be given to introduce footway/verge parking ban on Winton road and waiting restriction around junctions to improve visibility
Church	Ennerdale Road	Ward Councillor	Waiting restrictions similar to the one being proposed on Wellington Avenue should be considered on Ennerdale Road especially around the junctions.
Katesgrove	Park View	Housing Association	Request of parking review to deter non-resident parking
Katesgrove	Charndon Close	Neighbourhood Officer	Charndon close is to be adopted as part of the public highway. Request to restrict parking on all junctions within the Close.
Katesgrove	Elgar Road South	Business	Request of Double yellow line on corners to prevent accidents.
Kentwood	Broomfield Road	Resident	Request for waiting restriction on the bend

APPENDIX 2 - REQUESTS FOR WAITING RESTRICTIONS 2016A

Ward	Street		Summary of request
Kentwood	Overdown road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for existing waiting restriction to be extended to the Borough boundary.
Kentwood	Romany Close	Resident	Refuse collection lorry have difficulties accessing entrance to the back of Norcot Road on Romany close. Waiting restriction is required to allow HGV access.
Kentwood	Wealden Way	Resident Resident via Ward Councillor	Request to extend existing DYL from opposite Dartington Close to its junction with Pottery Road. Request of waiting restriction review to deter inconsiderate school pick up/drop off parking.

Minster	Southcote Road	Resident	Request for extension of waiting restriction to the south of its junction with Carmalite Drive
Minster	Tazewell Court	Residents	Resident feels the current restriction is too severe and request a review to relax its current No waiting at any restriction.

Park	Newtown area	Ward Councillor	Request to review its existing shared use RP hours from 10am-4pm to 8am-8pm.
Park	Green Road	Ward Councillor	Request to extend existing DYL at its junction with Whiteknights Road.
Park	Hamilton Road	Ward Councillor	Request for parking review i.e. Resident permit scheme to resolve ongoing parking issues
Park	Whiteknights Road	Ward Councillor	Request that the double yellow line at the junction of Talfourd Avenue to Holmes Road be shortened to provide more parking spaces.
Park	Crescent Road	Resident	Parking on Crescent Road causes traffic flow issues and the road would benefit from double yellow line and prevent Mexican standoff.

APPENDIX 2 - REQUESTS FOR WAITING RESTRICTIONS 2016A

Ward	Street	Requested by	Summary of request
Peppard	Galsworthy Drive	Resident via MP	Complaints of lorries, vans and pickup trucks parking in the evening and over the weekends in residential street, especially on the corner of Montpelier Drive, request for waiting restriction to deter inconsiderate parking.
Peppard	Lyefield Court	Resident	Resident felt restriction should again be considered at least in the narrow part of this road.

Southcote	Coronation Square	Family development team	Request for "emergency vehicle" and "disable parking" bay.
Southcote	Southcote Lane	Resident	Request for waiting restrictions all the way from Belgravia Court to Bath Road.

Thames	Highmoor Road	Resident	Request for consideration to introduce "no waiting at any time" at the junction to Kidmore Road
--------	---------------	----------	---

Tilehurst	Church End Lane	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for waiting restrictions on the inner bend opposite its junction with Stanham Road to improve visibility leaving private driveways.
Tilehurst	Mayfair/Park Lane	ResidentS via Ward Councillor	Bus services are regularly delay by parked cars close to the junction, request to extend existing waiting restriction to improve traffic flow.
Tilehurst	St Michaels Road	Ward Councillor	Request for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extension of waiting restriction up to No.58 St Michaels Road - Proposed waiting restriction opposite its junction with The Triangle
Tilehurst	Westwood Road	Ward Councillor	Request for waiting restriction at its junction with Crescent Road to improve driver's visibility at the junction

APPENDIX 2 - REQUESTS FOR WAITING RESTRICTIONS 2016A

Whitley	Dovecote Road	Residents	Request for waiting restrictions review for the entire road especially around the junction adjacent to No.16
Whitley	Greenfield Road	Resident via Ward Councillor	Request for footway/verge parking ban to be considered.