

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

REPORT BY DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES

TO:	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE		
DATE:	15 JUNE 2016	AGENDA ITEM:	14
TITLE:	RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS - HOSPITAL AND UNIVERSITY STUDY AND A33 MRT PHASE ONE		
LEAD COUNCILLOR:	TONY PAGE	PORTFOLIO:	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT
SERVICE:	TRANSPORTATION AND STREETCARE	WARDS:	REDLANDS & WHITLEY
LEAD OFFICERS:	CRIS BUTLER CHRIS MADDOCKS	TEL:	0118 937 2068
JOB TITLE:	STRATEGIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMME MANAGER/ TRANSPORT PLANNING MANAGER	E-MAIL:	Cris.butler@reading.gov.uk

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 Following completion of the informal consultations in 2015, it was agreed at the Traffic Management Sub-Committee in January 2016 to progress the formal Statutory Consultation on the Hospital and University proposals, and at the Traffic Management Sub-Committee in March 2016, it was agreed to progress the formal Statutory Consultation on phase one of the A33 MRT proposals.
- 1.2 The Statutory Consultations commenced on 12th May 2016 for a period of 28 days. Notices were placed on street informing of the consultation, alongside promotion via the Reading Borough Council website and social media platforms.
- 1.3 The results of the consultations will be presented on the night of this meeting.

2. RECOMMENDED ACTION

- 2.1 That the Sub-Committee note the report.
- 2.2 That the Sub-Committee consider the results of the statutory consultations.
- 2.3 That the Sub-committee consider the support/objections and comments received in response to the statutory consultation for changes to waiting restrictions as a part of the hospital and university area study.
- 2.4 Where no objections are received in response to the South Reading MRT proposal the scheme will be implemented as advertised.

3. POLICY CONTEXT

- 3.1 The provision of movement and waiting restrictions and associated criteria is specified within existing Reading Borough Council Traffic Management Policies and Standards.

4. THE PROPOSAL

Hospital and University Area Study

- 4.1 In line with the LTP, a consultation was undertaken in May 2012 on the principle of prioritising parking in the Hospital and University area for local residents through introducing a Residents' Parking Scheme, to include elements of pay and display parking, alongside complementary transport measures in the local area. The scheme was proposed to help address the issues previously identified by residents through the study, where parking had been identified as the top transport issue in the area.
- 4.2 Due to the mixed nature of responses received through the consultation, the study Steering Group took the decision not to proceed with the proposed parking scheme at that time. It was agreed to continue with the study and focus on continuing to work closely with key stakeholders, including the University and Hospital, to reassess the feasibility of introducing the complementary transport schemes as outlined in the consultation and as supported through feedback received from residents.
- 4.3 This work has continued over the past few years, and in 2015, a second set of proposals were prepared by the Council and presented for consultation by the Redlands Ward Councillors.
- 4.4 Redlands Ward Councillors promoted the latest set of proposals via a local leaflet delivered to all properties in the study area, information on the Redlands Councillors website, and a local exhibition took place at St Lukes Church Hall on Monday 28 September 2015 between 5:00pm to 7:00pm

supported by Council Transport Officers.

- 4.5 A report was submitted to this Sub-Committee in January 2016 confirming the results of the informal consultation and liaison with the Emergency Services. Members approved progression of the proposals located to the west of Alexandra Road (including Alexandra Road) to Statutory Consultation as these proposals were in general well received. However, due to the feedback received from Residents and the Emergency Services, Members agreed that the proposals to the east of Alexandra Road were not progressed any further.

South Reading Mass Rapid Transit

- 4.6 South Reading Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) is a proposed series of bus priority measures on the A33 corridor between Mere oak Park & Ride and Reading town centre. The scheme would reduce congestion and journey times, improving public transport reliability on the main growth corridor into Reading. The proposal does not reduce existing highway capacity along the A33 as additional capacity will be provided for public transport usage.
- 4.7 Phase 1A of the scheme involves construction of a series of bus lanes between the A33 junction with Imperial Way and the existing bus priority provided through M4 Junction 11. The scheme is achieved predominantly by utilising space in the central reservations and realigning existing lanes where required.
- 4.8 At the March 2016 meeting of this Sub-Committee, members approved the undertaking of the formal three week Statutory Consultation for this phase of works.
- 4.9 The Statutory Consultations commenced on 12th May 2016. Consultation notices were placed on lamp columns, alongside promotion of the proposals on the Council Website and Social Media.
- 4.10 The details of any objections or comments to either proposal will be tabled on the night of this meeting for consideration by members of the committee.

5. CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC AIMS

- 5.1 The delivery of the projects outlined in this report help to deliver the following Corporate Plan Service Priorities:
- Keeping the town clean, safe, green and active.
 - Providing infrastructure to support the economy.

6. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INFORMATION

- 6.1 The proposals have been and will continue to be communicated to the local community through the informal consultation, the Statutory Consultation process, Council Meetings and forums.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Any proposals for movement or 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, victimisation 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 A full EqIA has been completed and was reported to the January 2016 meeting of this Sub-Committee.

9. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 The cost associated with the Hospital and University Study will be funded from existing Transport budgets

9.2 The costs associated with the delivery of the LEP Growth Deal schemes are met by a combination of LEP and local funding.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS

10.1 Traffic Management Sub-Committee reports - November 2015, January 2016 & March 2016.

WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW, HOSPITAL AND UNIVERSITY PARKING - OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER
APPENDIX 1 - Summary of letters of support and objections received to Traffic Regulation Order

LAST UPDATED: 15/06/16

Scheme	Objections/supports/comments received.	Officer Response and Recommendation
<p>University and Hospital Area</p> <p>1) Objection</p> <p>2) Objection - Resident of Blenheim Gardens</p> <p>3) Support/Objection - Kendrick Road Resident</p>	<p>1) The removal of all short term parking will make parent drops to Redlands Primary School pay for parking every day to pick up and drop off their child. Pays taxes and council tax and doesn't think it's appropriate to remove all short stay parking around a school area, comes across as a money making scheme.</p> <p>2) Resident of Blenheim Gardens children go to Redlands Primary, thinks there isn't enough parking currently, and with the proposed restrictions this will reduce further.</p> <p>3) Pleased to see parking spaces back after the road surface refurbishment outside 117 and 119, as acts as traffic calming. Would like to see alternative parking on the North and South side of Allcroft Road as speeding is a big problem. The resident would prefer to keep the unrestricted parking at the south end of Kendrick, junction with Christchurch Road, as he wouldn't be able to park outside his house during the day. With the hospital and university 10 minutes away, there is no reason the parking to be restricted, the new scheme is ideally to protect residents not restrict them. Alternatively, would consider 'pay and display' or 'resident permit only' between 8am and 5.30pm as planned for Allcroft Road.</p>	<p>1) This is not a removal of parking that already exists. This scheme was designed to ensure that the limited kerbside space is better managed</p> <p>2) This does not remove the existing parking provision.</p> <p>3) This scheme replaces the existing daytime parking with pay and display to the same time restricted periods. Whilst some bays include RP Kendrick Road doesn't have any RP.</p>

4) Objection - Avebury Square resident	4) Resident feels Avebury Square should be included in these negotiations. Is aware they all have drives and residents wouldn't begrudge people parking where they can, especially access to the hospital however these proposals doesn't consider the length of stay time as some cars are parked and not moved for days/weeks, and inconsiderate parking, needs to make clearer of motorists not blocking the residents driveways.	4) Avebury Square is not included in the scheme.
5) Objection	5) This is a matter which will be difficult to have everyone's approval, but this will push the people regularly parking in these streets into Donnington/Hatherley/Blenheim/Foxhill and Cardigan Roads which is already busy with students and hospital or people parking and walking into town, which would be unfair on these residents especially when they come home from work and park near their house. Would welcome more resident parking in all the mentioned roads with Pay and Display from 8 till 4.30pm unless you're a resident and don't need to pay and display.	5) Carried out informal consultation in these residential areas without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.
6) Objection - Hospital employee	6) These proposals will not only have devastating effect on patients who are hard pressed for parking at the car park, but on staff too as there isn't enough spaces and need to park on the streets. Is it not discrimination against hospital staff and patients making it more difficult for them to attend work or appointments. For patients a hospital visit is worrying enough and some hospital staff aren't entitled to permits to use the hospital car park so many staff use spaces on the road every day of the working week, so to expect staff to pay to park on the roads every single day is disgraceful, as the Royal Berkshire Hospital is providing a service for the good of the community and should be taken into consideration. The majority of the houses in the area have driveways and shouldn't be affected by parking. The residents choose to live in this area and should realise the parking issues the	6) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff are offered permit parking within the hospital car park.

<p>7) Comment - Whitby Drive resident</p> <p>8) Objection - Cardigan Road Resident</p> <p>9) Support/Comment - Whitby Drive Resident</p> <p>10) Objection - Addington Road resident</p> <p>11) Objection - Redlands Road resident</p>	<p>hospital faces, as there is limited spaces on the hospital site and if they keep objecting to increase parking at the hospital they should understand patients and staff will have to park on the roads surrounding.</p> <p>7) Resident refers to a parking bay in Whitby Drive that would be suitable for 5 vehicles, suggests why this isn't for resident parking only.</p> <p>8) What is the plan for the tributary roads such as Cardigan Road as these are well within the overflow/walking distant of the hospital. Cardigan Road is wide/long enough to support a scheme, if limited to 1 or 2 cars and no oversized vans. Feels Cardigan Road should be dealt with now under the current proposals.</p> <p>9) Firstly, the parking bay in Whitby Drive has been excluded, suitable for 5 cars intended for Whitby Drive. Councillors Jones and Gavin visited and agreed this area should be designated for residents only. Secondly, the area on Allcroft Road to the west of Whitby Drive, proposed to be resident permits bay, can't understand why remove part of the grass verge to create a bay that will cost unnecessary money. Fully supports the proposal on Allcroft Road designated for Residents only to be implemented.</p> <p>10) There is already considerable pressure on the limited parking available on Addington Road and surround streets immediately to the east of Alexandra Road in the day time. The proposed scheme would exacerbate the problem in these areas making an already difficult parking problem even worse.</p> <p>11) Not exactly clear where residents are meant to park during the day. The current parking on the north side of Redlands Road means there is poor visibility when turning</p>	<p>7) Whitby Drive is not included in the scheme but could be added at a later date.</p> <p>8) Carried out informal consultation in these residential areas without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p> <p>9) Whitby Drive is not included in the scheme but could be added at a later date. This scheme is to utilise existing parking bay and not create more bays.</p> <p>10) Addington Road is included in the scheme and will be managed.</p> <p>11) This scheme is designed around the existing parking provision and doesn't remove any parking. Such</p>
---	--	---

<p>12) Support - Whitby Drive resident</p> <p>13) Support/ Comments - Denmark Road resident</p>	<p>onto Morgan Road, needs to be halfway across the road before seeing what's coming up the road from the west. Suggests there should be parking on one of the other sides of Morgan Road, to have the zig zag approach is dangerous. More consideration needed near crossing south of Morgan Road on Redlands, the proximity of proposed parking to the crossing reduces the safety of pedestrians. Parking needs to be prohibited so drivers can see the crossing and stop.</p> <p>12) Supports the proposals for parking restrictions in the Allcroft area except for the parking bay in Whitby Drive. Over time it is being used by day parkers and sometimes overnight. There is a bay for a disabled driver but no longer needed but may be useful for visitors with a blue badge, and would like it retained, but otherwise should be residents parking.</p> <p>13) Agrees with tackling the problems in Elmhurst and Upper Redlands which believes will help traffic flow. However, disagrees with changing Kendrick, Alexandra road and other roads outside the immediate campus/hospital area so at weekends only residents or permit holders can park there, friends and family may find it difficult to visit. Is weekend parking really an issue? Feels parking permits for visitors should allow for lunchtime visitors as the way for overnight and Reading has enough parking measures and would prefer to see 2hour parking slots. Does the hospital have sufficient parking for it's own staff, if not suggests a park and ride should be used more or car share, the staff working out of hours need help to get to work. Would like the see measures taken to discourage/ban students from bringing cars into the area which would free up a lot of parking and reduce traffic. If can't park near campus along Elmhurst or Pepper Lane then going to struggle elsewhere, would be better off using the bus service or</p>	<p>safety concern has not been raised under the existing arrangement but can be kept under review.</p> <p>12) Whitby Drive is not included in the scheme but could be added at a later date.</p> <p>13) This scheme is designed to cover the Monday to Friday period only and some bays do revert to RP only at weekends. If implemented this can be reviewed over time. We expect ongoing discussions with both the hospital and the university on other options such as park and ride. Visitors are accommodated through the permit scheme.</p>
---	--	---

<p>14) Support/ Comments - Denmark Road resident</p> <p>15) Support - Alexandra Road residents</p> <p>16) Comments</p>	<p>walking/cycling.</p> <p>14) Believes this scheme will detriment the residents and costing people more to park and displacing parking elsewhere in the area. Agrees with people visiting the area of the hospital, university or work should pay for something but not impacting the residents or short term visitors. There isn't enough parking spaces available for residents at present, therefore some residents will pay more under this scheme which is wrong. Wishes the parking to remain the same, 2hr no charge unrestricted. The proposed change which this resident supports is Elmhurst Road, the addition of 'No waiting at any Time' must be implemented to make this road safer, if this road is mainly used by students then would like to see charges here to be justified.</p> <p>15) Over the past 20 years parking round Reading has been a nightmare, even when residents can't park on their own road or own drive due to non-residents parking inconsiderably, which has been an issue for elderly neighbours who struggle to get to medical appointments as a result of this. Fully supports the scheme, including should only be residents after 5.30pm as if parking was free of charge for non-residents after this time there's the risk of spaces being taken up before residents get back from work.</p> <p>16) Alexandra Road should allow for short term pay and display at the weekends as well as the week. There are several residential properties where residents rely on weekend visits and this is usually the most popular time for visits, and feels visitor permits is a waste as these last half a day but the visit is only a few hours would therefore block the parking bay for longer than necessary. Has no objection to the idea of using pay and display as a concept</p>	<p>14) This scheme is a share use scheme which only applies Monday to Friday working day. Evenings and weekends accommodate resident parking.</p> <p>15) This scheme is designed to help residents.</p> <p>16) This scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time. The tariff as defined in previous committee reports does not include a free period but would look to half an hour pay periods for very short term parking.</p>
--	---	---

<p>17) Objection - Kendrick Road resident</p> <p>18) Support/Objection - Upper Redlands Road resident</p> <p>19) Comments - Upper Redlands Road residents</p> <p>20) Objection - Erleigh Road resident</p>	<p>in order to prevent people from parking all day for free and walking to work, however making the whole area pay and display rather harsh. Suggests all the new pay and display areas should have a free period to allow local visits to shops, doctors, orthodontists that are in the area. Could this be done on a trial basis after then could make it chargeable depending.</p> <p>17) Wants the parking restrictions to stay the same, lives on the corner of Kendrick and Morgan, doesn't want pay and display as it would feel like living in a car park. The current restrictions work well. People are roaming around looking for parking that go to the hospital or visiting appointments, feels pay and display won't help, why penalise them, help them with more parking.</p> <p>18) As a resident supports the scheme overall, however strongly objects to the fact that it perpetuates gross abuse of commercial vehicle parking. Buses drop and collect pupils from St Joseph's school using the bus stop near the junction of Alexandra road and sometimes be parked there all day. This is a difficult junction; however the buses badly impede the visibility for traffic turning onto Upper Redlands from Alexandra which generates congestion. Feels they shouldn't be using this permanent spot for what is actually occasionally used, as there is no bus route through upper redlands these markings should be removed.</p> <p>19) Agrees with the last comments especially on the effect on traffic when there are several buses parked for a period of time. Can the bus stop be removed as some people wait there expecting public transport.</p> <p>20) Firstly, houses 27-33 on Erleigh Road are part of Alexandra conservation area, doesn't make any sense to implement the same restrictions conservation area wide,</p>	<p>17) This is not a view of majority of residents who have long campaigned for parking restrictions to deal with the impact of the hospital and the university.</p> <p>18) This is an existing issue that is not affected directly by this proposal.</p> <p>19) This is an existing issue that is not affected directly by this proposal.</p> <p>20) This is an existing issue which is outside of this scheme proposal.</p>
--	--	---

<p>21) Objection - Denmark Road resident</p> <p>22) Objection</p>	<p>especially in the light of illegal parking of the Kirk vehicles. Secondly, Erleigh Road east of Alexandra Road and West of the Co-Op are trapped between 2 parking restrictions, which will mean increased demand of parking in that area. The current situation is awful, builders refuse to work because of lack of parking, and the demand for parking is set to be intolerable. Suggests making some permit parking outside house 33 and 22 as this may help address the illegal Kirk vehicle situation.</p> <p>21) Currently residing in the area, has a 41 weeks pregnant wife and needs somewhere to park their car without restrictions during the daytime. Been confirmed that they aren't eligible for a second permit has already been taken. This resident is more than happy to pay for the second permit or wishes these plans not to be implemented. Most of the houses within the area have large drives and can easily park inside.</p> <p>22) Is a current physiotherapist at the Royal Berkshire Hospital but has a long standing injury and struggles to walk long distances. Only lives 1 mile from the hospital but can no longer walk the distance as it causes too much pain. Due to living so close to the hospital they are not entitled for a parking permit on site, and there are no permits available due to the scheme being oversubscribed due to lack of parking. Can't cycle or use public transport as this will trigger the pain. Appreciates the proposal as in theory could help patients because streets wouldn't be so congested, however many patients have a lot of appointments with unknown length due to delays, with fines being issued for going over time they would have put in for pay and display which comes across as a money making scheme at the cost of the NHS and patients health. Furthermore, it will have a knock on effect on the surrounding residential roads that aren't involved, more cars will park on streets such as Winderemere Road as its</p>	<p>There will be continued work on the impact around the fringes of any implementation.</p> <p>21) This proposal increased the RP provision in Denmark Road. There is a discretionary permit process where permits have been refused issue.</p> <p>22) On street Pay and Display accommodates blue badge parking. We have had extensive discussions with both the university and the hospital over a number of years and this will continue.</p>
---	---	--

<p>23) Support for Marlborough Avenue</p> <p>24) Objection</p> <p>25) Objection - local resident</p>	<p>still in walking distance of the university and council allowing people to park on the bends. Fully believes that talks should be between the Council, hospital and the university.</p> <p>23) Thinks the proposals are an excellent compromise and hope there will achieve a majority of Marlborough Avenue residents in favour.</p> <p>24) These parking changes doesn't affect this resident directly, nor works at the hospital or rarely uses these areas. Feels that altering this to pay and display is clearly just going to cause more issues for our NHS staff who struggle to park in the hospital car park or live too close to receive a parking permit but too far to reasonably walk or use public transport. The NHS staff already have a hard enough time without adding unnecessary pressure. This will cause all sorts of hassle and push the problem slightly further out.</p> <p>25) Strongly objects to these proposals on Erleigh Road and Addington Road as borders on a money making scheme, the residents on these roads have their own off street parking in a majority of cases or spaces opposite the school. Were the parking at the hospital in anyway adequate to meet the needs of this group of people, restrictions on the surrounding roads wouldn't be an issue. The staff who don't qualify for a permit or on a long waiting list for a permit find some solace in being able to use these limited spaces. Pay and display will make it finically not viable to use these spaces and simply shift the parking issue to the smaller narrower surrounding roads that can't take the extra cars. There is a number of staff who have to come and go during the day, doing home visits and taking patients on trial visits, this group of people need somewhere free and local to park, it's not appropriate to make them pay or having to move their</p>	<p>23) Marlborough Avenue is a RP scheme.</p> <p>24) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking within the hospital car park.</p> <p>25) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking within the hospital car park.</p>
--	---	---

<p>26) Objection - Foxhill Road resident</p>	<p>car.</p> <p>26) Going ahead with pay and display in this scheme will cause further problems in the area that already has major problems, which will have a big impact on the residents of Donnington, Hatherley, Blenheim, Foxhill and Cardigan Road. Over the last four years seen the problem worsen and finds it stressful coming home from work or an evening out. One way of how the problem has worsened is the recent implementation of residents permits in the top half of Eastern Avenue, which the council had to implement due to the problems that parked cars were causing for vehicles driving up and down the road but has just pushed the problem elsewhere. If this scheme was to be implemented over the summer when all the students have gone home doesn't really show how bad the parking problem is as these roads have sufficient parking over the summer holidays, it is only during term time that residents have problems in these roads. Welcome pay and display in the mentioned roads but consideration needs to be given to residents, once this is implemented people will try to park in roads without pay and display. One option could be to introduce Pay and Display during the core hours for example Monday to Friday 8.30am-4.30pm with residents being able to park for free.</p>	<p>26) Carried out informal consultation in these residential areas without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme. This is a Monday to Friday working day scheme and most of the bays are free to use by residents overnight and at weekends.</p>
<p>27) Objection</p>	<p>27) Uses the short stay parking available to drop their children off at school before going to work walking the children up to the school. All the cars parked on these roads that will have pay and display will now move to roads that can't have any parking restrictions such as Blenheim Gardens, Foxhill Road, Heatherley Road and Donnington Gardens making it more difficult for residents.</p>	<p>27) This scheme does not remove any existing parking space and P and D will accommodate short term parking. Work will continue on the impacts around the fringes of the scheme.</p>
<p>28) Objection - Wokingham resident</p>	<p>28) Has to park in this area as lives in Wokingham but works in a café in the centre of Reading and usually has to be at work by 5.30am. There isn't any public transport</p>	<p>28) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This</p>

<p>29) Objection</p>	<p>that can be used, but being on minimum wage doesn't get paid enough to afford parking in the town centre. The restrictions proposed will force them to park further away from the town centre and walk even further to work. A result of not being able to afford to park in Reading will also force them to give up their job which will also reduce the available workforce to town centre businesses. In most areas the parking that is available has been used for a very long time without any problems to the residents, except on a few roads which could cause inconvenience which will worsen with these proposed restrictions and paying for permits. The restrictions will make visiting sick relatives expensive, with the hospital having very inadequate parking doesn't see the problem with visitors temporarily parking on neighbouring roads. With the parking revenue the Council are making the shopping in Reading less attractive, visits have been reduced due to the parking restrictions within the town centre, if these plans go ahead will no longer visit Reading for shopping or other activities. Believes the main reason for these restrictions is to generate parking revenue for the council, therefore not serving the public or local businesses but serving its own revenue. Can understand that parking controls are needed in some areas where residents are severely impacted or traffic problems arise, but should be limited as it impacts negatively on the ability of local people to live their lives and local businesses to profit.</p> <p>29) Objecting to the restrictions around Erleigh Road/Alexandra Road as since parking permits have come into place in this area, it is absolutely impossible to park in Donnington Road. Owns a garage on the corner of Donnington Road/Erleigh Road and as a business that has been running since 1965 currently finds it impossible to park everyday due to the people who don't live or work in this area taking the few parking spaces available. Hasn't been helped with nearly every house being rented out to</p>	<p>scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking within the hospital car park.</p> <p>29) This scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time. Carried out informal consultation in Donnington Road area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any P and D and RP scheme.</p>
----------------------	--	--

<p>30) Objection - Morgan Road resident</p>	<p>students or will have 2 to 3 cars. Finds customers have nowhere to park and won't bother coming down. Had suggested in the past about the 2 parking spaces outside the garage be allocated to the 2 businesses opposite but faded. Suggests to extend the 2 hour parking outside the church by at least one or two parking spaces and cut back on the yellow lines going into Donnington Road as would free up a few spaces.</p> <p>30) Expressed their views when the scheme was first proposed pointing out that the small parking area on the western side of Redlands Road 13m northwest of its junction with Morgan Road making it very dangerous to turn right from Morgan Road to Redlands Road as vehicles parked in that area block the view of vehicles approaching the junction from London road. Suggested in the past that the small area should be transferred to the eastern side of Redlands Road.</p>	<p>30) Such safety concern has not been raised under the existing arrangement but can be kept under review.</p>
<p>31) Objection - Petition, set up by Hospital employee</p>	<p>31) Staff members already have to pay for parking permits for the hospital and not even guaranteed a space. Given the fact that NHS staff pay has only risen by 1% and talking about increasing permit fees, therefore can't afford to pay for permit and park on the road. Where will hundreds of student nurses and midwives who aren't eligible for a permit park as they don't get paid. For visitors paying the parking charges at the hospital which is over-priced, the loss of on road parking will only increase anxiety and tension around parking when visiting. Wouldn't be able to afford to pay every day to park to visit patients if it wasn't for the 2 hour parking space. Believes the new restrictions will make it difficult for others to spend time with their loved ones. The petition has been signed by 8,328 signatures as of 9am 15/6/16.</p>	<p>31) This is to be presented as a petition for consideration by the Sub committee on the evening.</p>
<p>32) Support/Comment - Whitby</p>	<p>32) Has noticed the omission of the parking bay in Whitby Bay. The 14 Whitby Drive houses don't have any driveways</p>	<p>32) Whitby Drive is not included in the scheme but could be added at a</p>

Drive resident	so badly needs to be included. The proposal for Allcroft Road is welcoming and grateful for the efforts.	later date.
33) Objection - Foxhill Road resident	33) Has several concerns with future parking down Foxhill, Cardigan Road/Gardens, Hatherley and Donnington Road. Attended the consultation last summer regarding the pay and display/permit parking in the area, but it's been stated there was a poor response from residents, probably due to the fact that most of these houses are private landlords who rent them out to students, therefore not an interest to agree permit parking. It's a shame the students can't leave their car at the university or simply walk or cycle instead. The worst time is term time, there's a fight to find somewhere to park if go out in the evening or returning from work. It's got worse since the introduction of permit parking in Eastern Avenue, and with the introduction of Pay and Display on Alexandra Road this will push on aspects to smaller roads to avoid paying.	33) Carried out informal consultation in these residential areas without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme. This scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time.
34) Objection	34) Doesn't support the changes as believes the council shouldn't be making money by charging people to park near Royal Berkshire hospital. People should have fair and free access to road parking. Furthermore, you will just push people to park in alternative streets which doesn't solve any problems. Also, wouldn't attract highly skilled people to work in the area if can't park as buses and trains aren't an option for everyone.	34) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking within the hospital car park.
35) Objection - Orthodontic centre Erleigh Road	35) Wants to express the concern as a business in the local area. Although they have a small car park they have a duty to offer patients and staff places to park, so allocate 4 to staff and remaining 5 to patients which includes a disabled bay. The remaining staff and patients have to find parking elsewhere, as a business receive many complaints on a daily basis due to limited parking spots. Feels this new proposals would make this more frustrating for both patients and staff. If these proposals go ahead	35) This scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time.

<p>36) Objection - Craven Road resident</p>	<p>suggests they are allocated a number of permits for staff, so they are able to park on the road which would enable them to offer patients spaces in the car park.</p> <p>36) By introducing Pay and Display and plans to reduce number of street parking places seems a vindictive attack on NHS staff. With the continuation of to reject attempts to build a multi-storey car park to help patients and staff would ultimately downgrade or have to close the hospital and emergency services to Wexam Heatherwood, who are spending money to help their residents and NHS staff provide a service, which Reading Borough Council are going out their way to destroy the hospital. This resident doesn't park outside residents' houses and who have off road parking anyway.</p>	<p>36) There have many stakeholders meetings involving the RBH prior to this proposal. We expect discussions to continue regardless of the progress of this proposal.</p>
<p>37) Objection - Hospital employee</p>	<p>37) Parking is limited on the hospital site, finding parking is difficult and public transport isn't really an option as finds it difficult to get home after finishing at 9pm. By further limiting the parking on local roads, will make work even harder and more time consuming. Finding parking is often stressful enough, the proposed restrictions will only push the problem further away but not solve it. A solution could be offered additional facilities on or near site would relieve pressure from the local roads and serve the wider community and hospital staff.</p>	<p>37) We have had extensive discussions with both the university and the hospital over a number of years and this will continue. The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking within the hospital car park.</p>
<p>38) Comments - Whitby Drive resident</p>	<p>38) Welcomes the permit parking along Allcroft Road however, noticed the small parking bay on Whitby Drive has been omitted, which should be Permit Holders only. Has noticed a review of Lancaster Close also has been omitted, which parking along the road is a problem being a narrow road and cars parked on the road and pavement. This causes problems for buggies and disabled users who have to step into the road. Feels the parking will get worse as parking restrictions are introduced in nearby streets.</p>	<p>38) Whitby Drive and Lancaster Close is not included in the scheme but could be added at a later date.</p>

<p>39) Comment - Alexandra Road resident</p>	<p>39) Feels the whole scheme is unnecessarily restrictive. There has been a huge increase of non-residents parking on the roads in the area but doesn't actually cause any problems as many houses have driveways. There will always be antisocial, and parkers who block driveways but doesn't think the new scheme will improve this, better enforcement is needed. This scheme will no doubt benefit the residents without driveways but why apply such measures for all streets in the area, just seems as a revenue earning opportunity. The biggest concern is the visual degradation to the area, which many of our roads are gradually suffering over a number of years. An increase number of markings being drawn and signs being installed, which this scheme will exacerbate with further road markings and pay and display machines, will look to much like an urban centre not a residential area.</p>	<p>39) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across the area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking. The streetscape has been very much in mind when considering this scheme.</p>
<p>40) Objection</p>	<p>40) Wishes to object especially to the changes of the unrestricted areas. There is too few legitimate unrestricted parking areas around the university and hospital, proposals will reduce to an unacceptable level. Everyone who parks needs unrestricted access to the hospital, university and town centre, car tax already pays for unrestricted parking. Alexandra Road Mosque attendees need unrestricted access to meet their religious obligations.</p>	<p>40) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking within the hospital car park.</p>
<p>41) Objection - Kendrick Road resident</p>	<p>41) Believes the current parking restrictions on Kendrick Road works well as the 2 hour parking bay is well used by all taxi drivers, afternoon parents picking up their children and visitors. Kendrick road doesn't suffer the parking problems other residents of this area does, and Pay and Display isn't fit for purpose on Kendrick Road and believes parents will double park outside the school causing a new problem on the road.</p>	<p>41) This scheme replaces the existing daytime parking with pay and display to the same time restricted periods. Whilst some bays include RP Kendrick Road doesn't have any RP.</p>

<p>42) Objection - Erleigh Road resident</p>	<p>42) Wishes to object to the proposed changes, as currently parks his car in an unrestricted bay. Works in Reading so most days of the week walks or cycles into work, but with the proposed pay and display may force him to drive to work to save money, but to add the already congested roads in reading and missing out on exercise. Appreciates if there are any safety issue then they need to be addressed, however doesn't understand how pay and display will improve safety. Only moved here at the end of last year so missed the consultation that was held, but was attracted to the property because of the unrestricted parking available. Agrees that parking is an issue and understands that other streets adopting restrictions will move cars to other areas, but making the whole area pay and display won't solve the problem. Believes the proposed plans will decrease the chance of residents being able to park near their house, is open to the idea of resident parking which would hopefully make it easier to park near his house and affordable than daily pay and display charges. Would prefer no changes at all, however if other area get restrictions then it will become a busy street, then residential parking is a better option.</p>	<p>42) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit residents as this scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time.</p>
<p>43) Objection - Cardigan Road resident</p>	<p>43) Making Lydford Road 'No Waiting at any Time' on both sides will have a huge impact on the surrounding roads such as Cardigan Road, Cardigan Gardens and Cardigan Road. These roads get used as an overflow from Upper Redlands, Eastern Avenue and surrounding roads which have permit parking or reduced parking. Late in the evenings finds it very difficult to park near their house, except for Lydford Road which is sometimes full. Removing the parking option from Lydford Road will make the situation even worse, suggests permit parking as an option. Thinks the time restricted parking works well, just extend the length of Lydford Road.</p>	<p>43) Carried out informal consultation in these residential areas without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>
<p>44) Comment/obj</p>	<p>44) If these regulations go ahead then hopes that a</p>	<p>44) This scheme is designed to</p>

<p>ection - Donnington Road resident</p>	<p>resident parking permit would be given to all Redlands residents. Parking in this road is already impossible at times, will worsen as people look to park in unrestricted areas, which this resident already has to do. Where will everyone park when this and other roads are squashed between the restricted roads? If there aren't any plans for Donnington Road to get resident parking then wishes to register her objection.</p>	<p>improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit residents as this scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time. Informal consultation was carried out in Donnington Road without finding a consensus.</p>
<p>45) Comment - Donnington Road resident</p>	<p>45) Moved to the Reading area 16 months ago, has one car between them and coming back in the afternoons can be like a car park, with these restrictions it will just make it worse. Feels Erleigh, Alexandra, Elmhurst and Redlands Road have the capacity to cope with traffic and parking without restrictions, due to off street parking. Understands the issue with traffic particularly on Elmhurst but how do you support parking as the heavy load of cars isn't going to change. The university proposing anything to park within the grounds? After the initial consultation there was proposed changes to regards resident permits, which they were in favour of but left off the plans. Thinks this will help reduce cars in student/shared households. People start coming down the road earlier and earlier in the morning from local businesses and students from Reading school, concerned emergency vehicles won't be able to get down the road due to parking.</p>	<p>45) Carried out informal consultation in these residential areas without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme. The impact of the university on residents is a long standing concern across this area.</p>
<p>46) Objection</p>	<p>46) Most of the on road parking spaces especially on Elmhurst Road, Addington Road, Erleigh Road, Donnington Gardens, Donnington Road, Heatherley Road, Blenheim Gardens, Pepper Lane and Foxhill Road area during the day time are used by staff/students at the University, schools and Hospital staff. However, the proposal gives no alternative for these people and doesn't address the problem. Suggests creating a second multi-storey parking facility as the current one is always full with no disabled spaces, and not always feasible to travel by bus with</p>	<p>46) Carried out informal consultation in this residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme. This scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time.</p>

<p>47) Objection - Avebury Square resident</p> <p>48) Support - Eldon Road resident</p> <p>49) Comment - Malvern Court resident</p> <p>50) Objection - Avebury Square</p>	<p>wheelchair or buggy spaces limited and an expensive way of travelling. Doesn't understand why making majority of the roads resident parking or pay and display, believes the current parking on Kendrick Road works well could impose this in other streets. This scheme comes across as a money making activity. Many people drop their children off at school and go to work; however with the new restrictions they will have to pay to drop their children off as they don't have time to walk them to school. People who have no parking will look to park in unrestricted roads if this scheme is implemented causing more problems got resident parking.</p> <p>47) Current resident of Avebury Square and feels strongly they haven't been represented in the consultation, and is the only road within the area without any parking restrictions. The square already has problems with students and hospital workers who park there and block driveways. Furthermore, many cars travel at high speed with many young children playing. Suggests a 2 hour waiting restriction between working hours with residents only before/after and weekends. Feels people will park within this area as it's free parking.</p> <p>48) This seems a sensible use of available space and should reduce problems for residents.</p> <p>49) Struggles with parking as hospital staff and visitors park down Malvern Court and Addington Road, has 2 young children and has to wait hours to get a parking space. Fears these proposals will make things worse, hasn't heard anything about permits for residents as they will struggle.</p> <p>50) Would like to object as Avebury Square hasn't been considered.</p>	<p>47) Avebury Square is not included in the scheme.</p> <p>48) This scheme is designed to help residents.</p> <p>49) Malvern Court is not included in the scheme. This scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time</p> <p>50) Avebury Square is not included in the scheme.</p>
---	--	--

<p>resident</p> <p>51) Objection - Avebury Square resident</p> <p>52) Objection</p> <p>53) Objection - Morgan Road resident</p> <p>54) Objection - Donnington Gardens resident</p>	<p>51) Objects to the scheme as Avebury Square hasn't been included, the approach to parking often shifts the problems rather than solve them. Have a stream of people driving around the square often at speed looking for parking spaces, fear it could get worse if scheme is implemented. The university prohibits students in Halls parking on campus or one mile radius, but often students park in Avebury square so it isn't enforced.</p> <p>52) Objects to the scheme on the basis that those working in the hospital who don't live around Reading drive in because it is cheaper, quicker and mostly more convenient. Staff parking is minimal so many resort to the roads, the M4 park and ride would add up a lot of money per day and working anti-social hours with buses few and far between. Agrees parking needs to be restricted, but needs a substantial provision for patients and staff.</p> <p>53) Objects to the scheme as feels the meters will look unsightly, residents don't mind people parking up to 2 hours for free, bigger issue is Residents with the same parking zone permit who work at this hospital and take all the parking spaces live on this road. Feel the Council are penalising the sick, or visiting a sick friend/relative.</p> <p>54) The parking situation in Donnington Gardens is already challenging, returning during the day often has to wait for a space to become available. Majority of these cars aren't residents and Donnington Gardens is desperate for a scheme to help residents. Recently attended a consultation on resident parking but disappointed to see nothing came of it, as was in favour and if scheme goes ahead parking will get worse. An ambulance barely scraped down the road, a fire engine wouldn't have got through.</p>	<p>51) Avebury Square is not included in the scheme.</p> <p>52) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking within the hospital car park.</p> <p>53) The streetscape have been very much in mind when considering this scheme. The proposal will make access and parking for the hospital by those who need it the most more accessible.</p> <p>54) Carried out informal consultation in this residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>
--	--	---

55) Objection - Avebury Square resident	55) Objecting to the proposals as Avebury Square has been excluded. It is difficult to predict the impact the scheme will have on Avebury Square and consequences for road safety.	55) Avebury Square is not included in the scheme.
56) Objection	56) The roads are constantly in use by visiting schools hospitals and local businesses, introducing paid parking won't benefit anyone. At current, the 2 hour parking restriction works well, don't need to change it. Would be damaging to the university and schools, but also the small businesses in the area. It is a thriving community but will change under the new scheme.	56) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH and surrounding area.
57) Objection - Donnington Garden resident	57) Seems the Council are keen to implement the scheme quickly with minimal resistance. This scheme only takes certain roads into account. Feels this is just a money making scheme for the Council, and wonders why Donnington Gardens and surrounding roads are excluded. Will have a detrimental effect on residents who find it difficult to park already.	57) Carried out informal consultation in this residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.
58) Comments - Wokingham Borough Councillor	58) Has been approached by a number of residents who work at the hospital and concerned about the removal of free parking. They currently drive to work as there aren't any buses from Lower Earley that run early enough in the morning, nor run later in the evening to cover the end of their shifts. Needs to be a more regular bus timetable regularly early and late, as well as the weekend service which is inadequate for shift patterns. Possible for hospital employees to have free parking by a way of having a disc for their car given by the Council, or cycle to work but the roads surrounding have many potholes and number of thefts round the area.	58) This scheme replaces the existing daytime parking with pay and display to the same time restricted periods. Whilst some bays include RP. Staff are offered permit parking within the hospital car park. We expect ongoing discussions with both the hospital and the university on other options such as park and ride.
59) Objection -	59) Not sure of the problem the Council are trying to	59) Carried out informal consultation

<p>Blenheim Gardens resident</p>	<p>resolve, the only real issue for parking is Elmhurst Road, causing the road to narrow. This could be resolved by introducing alternative double yellow lines. The proposals as they stand will restrict parking that all the small roads will naturally become a parking choice for University and Hospital visitors causing issues to the residents, which the Council will then have to address.</p>	<p>in the small roads without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>
<p>60) Objection - Hospital employee</p>	<p>60) Current member of staff at the hospital and signed the online petition. Doesn't qualify for a permit for the car park and unable to get the bus so has to park on the surrounding roads. Changing all roads to pay and display will only cause more problems stress, time and money. The hospital doesn't have sufficient parking for staff and the general public so rely on the surrounding roads.</p>	<p>60) This is to be presented as a petition for consideration by the Sub committee on the evening.</p>
<p>61) Objection - Blenheim Road resident</p>	<p>61) A pensioner living on a one car household, during University time 90% of the time has to park on Alexandra Road as Blenheim is full. Where would he park if the proposal was implemented? Arrived home twice in one week at 2200hours and has to park on Alexandra Road. Wouldn't be safe to at night having to walk a long way to his home. The proposals will only push the cars and make parking worse down Blenheim, need to look at the whole area or don't change anything as the proposal will only make things worse.</p>	<p>61) Carried out informal consultation is this residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>
<p>62) Objection - Foxhill Road resident</p>	<p>62) Objecting to a poorly thought through proposal, the problem is there aren't sufficient parking spaces for the cars that need to park, which will be removed further under this scheme. It will especially remove parking along the entire Lydford Road, which is an important overflow for people arriving late at night, yet these will be removed from residents. Suggests the council to stop trying to enforce restrictions in this area as there is no solution.</p>	<p>62) This scheme does not remove the existing parking provision. Lydford Road has been reviewed a number of times as it not wide enough to support parking. This proposal is as a result of previous consultations.</p>

<p>63) Objection - Donnington Gardens resident</p>	<p>63) A family of 4 with only one car, which is used to travel to work and the family shop. However, the ability to park near their own home is difficult and has an impact on the standard of living, carrying a weeks' worth of shopping or heavy materials etc. is difficult when you can't park close to the house, have to make multiple trips. Was shocked and dismayed when the council weren't going to pursue parking restrictions in the smaller roads, pushing the parking from Zone A to Zone C. Hospital staff need to get to work, but cramming more cars into narrow Victorian terraced streets cannot be a sustainable solution.</p>	<p>63) Carried out informal consultation in Zone C area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>
<p>64) Objection - Farnborough resident</p>	<p>64) Travels approximately 2hours to work each day to Erleigh Road, if the surrounding roads are to become resident parking or limited pay and display then make it impossible to park. The new proposal doesn't take in to account the income generated from the businesses in the area, this will have a big impact on these businesses. Most of the properties on Alexandra Road and Erleigh Road have off road parking, so why give priority to them with resident parking, the condition of Erleigh Road, Alexandra Road and the surrounding roads are appalling and people shouldn't be made to pay to use them.</p>	<p>64) The parking pressures in this area have been a long standing problem. This proposal will prevent all day commuter parking from taking up space at would otherwise be used for short term parking for the benefit of local residents and business.</p>
<p>65) Objection - Hospital employee</p>	<p>65) The huge increase in population is overwhelming the parking at the hospital site, travels in from Church Crookham in Hampshire. If doing a late shift, arriving at midday there is no parking so have to park on the streets and leaving at 10pm. Also, there is no suitable public transport to use either. Furthermore, this will also exacerbate severe recruitment and retention as many people can't afford to live in Reading or near which can be harder to attract people or agencies to work here.</p>	<p>65) The parking pressures in this area have been a long standing problem. This proposal will prevent all day commuter parking from taking up space at would otherwise be used for short term parking for the benefit of local residents and business.</p>
<p>66) Objection - Addington Road residents</p>	<p>66) Objects to the introduction of parking meters within the area, as this can only be seen as revenue for the Council and won't benefit the local residents. As these</p>	<p>66) The majority of this scheme is RP with on street pay and display share use so residents are</p>

	streets were built in the Victorian times they weren't designed for cars to park, and no amount of restrictions will solve this issue let alone introducing pay and display. The current situation isn't great but people manage to find somewhere to park without being charged.	protected.
67) Objection - Denmark Road resident	67) Feels introducing parking meters is unnecessary and an unwelcome step. Doesn't wish to see more intrusions on conservation area streetscape or impositions on visitors. There is no need for more residents to park in Denmark Road day and night.	67) The streetscape has been very much in mind when considering this scheme.
68) Objection	68) Living in Henley who regularly travels to the hospital with his wife find the parking in the area stressful enough. These changes would only increase the stress of visiting and would result in far more expense for both.	68) There are a number of options, particularly from Henley without parking at the hospital.
69) Objection - Allcroft Road resident	69) Made comments previously to the earlier planning proposals, which still stands. Doesn't believe these plans will do anything to improve the parking situation, there isn't any benefit to anyone. There is a good mix of parking use here and would be destroyed if these plans were implemented. May not be entitled to a permit therefore would have to pave their front lawn which will cause drainage problems.	69) This scheme is designed to help residents.
70) Objection - Avebury Square resident	70) As a resident of Avebury Square is concerned that the parking restrictions on the neighbouring roads will have an impact on the parking on this road which frequently has cars left for days at a time and occasions driveways being blocked.	70) Avebury Square is not included in the scheme.
71) Objection - Student	71) Would like to object to all plans, these areas are very important for students to be able to park our cars when it's difficult to park elsewhere.	71) The University have a no car policy and this is exactly the type of issue their policy is designed to deal with.
72) Objection -	72) This is too far and extreme measures, will affect an	

<p>Alexandra Road resident</p>	<p>endless amount of roads, people and cars. To help the economy we are encouraged to buy, cars too, however where will these cars go, in the road. Pay all sorts of tax and VAT, will now have to pay for parking permits. Some roads are conservation areas, habitat for all sorts of life and help look after our green space which would surely help lower the pollution which would benefit the human species too. There are people who park inconsiderably, some park for a day and work in London or some park there for months on end, but doesn't really warrant the extreme measures proposed. Parking metres in a conservation area will look ugly and more hassle. Parking restricted to 2 hours from 8am-6pm and then free parking is enough to discourage the street hoppers in change is needed.</p>	<p>72) This is a managed parking scheme utilising the existing space. This is Monday to Friday working day scheme.</p>
<p>73) Objection</p>	<p>73) PhD student works long hours and plenty of walking each day which can be inconvenient and unsafe late at night and early morning. Can't afford to pay for a parking permit for University parking alongside there not enough parking spaces available. Therefore, this change will affect a lot of University students, the parking system is far from ideal and quite difficult during term time. Having to pay a daily fee depicts Reading in an extremely negative light. Being a self-funded international student can't afford extra expenses to park off campus. The council should find money from elsewhere rather than charging students on top of their university fees. Feels the Council should assist parking for students on and around campus, imposing a fee will not have a positive effect both on education and attendance as well as the reputation of the university and Reading itself. If the scheme goes ahead then the Council should provide better alternative for students.</p>	<p>73) The University have a no car policy and this is exactly the type of issue their policy is designed to deal with.</p>
<p>74) Support - Alexandra</p>	<p>74) Fully supports the restrictions on Alexandra Road and surrounding area, beside the bad parking and obstruction</p>	<p>74) This scheme is designed to help residents.</p>

<p>Road resident</p> <p>75) Support/Comment - University staff</p> <p>76) Objection</p> <p>77) Objection</p>	<p>of driveways, tradesmen struggle to park up and complete their work as there are limited spaces to park.</p> <p>75) The University broadly support the proposal to introduce pay and display and permits as this should improve the parking situation for residents in the area. Suggests if the scheme is implemented there is plenty of advance warning to allow households to make arrangements as this may affect plenty of student households. Questions if there will be monitoring of the bays to avoid the situation where resident permit holders elect to block the provided Pay and Display bays. The provision for residents only in Morgan Road, Allcroft Road and Alexandra Road I higher than necessary given the number of properties. The main concern is for visitors and contractors that the duration of the pay and display system will allow a vehicle to park for a number of hours at a time rather than the maximum 2 hours.</p> <p>76) No longer lives in the area but can imagine the effect of displacing the hospital and university traffic searching for free parking, this is bound to reduce safety for pedestrians in the area and increase air pollution. Can't see any evidence that there is a problem with the current arrangements, or taking in to account the knock on effect to the neighbouring areas. Given that Erleigh Road and Crescent Road is traffic rat-runs perhaps try and reduce traffic movement here is more appropriate.</p> <p>77) Has attended the hospital many times but finds it virtually impossible to find a space available in the car park. Therefore most the time has to park on one the streets bordering the hospital. Knows a friend who has regular visits to the hospital and despite having a permit they can never find a free car space. If these roads get restricted going to find it more difficult, not attend their appointment and add more anxiety to their visit.</p>	<p>75) This scheme is designed to help residents which will be monitored. Visitors are accommodated through the permit scheme.</p> <p>76) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH.</p> <p>77) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH.</p>
--	---	--

78) Support/Objection - Alexandra Road resident	78) In general supports the scheme however, the purpose of the scheme has not been established and not clear what the safety and other issues are. There hasn't been sufficient consultation and feels pay and display is unsightly. Also, there should be free parking outside the 8am-5.30pm period so guests and visitors can park and the consequence of the scheme will be that residents will convert their front gardens. The council should start/continue their discussions with the hospital and university to provide more off street parking, a parking permit scheme should be introduced to Zone C both sides of the street and there should be a further consultation to explain the concerns of how the residents can be addressed.	78) Carried out informal consultation in the Zone C residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme. Visitors are accommodate through the permit scheme.
79) Objection	79) Feels parking meters won't make things safer; just raise revenue for the Council. People travel many miles to attend appointments so can already be a stressful time, as the car park is inadequate and expensive and public transport isn't an option for everyone and expensive. How can people afford to pay to park if have to visit every day.	79) This is a managed parking scheme designed to make access to the existing space that can otherwise be used by commuter parking.
80) Objection - Donnington Road resident	80) As a resident of Donnington Road in which it is very difficult to park due to non-residents using the space which could result in seeking to park elsewhere, possibly in a regulated area and risk getting a fine. The number of HMOs has exacerbated this situation and insufficient hospital parking.	80) Carried out informal consultation in this residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.
81) Objection - 38 households within the Redlands Ward	81) Is objecting to both the traffic orders as it isn't established there is a problem associated with safety or there is a problem with parking in which the TROs are being applied. Feels parking will become more difficult in the area, increase traffic by cars looking for parking spaces and air pollution will increase as a result of increased traffic. Residents who have kept their front	81) Carried out informal consultation in this residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.

	<p>gardens will be encouraged to pave them for parking spaces or extend existing parking. This will have a big impact as it will degrade the appearance of the area, reduces habitat for wildlife which is already struggling and under pressure, the loss of garden reduces the foliage that is available to reduce the pollutants in the air and parking could reduce the capacity of the area to store water during periods of storm surges. Regarding the previous consultation, disappointed to see no proposals have been included for Zone C, believes the proposal should go ahead with all areas. Feels that if the parking improves then this will degrade the air quality having an effect on everyone and particularly Respiratory Disease suffers. Feels the council should have allowed the hospital to build a bigger car park. Concerned about visitors on Erleigh Road and where they would park.</p>	
<p>82) Objection - 2 households from Lancaster Close</p>	<p>82) Lives on Lancaster Close and feels every day that his children aren't able to walk to school safely as cars are parked on every space of pavement. Often see people park at 8am and return at 5.30pm after a day at the hospital or in the Town Centre, and even at weekends see people return from town with their shopping. On several occasions the refuse collection has not been collected due to the parked cars. Would like to see Resident Permit parking to make Lancaster Close a safe area for children to play.</p>	<p>82) Lancaster Close is not included in the scheme but could be added at a later date.</p>
<p>83) Objections - 9 Individuals who have signed the online petition</p>	<p>83) Staff members already have to pay for parking permits for the hospital and not even guaranteed a space. Given the fact that NHS staff pay has only risen by 1% and talking about increasing permit fees, therefore can't afford to pay for permit and park on the road. Where will hundreds of student nurses and midwives who aren't eligible for a permit park as they don't get paid. For</p>	<p>83) This is to be presented as a petition for consideration by the Sub committee on the evening.</p>

<p>87) Objection - Cardigan Gardens resident</p>	<p>unrestricted parking streets or 2 hour limit space. Recently had to park in the 2 hour parking bay but the appointment took 4 hours. Therefore this could be a flaw in pay and display; you don't know how long the appointment is going to be, without being able to extend your time on the ticket. Pay and display could work if flexible and could have some benefits.</p> <p>87) Objects to the introduction of "No waiting at any time" along the entire length of Lydford Road, as there is already restrictions in place along sections of this road. A number of residents use this road to park overnight, if this provision was removed then it will increase parking on the surrounding roads. Can't see a positive effect in terms of safety this would have on residents in the area, it's not required for emergency or refuse vehicles access.</p>	<p>The tariff is yet to be set for this scheme.</p> <p>87) Lydford Road has been reviewed a number of times as it not wide enough to support parking. This proposal is as a result of previous consultations.</p>
<p>88) Objection - Blenheim Gardens resident</p>	<p>88) Wishes to object to both the traffic orders as the proposal will drastically reduce the number of parking spaces in the area. It is difficult to find parking spaces Monday to Friday having to park round the neighbourhood. People not from this community park and then walk towards to town.</p>	<p>88) Carried out informal consultation is this residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>
<p>89) Objection - Hatherley Road resident</p>	<p>89) Main principal objection is that roads within Zone C aren't included and will become more congested as a result of this scheme as people will not want to pay for parking. Displaced residents may have to resort to Pay and Display parking, with the additional traffic will have implications on road safety and air pollution. The scheme will encourage more people to convert their front gardens to stand for parking which will have consequences on appearance, dispersal of storm water and wildlife. With reference to the consultation meeting last year claims they had been informed of false information regarding losing 50% of parking to double yellow lines due to Fire Brigade requirement.</p>	<p>89) Carried out informal consultation in zone C area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>

<p>90) Objection - Avebury Square resident</p>	<p>90) Objecting to the scheme as never had been involved in any consultation about the proposals. Being the only road in the area unrestricted is going to make things difficult, there are a number of car owners who don't need their cars for long periods and leave them parked on the Square, driveways are blocked and can be left more days.</p>	<p>90) Avebury Square is not included in the scheme.</p>
<p>91) Comments - Hospital employee</p>	<p>91) Parking at the hospital is inadequate for the number of staff and visitors/patients using the hospital, therefore has to park in the nearby streets. Removing off road parking and 2 hour time slots is going to add additional stress to the people who are sick.</p>	<p>91) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff are offered permit parking within the hospital car park.</p>
<p>92) Support - Alexandra Road residents</p>	<p>92) Supporting the parking restrictions having seen the squeeze for parking increase due to many factors such as the closure of Battle Hospital, rise in students parking and HMOs, visitors to the mosque, orthodontist and dentist patients. In addition, have to regularly deal with commuters parking daily from 7am-7pm, people who want to avoid the parking charges in the town centre so leave their car and walk and commercial vehicles that regularly get left for days or weeks. If the lack of restrictions continues the situation will worsen, we live in this road as it encourages diversity however parking problems erode the desire to stay. By introducing these restrictions it should mean that residents should be able to park on their own roads, people who need to visit the hospital or local amenity will be able to park safely.</p>	<p>92) This scheme is designed to help residents.</p>
<p>93) Objection - Hatherley Road resident</p>	<p>93) As a resident the proposals will present a series of problems if they go ahead, since moving last year rarely is able to find parking on the road, regularly parks on the surrounding roads where there is space, pay and display will make this worse. This could lead to an increase in traffic which will cause safety and air quality concerns. Parents tend to park on Hatherley Road to drop their</p>	<p>93) Carried out informal consultation is this residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>

	<p>children off and several hospital employees park whilst at work. Regularly sees vans parking illegally on double yellow lines which restrict access.</p>	
<p>94) Objection - Alexandra Road resident</p>	<p>94) Has a family of drivers, with friends and family who pop over to visit, is not looking forward to paying more money to have extended family park outside their home. Life can be stressful enough these days and the plans seem very restrictive.</p>	<p>94) Visitors are accommodated through the permit scheme.</p>
<p>95) Support - Alexandra Road resident</p>	<p>95) Supports the proposal of introducing No waiting at any time in Lydford Road as vehicles often tend to park in front of his garage. Fire appliances have struggled to get to Redlands school via Lydford Road due to all the parked cars as well as an ambulance being called to Donnington Gardens. The daily commuters that park on Alexandra Road would be pushed to Lydford Road, without these restrictions there would be no garage access.</p>	<p>95) This scheme is designed to help residents</p>
<p>96) Objection - Addington Road residents</p>	<p>96) Objects to the proposal, parking on Addington Road and the neighbouring streets is very challenging during the week. Not opposed to the introduction of pay and display/resident parking, but feels it should cover a larger area as these are affected by parking issues.</p>	<p>96) This scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time.</p>
<p>97) Support - 2 households on Elmhurst Road</p>	<p>97) Welcomes the current proposal which could potential improve the situation with the provision of free short term parking.</p>	<p>97) This scheme is designed to help residents.</p>
<p>98) Objection</p>	<p>98) The parking plans proposed will only push the parking situation to the adjoining streets that aren't part of the scheme. Parking charges may only be set out to relieve or prevent congestion of traffic however, these proposals don't satisfy this, viewed as a revenue generating scheme and doesn't solve the issue.</p>	<p>98) Carried out informal consultation to the wider residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>
<p>99) Objection</p>	<p>99) Feels the new proposals for Allcroft Road doesn't solve</p>	<p>99) This scheme is designed to</p>

<p>100) Objection</p>	<p>any of the parking problems, offers no advantage to residents, visitors or hospital patients and visitors. Significant pressures on available spaces, these proposals don't increase the parking. The existing works just leave it as that.</p> <p>100) Convinced the result of these proposals will make the parking more difficult in the Redlands Ward. These restrictions will have a negative impact on local community activities, the mosque and parish church relying on the free parking.</p>	<p>improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit residents and the surrounding area.</p> <p>100) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking within the hospital car park.</p>
<p>101) Objection - Blenheim Gardens resident</p>	<p>101) The parking situation in Blenheim Gardens is already strained and might become unsustainable if the scheme goes ahead. Strongly in favour of resident parking on both sides of Blenheim Gardens.</p>	<p>101) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking within the hospital car park.</p>
<p>102) Objection - Addington Road resident</p>	<p>102) This scheme will have a negative impact in the neighbourhood causing serious crowding on the streets, dangerous driving on narrow streets and intimidating women and elderly resident who return late at night. Visitors and workmen find it difficult to park.</p>	<p>102) Carried out informal consultation in the surrounding area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>
<p>103) Support - The Mount resident</p>	<p>103) Referring to parts 1 & 2, the current situation leads to delays and issues as poorly parked vehicles block entrances, driveways and roads disrupting other traffic, pedestrians forced off pavements, as buses and</p>	<p>103) This scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time.</p>

<p>104) Support - The Mount resident</p> <p>105) Objection - Avebury Square resident</p> <p>106) Objection</p> <p>107) Objection</p>	<p>ambulances struggle to get through. Reading is a large urban area and workers/visitors of the hospital and university have many public transport options open to them including the new Park and Ride. I don't believe objections to this scheme based on cost to park are particularly valid as in other urban areas similar arrangements exist and the cost to a few is outweighed by the benefit to many. Ultimately these proposals will improve public transport use reducing congestion and pollution allowing those who need to park in a rush to do so more easily. I believe overall the proposals will improve the operating efficiency of our local roads to the benefit of everyone visiting the area. The recent scheme at the Mount has been great allowing local shoppers, theatre goers, pub and restaurant diners plus residents to live in (better) harmony. I strongly support this.</p> <p>104) As a local resident these changes are paramount to improve the parking issues currently face on a daily basis.</p> <p>105) Feels the Square will become the destination for unsatisfied parking demand around the area due to the lack of restrictions. This will make it more dangerous for adults and children who walk and play on the road. This scheme will also result on blocking of residents' driveways, accidental damage to vehicles and increase in pollution.</p> <p>106) Believes that a working party that includes all stakeholders should be set to look at resolving the issues and putting a strategy in place and getting buy in from Stakeholders on what they are willing to do.</p> <p>107) Strongly objects to the proposals regarding the removal of permit parking in residential areas near the</p>	<p>104) This scheme is designed to help residents.</p> <p>105) Avebury Square is not included in the scheme.</p> <p>106) There have many stakeholders meetings involving the RBH and University prior to this proposal. We expect discussions to continue regardless of the progress of this proposal.</p> <p>107) This is not a removal of permit parking. This scheme replaces the</p>
--	---	--

<p>108) Objection - Blenheim Gardens resident</p>	<p>university and hospital. Considers it grossly unfair that private homes should be penalised to alleviate the parking problems.</p> <p>108) Don't go ahead with this scheme until London style double sided permits for the small roads to the east of Alexandra Road have been agreed. Has lived in Blenheim Gardens for 34 years and already finds parking so difficult.</p>	<p>existing daytime parking with pay and display to the same time restricted periods.</p> <p>108) Carried out informal consultation in the surrounding area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>
<p>109) Objection - Alexandra Road resident</p>	<p>109) Foresees this as extra pressure on other areas and will not make parking any easier for residents as during the day others will be Paying and Displaying. Concerned when having visitors in an evening or overnight as they wouldn't be able to park. There are other ways of preventing people from staying all day other than pay and display. More parking spaces need to be provided or park and ride schemes rather than removing the local options.</p>	<p>109) This scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day. Carried out informal consultation in the surrounding area without finding a consensus. Visitors are accommodated through the permit scheme.</p>
<p>110) Objection - Muirfield Close resident</p>	<p>110) Doesn't view the changes a benefit to anyone but only to make profit. Regarding the changing to Pepper Lane, the road is wide enough to easily accommodate parking along its side. There is no significant competition for parking with residents only to generate income. Regarding the changes to Alexandra Road, Erleigh Road and Addington Road, see no real justification for parking charges in these locations which will be an inconvenience Redlands residents who will have to use visitor permits and push cars to other areas. There should be no restrictions of hours or parking at the weekend or evenings, outside of working hours these roads aren't busy. A permit holder's only restriction is an inconvenience to residents.</p>	<p>110) This scheme is designed for Monday to Friday working day but can be reviewed over time. Visitors are accommodated through the permit scheme.</p>
<p>111) Objection - 2 students and 2</p>	<p>111) Wishes to object to the restrictions proposed on Pepper Lane as it doesn't pose a safety risk. There aren't</p>	<p>111) The University have a no car policy and this is exactly the type</p>

university employee	currently enough parking spaces for students on campus and students travel from locations where public transport isn't an option. Many students park on this section of the road, Monday to Friday during the day, therefore with these restrictions students will be forced to park elsewhere.	of issue their policy is designed to deal with.
112) Objection - Coventry Road resident	112) Believes the scheme will displace parking on to the nearby residential roads to the east of Alexandra Road which already has parking problems.	112) Carried out informal consultation to the wider residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.
113) Objection	113) The problem is the lack of parking at the Hospital itself, this would remove any need for changing the roadside parking. Introducing Pay and Display won't stop people from parking and attending the hospital, just a financial burden. There is no parking problems during Saturday, Sunday and in the evening weekdays on any of the streets, it is unnecessary to make it residents only after 5.30pm and stops people from parking who have an A&E emergency. The bus service that goes to RBH is non-existent on Sundays and evenings, the poorest families will be most affected either through the parking charges or the need for a taxi. It is hard to determine how long one might be parked for therefore Pay and Display is inappropriate.	113) This scheme is designed to cover the Monday to Friday period only and some bays do revert to RP only at weekends. If implemented this can be reviewed over time. We expect ongoing discussions with both the hospital and the university on other options such as park and ride.
114) Objection	114) Objects to the proposal of putting parking metres on the road around the hospital as this won't have a positive effect for the hospital community and visitors.	114) This scheme is designed to help residents.
115) Support	115) Strongly supports the introduction of parking metres as this will make the area safer for pedestrians and cyclists if there are less cars parking on both sides of the road. Suggests making one side of Addington Road parking free to allow the free flow of traffic and particularly buses.	115) This scheme is designed to help residents and improve safety.

116) Objection	116) Objecting to the proposals as feels it will make parking at the hospital much more difficult for visitors and people who work there and parents picking children up from the schools in the area. Resents having to pay more money to the council just to park for a short time.	116) This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking at the hospital car park.
117) Objection	117) Objects to the proposed parking charges, has many times briefly visited elderly people at the hospital but can't afford the hospital charges. The 2 hours free parking enables people to pop in and visit patients without being charged.	117) As a managed parking scheme and to be effective then this scheme needs to pay for itself.
118) Objection	118) Introducing Pay and Display won't alleviate the problem and the metres may even make things look worse. If people can't find a space in the hospital car park then park on the surrounding roads. As these places are 2 hours no return they can usually attend their appointment or visit a patient vacating the space for someone else. However, by introducing all day metres spaces are less likely to be vacant. People who have to regularly attend the hospital adds a financial burden.	118) This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. The streetscape has been very much in mind when considering this scheme.
119) Support/Comments - 13 households of Elmhurst Road	119) Welcomes the proposed Resident Permits only in Elmhurst Road as this will help remove congestion and with the new 20mph should increase safety for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. However, feels pay and display Monday to Friday and all other times resident permits is too restrictive. Would like some free parking for short stays by visitors and tradesmen, suggested making it the same restrictions as Marlborough Avenue, Monday to Friday 8am-5.30pm 2 hours limited waiting no return within 2 hours, or Permit Holders only. Furthermore, under the current proposals there is nothing that meet the needs of a disabled neighbour who requires visits twice a day, a disabled bay would be suitable in front of the residents house.	119) This scheme is designed to help residents and improve safety. The disabled bay can be reviewed at a later date.

<p>120) Objection - Marlborough Avenue resident</p>	<p>120) Is writing in particular about Elmhurst Road in the Redlands Conservation Area. In respect of Conservation Areas Historic England advises to minimise or remove inappropriate street furniture or should if possible enhance the street scene and feels parking metres are not appropriate with the Redlands Conservation Area and degrade its qualities. There are several other examples of streets within Conservation Area for which parking metres are proposed, suggests by considering a broader spectrum of possible solutions, such as the most appropriate choice of street furniture.</p>	<p>120) The streetscape has been very much in mind when considering this scheme. The proposal will make access and parking for the hospital by those who need it the most more accessible.</p>
<p>121) Objection - Donnington Road resident</p>	<p>121) As a resident from the surrounding roads without any parking restrictions and feels this scheme will make it worse. There was the possibility of residents parking but it's not included in the proposal. The university and the hospital are as much to blame in providing too little parking but affects the area at different times of the day and night.</p>	<p>121) Carried out informal consultation to the wider residential area without finding a consensus. This work will continue post implementation of any pay and display and RP scheme.</p>
<p>122) Objection</p>	<p>122) Strongly objects to the proposal as this will create enormous problems for out-patients, visitors and staff. Parking on site at the hospital is currently inadequate for a large and busy hospital, therefore the car park is always full so have to park on street in the surrounding roads. To reduce the current level of parking in these roads and introduce pay and display metres would make matters worse and lead to considerable extra stress and financial hardship for some.</p>	<p>122) The impact of the hospital on residents is a long standing concern across this area. This scheme is designed to improve access to parking by removing all day parking which will benefit patients to RBH. Staff is offered permit parking within the hospital car park.</p>
<p>123) Objection</p>	<p>123) Feels the current limited unrestricted parking is fair and reasonable. The council should be doing more to support free parking, but target the people that park in the same space for days. Comes across as a money making scheme rather than providing solutions.</p>	<p>123) This is a managed parking scheme designed to make access to the existing space that can otherwise be used by commuter parking.</p>

124) Objection	124) As a regular participant at the mosque on Alexandra Road doesn't agree to imposing paid parking as this will result in additional costs as well as inconvenience to attend a place of worship.	124) As a managed parking scheme and to be effective then this scheme needs to pay for itself.
125) Objection	125) Parking at the hospital can be a nightmare, but can't understand why the council are removing more parking. Suggests building more parking.	125) This scheme is designed around the existing parking provision and doesn't remove any parking.