Appendix 2, RESULTS OF STATUTORY CONSULTATION - GROVELANDS ROAD AREA RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING

Please note that the feedback text contained in this document has been directly copied from the responses we have received to preserve the integrity of the feedback. Where there was any sensitive or identifiable information provided, this text has been removed and has been clearly indicated.

Summary	Feedback received
	Summary of responses: **Objections 362, Support 91, Comment 3**
1. Object	To whom it may concern, I would like to register my strong objection to the proposal to convert local public roads around St George's Road and roads in the local area to permit parking only. I feel strongly that this change in status will not resolve the current problem of parking in the area and in fact will likely create further frustration and impact on residents. At the moment there are 2 main problems with parking- 1. Poor parking by some individuals who cannot adhere to usual parking norms and use space considerately to other residents in the area 2. A huge increase in the number of large commercials vans being parked in and around the area, forcing residents out of the space usually used to park outside their own homes. In addition to the HMO on St George's Road, the new homes by the church and the re-painting of yellow lines around the area, the council really has not done anything to support the residents in resolving these issues. I truly fail to see how charging residents to park outside their own homes will help in resolving these issues and urge you, please, to reconsider this proposal and not put permit parking in these areas. A sense of community is already lost by the current frustration and discomfort having to find a space can cause and adding another layer of stress will not help this. I am totally confident that in charging me to park, my local neighbours will not change their selfish parking behaviours and this problem will continue to be present. Please consider the impact of this decision on people who simply want to have access to their homes.
2. Object	I am writing regarding the Grovelands Road Area Resident Permit Scheme. I currently live at [REDACTED] St. George's Rd, and because of my job, I have to drive [REDACTED] . I do not have my own car, and I use the work car as personal. As the registration numbers varies between the cars, I don't think I can ask for a standard park permit; but as a resident, I think I should have the right to park in the street where I live. Also, I work in the [REDACTED] and I am very often [REDACTED] . I would not feel safe if I had to park a few hundred yards away from the place where I live, and then walk back home in the middle of the night.Could you please clarify if I still will be allowed to park in the street where I live, and what type of permit I should apply for? Thank you.
3. Object	We object the Grovelands road parking scheme I live in the Waverley Road. I think is very unfair that you put the whole area together, and we cannot vote separately just for our own street. I think you want our money so desperately. [REDACTED] Four of us have cars. The Beecham Road last year and now this. The permit will not give parking place. What about the third and fourth car? Where should we park? This is very unfair.
4. Support	Hi there. Thank you for opening the consultation and revering further feedback for the Grovelands Parking Permit Scheme. I was unable to join the consultation when it gathered a while back with local councillors and haven't remembered to send in my comments or concerns, and so I appreciate the council making the space to do so around this subject. Whilst in favour of better parking in the area I have questions about the enforcement into the late hours of night and early hours of morning. I currently work [REDACTED] , and prior to COVID-19 I would attend [REDACTED] until around 10pm or later. Returning home at this point would often require parking in the middle of our road (Beecham Road) [REDACTED] then hunting for a space, sometimes a good walk away on one of the nearby roads etc. I then would retrieve my car first thing in the morning knowing that there are spaces available on our road from 6am when the first people head out for work. It's not ideal at the moment and [REDACTED] , when we have arrived back late from [REDACTED] and then going to hunt for space. My observation would be that the roads around the area are more densely populated between the hours of 7pm and 6am.

		During the day one is able to park freely without having to “hunt for space.”My question would be, how would this proposal present a better alternative if during the day roads and clearer to park on currently? And if this scheme does become a reality, what level of enforcement would there be, and at what times would it actually be operating? If the traffic enforcement officers clock off at 10pm and start work again at 6am, how would this solve a problem that simply wouldn’t be policed and therefore doesn’t actually solve the problem at the late night shifts? Or perhaps traffic enforcement is to be carried out through the night? If so then that answers my question and I am more than happy to see this vote go through. Thank you so much for reading through this email. I am in favour in essence of the proposal, and just have these questions regarding the enforcement of it in the late hours. Kind regards,
5.	Object	To whom it may concern, I strongly object to the introduction of parking permits in my area. This is because: . The supposed purpose of parking permits is to ensure that the scarce parking spaces here are prioritised for residents. This makes sense. However, this area is nothing but residents, therefore the number of cars here that don't belong to residents or their visitors would be negligible. Therefore, any proposed parking permit system is redundant. 2. Accepting the above statement as true, which it is; no doubt someone at the council will try and make the case that parking permits will prioritise residents over visitors. Due to the proposed visitor permit system this is patently false. The same number of visitors would still be able to come and park here, rendering the proposed system utterly pointless. 3. If the council honestly wanted this system for the benefit of residents, then each house would receive one parking permit for free. Essentially you are proposing to charge us £42 to park on our own road even though there would be: - no change to the current dog-eat-dog and free-for-all method of trying to get a space; - no guarantee of a car space if you have a permit; and - no extra spaces being constructed. What is this £42 for exactly?! We already pay (colossal) council tax and we already pay road tax. This proposed parking permit system is clearly yet another transparent money-making opportunity by the council. A transparent scam for the for skelping of yet more money from residents while providing nothing in return. I know that nothing I or any other resident says will have any bearing on this going through. This consultancy is a formality and I am fully aware the council actually couldn't care less about the residents.
6.	Object	Hi, Permits will not ease parking difficulties as there are far more cars here than spaces anyway! If RBC really wanted to ease parking problems, firstly you could paint bay markers along the roads to help those who are not "parking savvy".The scheme Will. Not. Help. It will simply cost us money and we will still not be able to park outside our homes. I 100% object. The idea of the scheme makes me angry. Put bay markers, if you truly want to help.
7.	Object	I am emailing to object about the Residents Parking Scheme for the Grovelands Road area order 2021 . I do not believe the new parking will assist the alleged parking issues. Personally I have never had a problem parking in Waverley Road where I live. The proposed permits will not guarantee a parking space in the area. The cost of the permits are ridiculously high and most households have 2 cars due to jobs and having to deal with the school run. The introduction of such schemes will not enable visitors to visit without added cost. Given the fact we are slowly coming out of lockdown seeing friends and family after such along time is paramount to a better mental health and this scheme is again deter-mental to helping people and will Cause more anxiety. This is an unnecessary scheme which benefits the council in a financial way. It will mean other streets will get used instead abs those with young children/elderly relatives l/the elderly and vulnerable will suffer both mentally, physically and mentally. Yours sincerely
8.	Object	Dear Sirs, I wish to record my objection to your proposed parking permit scheme. PT/016506 on the grounds that Permits will evidently not ease parking difficulties in our residential streets as you will issue far more permits than there are parking spaces. If you - RBC - really wanted to ease our parking problems, firstly you'd ban commercial vehicles from parking in residential streets overnight and paint bay markers along the roads to help those who are not "parking savvy", Also it is well known most of the builders / trades vans are classed by you as cars so they'll get permits too and we all know it is these commercial vehicles which cause most of the problems, in addition you - RBC say it is "ok to park on solid white lines" (where there are gates, garages and access to flats etc). So RBC, we already pay enough Council Tax so please, residents do not want this parking permit scheme.

9. Object	We are resident [REDACTED] Grovelands Road and object to the current proposals and vote against them. They fail to take into account that households on our side of the road without driveways (including ours, outside which we try to park our one car when possible) could find parking increasingly difficult as all and sundry will be permitted to park indefinitely outside our house, while we will be unable to park overnight in alternative spaces like we sometimes are forced to do at present, notably outside Hampstead Court. Our house is Victorian and built before the motor car age and its architectural and physical integrity would be degraded if a driveway were added. The council should be seeking to try to preserve the integrity of such houses and not encourage owners to degrade them. The proposals fail to take into account the greater pressure we will subjected to and the lack of any alternative the new scheme will provide for us, such as membership of the proposed scheme. We vote against and propose you devise a new plan which will take our needs into account.
10. Object	I object to the proposed scheme - it is unnecessary and a waste of resources
11. Object	I would like to raise my objections to the proposed parking permit scheme for the Grovelands Road Order 2021.I object to any changes in the parking arrangements as until you can guarantee we can all park outside our own houses I do not agree with making us all pay. Can you please advise why we should be asked to pay a substantial amount when we will still not be able to park outside our own houses. I agree that changes need to be made to the north end of Beecham Road as on countless occasions lorries have got stuck there and only earlier this week one lorry caused a lot of damage to several cars. If parking permits have to be issued I think it is only fair to make all the roads 2 hour parking and not just Grovelands Road, St George's Road and Waverley Road. Carers who visit elderly residents cannot struggle to find a space in one of the above roads and then walk to their clients, that is grossly unfair and relatives picking up children etc cannot be expected to try and find a space in those three roads which are going to get blocked if it is just those roads that are being used for 2 hour parking. This seems a way for the council to get more money from residents when it really isn't needed as there are very few problems in the road at the present time. I would also like clarification on whether residents who have a disabled badge have to pay the statutory £42.Regards
12. Object	We are writing to object to the proposed new parking permit scheme for the Grovelands Road and surrounding areas. We live in St Ronans Road, we oppose and object to the scheme for the following reasons: • We have lived in St Ronans Road [REDACTED] , I have never not been able to park in my street. • We do not believe that this scheme will increase the amount of parking spaces, if anything it will encourage people in the surrounding streets to park here. • Why should we be made to pay to have the right to park in our street when we already pay high council tax. • We have a child [REDACTED] and regularly have a family member park for a number of hours three days a [REDACTED] A visitors permit book would not last us long therefore increasing our yearly outgoings even more. • The proposed yellow lines at the bottom of Longridge Close will reduce the number of parking spaces further putting more pressure on parking. • We do not believe this is being proposed for our benefit otherwise it would be done without any charge to us. • The past year has been an incredibly difficult year for most people due to the Covid Pandemic. It has been financially challenging for most and will continue to be so for some time. The charges associated with this parking scheme could push people financially over the edge.We confirm we strongly object to the proposed parking scheme for the above reasons. We do hope you take these reasons into account when making your final decision. Kind regards
13. Object	Dear Sir,Having been a resident that voted yes in the initial consultation in 19/20 I would like to register my response as a NO at this time to the consultation.My rationale is the pandemic has had a significant impact on the way that we live and work, and the impact on the travel to work and commuting is not yet fully understood. I am aware of several cars that used to park in Waverley Road every day and go to work and return at the end of the day and as a result of the pandemic this no longer happens. This consultation would be better placed to review in a years' time. I would like to raise the following points and would appreciate a response to the following: 1. There has been a reduction in available on street parking as a result of a number of houses taking their front gardens out, or, increasing their drives. There has been no dropped kerbs or courtesy lines installed, so I assume that council has not been granted. If a

	dropped kerb has not been installed in accordance with the council, is the space in front of the now drive, discounted and therefore marked as a space in any parking scheme? 2. Other LAs take into consideration the number of spaces on a resident's drive and the household is allowed parking permits minus the spaces they already have access to. Why does Reading not implement a similar system? 3. Review of Waverley Road and the practicality of the Road becoming an one system, enter at Grovelands Road and exit at the Tilehurst Road end. This would create the ability for further parking spaces, as there is no need for 'pulling over' spaces. 4. Independent of point 3 and this consultation. A review of the double yellow lines along the length of Waverley Road, a number of sections seem to be elongated beyond which are required for safety grounds and away from junctions etc. Locally it is known as the Cllr effect, there are double yellow lines around the Cllrs houses or upon their request. Kind regards
14. Comment	Sirs, wrt your proposed parking scheme, may I suggest, as there is heavy disputes over what makes a useful scheme and what does not, may I request you hire a local hall (eg St.Georges Church) and hold a public meeting and a secret ballot for everyone, on and off the internet, can have their say and cast their vote for how the scheme should work in their opinion.
15. Object	I refer to a letter, dated 23 April 2021, which I have received from Labour Cllr(Norcot Ward) and the notices recently displayed on lamp post in the inmediate victinity of Waverley Road concerning the statutory consultation on the proposed above mentioned scheme. I object to this proposed scheme for the following reasons: 1.it will make no difference to the number of vehicles parked in the road. 2. There is no guarantee that one will be able to park outside ones house-even though one is paying for a permit. 3. The money saved by not implementing this scheme, i.e the associated costs of lining and signing, would be better spent on repairing the road surface where it is stripped, particularly on the crown of the road in Tilerhurst Road- from the top of Castle Hill to Western Elms Avenue. The administrative cost of this scheme will be prohibitive. I trust these points will be taken into account before a final decision is reached by the Councils Traffic Management Sub Committee.
16. Support	[REDACTED] I am writing about the parking scheme. There have being a lots of new resident and is hard to find some where to park. I would like to shared parking for come workers and visitors.
17. Object	Hello, I would like to register my objection to the proposed residents parking permit scheme for the Grovelands Road area pt/016506. The scheme appears decidedly unfair to any household that requires more than one vehicle. I understand that people should be encouraged to use public transport, however for many working adults this simply isn't a viable option. Those who have shifts ending in the early hours of the morning for example.The substantial price increase for the second permit is totally unnecessary. If this scheme is truly about protecting the parking spaces for the residents then they should not be subjected to financial punishment, instead make the punishment more severe for those found to be parking without a permit.A question I would like to have answered is how would permits be expected to be displayed on Motorcycles? They can easily be stolen unless secured to the vehicle, potentially damaging paintwork or other vulnerable cosmetic finishes. Any clarification would be greatly appreciated.Kind regards.
18. Comment	Hey There, My family and I currently have a disabled parking bay[REDACTED] . I have a few questions before i can either support/object this. • Do blue badge holders get permit parking for free? or Discounted? • What about our carers, do they get permit parking, or can we get a more permanent permit just for them? • Is there any prediction as to how the congestion on the roads will change?
19. Object	To whom it may concern. We are writing to object to the new parking permit scheme that is being proposed for Grovelands Road area. We live in Longridge Close. We oppose and object to the scheme for the following reasons: •We do not believe it will increase the amount of parking in our street.•We do not want to have to pay to park in our street.•We have always been able to find a space in our street.•During the day, there are always plenty of spaces and no problems to park at all.•Parking restrictions mean that workers, friends and family will not be able to park without a permit (which comes at a cost and inconvenience). •We have a **[REDACTED]** object to having to pay for a permit for the 1:1 support **[REDACTED]**. Jo informed us of the carers pass, but having looked at the scheme, it may not be that simple for us to get a carers pass.•Your proposed parking restrictions (the yellow lines) at the bottom of Longridge Close, means there will actually be less parking.•I think it is very wrong to do this during what has been an incredibly challenging and financially difficult time for most people. People's circumstances will have changed permanently because of

	this pandemic and I think this needs to be considered. As I have said above, we strongly oppose the scheme. If the scheme does go ahead, our main concern is around the carers parking permit. On your website it says that if "you have been issued with a residents permit then you may not apply for a carer permit unless you are able to demonstrate exceptional circumstances". This is not reassuring for us. [REDACTED] cover worker) will always be here for significantly longer than 2 hours. Weekdays and Weekends too. [REDACTED]. So in terms of proof of disability[REDACTED]. We do have [REDACTED]. Would that be evidence enough and are these considered exceptional circumstances enough to get a pass? If it is, we would like assurances now, that we will get a carers [REDACTED]Another thing we would like considered if the scheme does go through, is that there are either no daytime restrictions (mainly because there is always lots of parking space during the day) or that all roads have at least 2 hours free parking. Our understanding is, is that Longridge Close wont have this.This would be incredibly unfair as anyone coming to our house would always need a permit. Thank you for taking the time to read this email.
20. Object	To whom it may concern I am writing to strongly object AGAINST the proposed paid parking scheme at the Grovelands Road area. I live on Longridge [REDACTED] and I think the proposed scheme will bring financial burden and lots of inconvenience to residents and it will not improve anyone's situation• scheme will not add any more parking spaces, in fact it will reduce them due to parking restrictions and yellow lines at the bottom of Longridge Close, where residents park•currently we do not pay for our spaces and never have, and it is completely wrong to charge residents for parking and financially burden them more, especially in these challenging times when jobs are uncertain and cost of living is constantly rising. I am [REDACTED] mother [REDACTED] (in excess of £150!) on my own, and I do not wish to pay any more for any unnecessary fees that are parking permits in this case.•we have never had any problems with parking over the past [REDACTED] that I have lived here. There are enough spaces for residents around although evenings can get busy, however, we always manage to find a free space around. •during the day there are ALWAYS plenty of spaces around to park, even for visitors or tradesman. Never had any problems to park or never had to park in other streets. (Please visit and see!)•we are not near the town, a shopping mall or a park, so non-residents have no reason to park here and they don't, it's mostly people who live here or their visitors. Parking problems in many areas in Reading are caused by poor planning and overbuilt areas (flats being built everywhere) •our friends, family or tradesmen will only be able to park with a permit, which means a huge inconvenience for residents in terms of cost and time restrictions•I think the scheme is just an easy way for the council to make more money, nothing else. If it was in any interest of the council to improve the situation, it would be FREE for residents and their relatives/friends
21. Object	As a long time resident of [REDACTED] St Ronans Rd [REDACTED] we strongly object to the parking permit proposals for the following reasons. 1) They are inadequate 2) They penalise family visits 3) [REDACTED] we will bear an unreasonable cost 4) The scheme will only serve to socially isolate us 5) Permit visitor books x 2 are wholly inadequate and extras prohibitively expensive 6) The permit scheme is inconvenient for family visitors 7) The scheme will in effect restrict visits to within a two hour period 8) Visitors will soon consume the free two booklets 9) Any Trades visits over the two hour maximum permitted will also require permits at our expense 10) The scheme in our opinion serves no one except the council's coffers Also, we are concerned when the majority of St Ronans Rd residents object, will RBC implement the scheme within the surrounding area, thereby making us victims of further excess parking? Regards
22. Object	I object the scheme parking in grovelands road. I live on [REDACTED] grovelands road and I would like the parking to be as it is. Free parking. I have so many family friend which they will visit often. I'm happy for the parking in grovelands road to be free for everyone.
23. Object	As a long time resident of Grovelands Road I would contend that it is important that some unregulated spaces be left for those who may be visiting residents and staying for a very short period. There are also many shops on the adjoining Oxford Road whose customers have a

	need to park when shopping. I know that there are plans to provide parking for casual visitors but this would make the casual and welcome visitor a greater rarity!To make the road parking for residents only would hinder the convenient and occasional use of the pharmacy and local doctor's surgery for many who find the local and unrestricted parking a great help. The local surgery car park does not have enough parking for all who choose to visit. Grovelands Road is sufficiently wide enough to allow for traffic and local use by those visiting for a short period and most local residents on the west side of the road have parking at their homes via drives, etc, very few have to use the road for parking. The increasing production and sale of motor vehicles means that the roads will become increasingly busy in the future and whilst some parking restrictions may be necessary in town centres, as currently in Reading, the more urban areas are still used and needed by many and further restrictions are therefore unnecessary. Please continue to allow for random and occasional parking in the Grovelands Road area in some form, thank you.
24. Object	I am totally against permits on Grovelands Road. There are already more cars than spaces and we shouldn't have to pay to park outside our homes when it doesn't even guarantee a spot. It would be more helpful if you painted bays on the road to stop people who take up more than one parking space. It dormant help or make sense for residents to pay for parking permits when we are not guaranteed a space. All that's happening is you are making money out of the people who live on this road which is just adding to the frustration! Please do not go ahead with this and think of ways to help the residents without making money from them. Best wishes
25. Object	I would like to raise an objection to the Parking permit scheme for Grovelands and Waverly Road in Reading. We [REDACTED]HMO licenced property for our employees – Health Care Assistants at [REDACTED] Waverly Road. The necessity to apply for parking permit for each vehicle would have detrimental effect to our tenants / employees. We are a [REDACTED] Berkshire and Oxfordshire so it is necessary for every employee to have a single car. Some employees has own cars, some are provided with a company hired vehicle. It would be very difficult to get a permit for our company hired vehicles as we never know in advance which vehicle will be driven by an employee living at [REDACTED] Waverly Road. As much as I know there will be only two permits allocated for each property so I cannot imagine how to cover 5 permits (partially private owners, partially company owned vehicles) for a property with licence for 5 tenants. Obviously the financial impact will not be negligible as well. Thank you for taking our concerns into consideration. Kind Regards
26. Object	Dear objections team. I do not believe that reducing parking (DYL) and making residents pay to park is the way to alleviate the parking problem for residents on Grovelands Rd. I have always suggested bays being painted either diagonally at a 30 degree angle facing SE on the terraced side of Grovelands Rd, or bays added to the already parallel parking space. Everybody who I have spoken to has welcomed the idea. The 30 degree angle creates a safe reversing radius while also securing almost 75% more parking opportunities. I can provide you with a diagram to show my thinking. The problem is when two adjacent cars leave and another new car arrives, and parks in the middle of where those two cars just were, thus removing the potential for 2 residents to park. With bays painted, at least residents and non-residents will be conscious of the space they are taking up. Thank you
27. Object	Hi. I'm completely confused as to why your putting parking permits in place for Grovelands rd. It's already a hassle to find a space sometimes as there is always more cars than spaces. And why should I have to pay to park out side my own house! Its robbery that's what it is! And to change the situation wile everyone is not paying attention and worried about Covid is a right piss take. I never even heard about the meeting talking about it. Only to find it was last year in a lockdown. I am completely against the idea!
28. Object	Hi, I would like to vote against permits being put in place along Grovelands Road. Parking is already an issue with more cars than spaces and introducing permits will not help the situation. I do not think we should have to pay to park outside of our own homes especially when a space is not even guaranteed! In addition to the increase in council tax rates too. This year has been financially a strain on families, some of us who require our vehicles for work & we will be forced to pay an additional cost for permits.... just not what is needed right now! Yet another way to make money for the council. Kind regards
29. Object	Dear Sir We have received a leaflet through our door with proposed parking restrictions to our road . All the roads around us have parking restrictions and Grovelands rd has been a blessing for people who find no restrictions here. We are a wide road and have much traffic here approaching the main Oxford road where people can comfortably park to go to the surgery ,

	chemist or local shops . Sometimes people park here enabling them to go into town . Most places charge for parking so this is a good option for those wanting to pop to town . It will cause difficulty for those with more than one car and will help to create more double parking in the street . We have so many restrictions and control already these days and will really deter people visiting . Fines upon fines which is not necessary and causes so much grief for people . I wanted to visit the surgery one day but the car park was full so I parked just for a few mins in a nearby street . When I returned I had a fine which was so upsetting . There must be free parking zones for people. Some people say that it's impossible in the area as it is without bringing more restrictions. We object to more parking restrictions in Grovelands rd. If someone does visit then they are restricted to only 2 hrs and then forced to leave because there is nowhere else to go. Stop the restriction and control, let people live.
30. Object	We are opposed to the proposed parking restrictions in Grovelands rd because it is one of very few free parking streets in the area. We have experienced many restrictions and control over this last year especially and do not want to embrace further controls in our lives. To have this free parking road is a blessing to many people and enhances the quality of life here.I have friends who are strictly restricted in parking and it's a real blight to them . It discourages visitors and frustrates residents because your mind is not free because the stress of parking is always there. The added cost to park in one's own street is diabolical & far too high especially when our council tax has just gone up. Stop these moves of control upon the people of our town and community. There is enough stress for people as it is without bringing more restraints into their lives. People also park in our road to visit the chemist, surgery and other shops. We strongly oppose bringing parking restrictions to our road. Your sincerely
31. Support	I'm in agreement in principle with your proposals for parking permits
32. Object	I have seen the plans for there to be permits put down Beecham Road. I leave for work at **[REDACTED]**. I struggle to get a parking space quite often and have to park on other roads. My question is if you bring in car permits am I 100 percent going to be guaranteed a space on the road every day. Or am I going to be doing what I am at the moment and trying to find car parking somewhere else every evening and paying the countcil £42 a year for the privilege? And then potentially still get a parking fines if the permits are road specific? Are the permits pay per year? Some of the information given has been very unclear. Has the road been checked for how many cars it can hold and has someone found out how many cars belong to people living on this road as we've been asked for no such information? There are flats on the road, are they eligible for 2 permits each or 2 as one property? I would like the research made available which you have completed and has led you come to the conclusion permit passes which we have to pay the council for is going to benefit us instead of the free on road parking we have at the moment. Our council tax has already gone up nearly £300 a year since living on this road for [REDACTED], we will now have to pay to park on our own road as well as for the privilege of having friends and family visit us - is there anything else you've got planned to take more money from us? Looking forward to your response. Many thanks
33. Object	Dear Council, I wanted to put forward my reasons for objecting to the proposed introduction of resident only parking in Beecham Road and its surrounding streets. [REDACTED]I am a [REDACTED]for my mother but do not live with her. I have to use my car [REDACTED]She also has [REDACTED]who have to park in Beecham Road or as close as possible in order to do their job. My understanding is that there are Carers permits available which allow visits to residents who need carers, however my [REDACTED]arrive earlier than these permits allow and she has more than [REDACTED] (and hence registrations) who rotate. This would mean that [REDACTED]would have to buy additional expensive parking permits which again would not even be valid at the earlier hour when her carers attend. What will happen to her care if the agency refuse to run the risk of their employees getting parking tickets regularly? I can understand the desire of residents in a difficult parking area such as Beecham Road to have the security of a permit, but I believe the council needs to think carefully about the huge impact the scheme will have on certain vulnerable residents and their carers and families. Best regards
34. Object	Good afternoon. I object to the parking permits suggestions for Beecham Road. How to do I vote against this?Thank you

35. Object	I strongly object to the residents permit scheme being introduced to Beecham Road. I do not believe I should have to pay to park outside my house, when there is no alternative. This is a new unnecessary charge and I feel I am being exploited as you create new, uneccesary, income generating schemes, at my expense. You have no compassion or empathy. One thing you can count on, is that I will vote for your opposition.
36. Object	Dear Sir/Madam I live in Beecham Rd, where it is proposed to make all parking 'permit holders only' at all times. I strongly object to this scheme because there is not adequate provison for those needing care. I am [REDACTED]. I receive a visit from a care agency [REDACTED]. The agency send various carers - I have [REDACTED] different people visit [REDACTED] - so a carers' permit with a maximum of 3 registration numbers listed is useless. If I request visitors' permits instead I would have to pay £125 for the maximum number permitted and would still only have enough to cover about a third of the number of visits I need in a year. This is for a single visit each day. Many elderly or disabled people need 3 or 4 visits per day. This proposal means I will no longer be able to receive [REDACTED] to stay in my own home without breaking the law. Surely there must be a better solution than this proposal which discriminates against the most vulnerable people in society.
37. Object	Dear Mr. Graham,I live on Beecham road. The only times parking is readily available is during working hours and that is not helpful as I and most others will be at work. Around 6pm, the parking spaces are extremely difficult to come by and we are then forced to look on Waverley Avenue and sometimes St. George's Terr. But under the new proposed parking scheme, both of those roads will also be subject to the new scheme. The rates you are proposing to get permits are ridiculously high and it's not like we don't pay enough council tax already which is always going up. And this too will also increase annually and we will not see any benefit in it as we won't be guaranteed a parking spot. Also with the proposed yellow lines, this will reduce the areas where we can park. I am vehemently objecting to these new proposals as they do not benefit the residents of Reading and only the council who stand to make even more money from this. I would suggest you see the perspective of the residents rather than from the perspective of your own pockets. Kind regards,
38. Support	[REDACTED] I never have anywhere to park because of all the vans everywhere. I definitely welcome the permits.
39. Support	Support with a few reservation: As a resident of Rona Court, [REDACTED] I see that there are double yellow lines proposed up and down the court in front of our (residents) allocated parking spaces. 1. Currently concerned that some non-residents might see the double yellows as an opportunity to double park and block us in. 2. Have any plans been put in place to ensure that our allocated spaces, 'non highway' as they are, can be identified against legitimate residents living in Rona Court?
40. Support	Fully support. This will get rid of large commercial vans which are parked here overnight and at weekends and also alleviate issue of dumped / unused cars blocking parking spaces.
41. Object	I think the main issue is lack of parking space for residents. And the introduction of parking schema does not address that. I am not seeing many non-resident cars parked during the day/night and thus I don't see how this proposal will help solving this problem. On contrary, we will have now to purchase parking permits and manage visitor's parking which adds an unnecessary burden. On these reasons, I object introduction of parking permits in my area.
42. Object	This will lead to people parking in other roads eg St. Ronans Road, where on-road parking is already very tight.
43. Support	Parking is a complete nightmare for residents at the best of times. This scheme cannot be brought in soon enough
44. Object	Leave us alone. Whenever parking restrictions are activated it results in inconvenience to home owners, their visitors, visits from home improvements project companies etc, etc, etc. Restrictions restrict. It is just another way for the council to make money off our inconvenience. If you are so concerned about parking space for residents, please take to effort to paint parking bays so people with inadequate parking silks need to know the space within which they need to park. What we need as a society is a social consentience,

	not regulation. Please educate people instead of implementing schemes that could restrict home owners and make money off your (elected representatives of th4epeople) schemes. I understand policies encouraging people to travel to the town centre using public transport, however we have chosen housing away from the town entre. Leave us alone.
45. Support	Support fully - parking on all rounds around St Georges Terrace/Road/Rona Court are now dangerous, double yellows ignored, blocking designated parking spaces on Rona Court are a regular, pavement access also very restricted at times.. but parking on corners is prob the worst part as t totally restricts view to drive around safely
46. Support	At the Waverley Road/Grovelands Road junction, traffic emerging from the former turning right into the latter is frequently unsighted by parked vehicles close to the junction. I suggest that extending the DYL about 2 vehicle lengths as part of this scheme would largely alleviate this problem.
47. Support	I support this as I live on this road, The inconvenience of other people parking down my road for up to days on end who don't live on this road is ridiculous. As well as people leaving there vehicles parked outside my house/road while they go on holiday for up to 3 weeks at a time, I've been unable [REDACTED] as cars where parked outside my house and on the other side of the road some had been there more than a few days which is unfair as I live here, When you get home from work there's nowhere to park, Its become unbearable to be honest and people will park from Grovelands Road & Waverley Road it was a lovely road now it's a nightmare.
48. Support	I live in Longridge close and the parking is getting progressively worse. On many occasions the dustcarts have not been able to access the close because of cars parked both sides on the slope that leads into the close, Many of the people who park up here do not live here, they are from St Ronans rd and Waverley rd. They cannot park in their roads because people from surrounding roads have parked outside their houses. I have lived here [REDACTED] and if some sort of restrictions are not applied the situation will continue to escalate. On one occasion [REDACTED] he had to park on the other side of Grovelands road, this morning he had to park in St Ronans rd.
49. Support	[REDACTED] I think the street needs to have this change so we can be confident in driving whenever we want, and know that when we get home we are able to park on our own street.
50. Support	[REDACTED] By making a change to the way that parking works on the street, I think all residents would benefit from being able to park on the street that they live on, whilst having their car in view of their house, decreasing anxieties RE: theft.
51. Support	I have concerns with the parking at the beginning of St Ronans Road with vehicles parking on both sides of the road half on the path and half on the road. Is parking on the path legal ? Also these vehicles make it difficult getting larger vehicles ie fire engine up the drive way to the houses 1A, B,C and D. Can the parking be restricted opposite this drive to allow larger vehicle access.
52. Support	I strongly support this proposal.
53. Support	we support the proposal in the hope that it removes the quantity of cars parking on our road from non residents. However, with the unrestricted conversion of small terrace dwellings into H.M.O.'s ,have the council calculated how many spaces are needed in the road[REDACTED] What happens if the permit only system does not free up spaces for residents? Is there a back up plan? Also , a number of houses in the road , although not HMO's have a number of vehicles that belong to adult children still living there and regularly parking. Is there a Maximum number of permits per household?
54. Support	It isn't just that residents can't park, the congestion means that refuse lorries cannot access Longridge Close meaning that our rubbish and recyclables are left uncollected.
55. Support	Support in general for overall scheme, yes. Support for the 2 hour parking, yes. Clarification on blue badge allocated space please.
56. Object	[REDACTED] I understand that permits for residents will be issued but we would have to pay extra for visitors. Also, those people I know who have these schemes find that there are more permits issued than there are places available so it's difficult to find somewhere to park near your home anyway. [REDACTED] Lastly, because there are more people needing parking than spaces, I think we will end up with more people coming into the close to park and taking up spaces which residents currently use.

57. Object	This consultation does not constitute a fully open process. You provide us with little information on how the scheme will work in practice. How much will it cost? How will it be enforced? The main time that parking is an issue in this area is between 8pm and 8am. I have never witnessed a traffic warden in any of the neighbouring areas that already have residents parking. The lack of proper information indicates that the aim to raise revenue not to solve parking issues for local residents. Having residents only parking implies that it is going to benefit residents. What is seems to be in effect is charging us to park on our own streets, and without enforcement at busy times it will just allow the non-residents and the residents with two or more vehicles to park at will anyway. What is the benefit to us residents. We are already paying over the odds in Council Tax. Why should we pay for this pointless scheme that provides us with no discernible benefits?
58. Object	the people I see parked are all locals so the same people will be trying for the same spaces regardless. Typically plumbers and builders start at 8.00am and carers call later than 5.00pm so cant take advantage of the 2 hour slot. Where I lived before residents thought permits were the silver bullet but it made very little difference except paying to park outside your own house.
59. Object	This was pushed for year after year and failed, but finally the lobbying has forced the outcome the council wanted. Although the expert at the previous drop in said it worked my own experience from when it went in on my street in central Reading many years ago was no difference at all. Please make clear the costs associated with this people will know what they are signing up to as these have been hidden from the start. =How much do the Council expect to make annually if this goes through and can you hand on heart say that is not what this is all about? In addition many of the people voting FOR this have double drives so will be subsidised by those who have to pay for parking permits (just so nobody parks over their drive) and I am calling out that this is not therefore a fair consultation. All that will happen is any excess traffic will be pushed out to make streets next to ours choked even when there are spaces in Waverley etc. By all logic this makes no sense - do you ask the surrounding streets for their view or is that the plan to go to them next once their roads are even more choked - aha you're busted!
60. Support	Looks like a reasonable scheme, it is unclear which residence will be able to apply for a parking permit. At the moment the parking is more difficult due to residence on the oxford road using these roads for parking.
61. Object	We object to this because we rarely have any trouble parking, and we are not happy about basically having to pay to park in our own road! We also have visitors who come by car, and we will be penalised financially for this too. What is more important for this road is proper speed restrictions. Either humps or speed cameras, as some cars go at an incredible speed up Grovelands road and something terrible is going to happen one of these days. I see this as a massive money making ploy by RBC...
62. Object	The letter I received informs me that a majority of residents wanted to take it to the next stage and ask the council to design a scheme and carry out a statutory consultation. Where are the results available?
63. Object	It won't make a difference to the amount of cars on the road, we'll just have to pay for the privilege of parking outside our own houses - I'm sure it won't be the council who fork out for the reduction in house prices
64. Object	I think the permit scheme is unnecessary. It won't reduce the parking issues and means we will have to pay another cost to have cars in our own road and visitors.
65. Object	Parking scheme will not solve the issues on this road and only penalises the residents.
66. Support	[REDACTED] Regardless of the type of scheme agreed, there needs to be a solution to this issue as it is unfair to all residents who are unable to park their cars on our road (or a neighboring road). [REDACTED]we feel very strongly that a scheme would discourage those using our road to park which stops residents being able to find suitable spaces.
67. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]

68. Object	[REDACTED] I do not believe that a parking scheme will have the effect of reducing the parking in the area. The majority of cars parking on the road are owned by the residents. This is blatantly obvious when you look at the road during a normal (non pandemic lockdown) working day. The cars all disappear during the day because people have driven off to work. After about 6pm both sides of the road are full. I believe that any parking scheme that requires a second permit to be purchased is tantamount to an indirect tax on those in the street who are already under significant additional financial pressures right now with many out of work or on furlough. I wholeheartedly object to any parking scheme being introduced in the local area.
69. Support	[REDACTED] we have noticed frequently cars being parked outside our house for the day and then drivers moving it in the evening. We suspect they park there and then go to work . We are definitely coming n favour of parking permits
70. Support	The proposals appear fair and equitable. The capacity of having 2 hours of the shared parking in the areas indicated seem generous - perhaps there doesn't need to be quite so much of the 2hours shared parking? There were no details given as to the number of parking permits available per household. I would suggest 1 and in exceptional circumstances an additional, bearing in mind that each house can typically only accommodate one parking space in front of it! Commercial vehicles should not receive a parking permit as these are residential streets.
71. Support	I am satisfied with the proposals as described. Information on the number of residents' permits available per household would be helpful, along with the number of visitors' permits. I would recommend that one resident permit be made available per household, with the possibility for applying for one other. This is particularly important as many of the streets in question cannot accommodate more than one car parked outside.[REDACTED]many households own at least two cars. When this is combined with the number of commercial vehicles parked on the street over night, parking is impossible. The proposals show that the entirety of Beecham is to be designated as residents' parking only. Clearly it is not possible to incorporate a shared parking scheme on Beecham, and I am pleased that this has been recognised as it would lead to non-residents attempting to take the place of permit holders.
72. Object	The scheme will not reduce the number of vehicles parked in the area. These are residents vehicles. During the day it easy to park, at night it becomes more difficult when residents return from work.
73. Support	We need to ensure that the residents living on our road have priority over parking. There are huge numbers of cars parking [REDACTED]that don't live here and this caused lots of issues for us when returning home in the car, unable to find somewhere to park. [REDACTED]l a scheme would really make a difference and hopefully stop some commuters and those parking here that shouldn't be. It seems like the only option is to create a scheme as this issue won't be resolved unless something is enforced. We feel really negatively about the issue and have even considered moving as its such a problem
74. Support	The area has been plagued by excessive parking for years and made worse at every tweak of restrictions in nearby areas. Permits are long overdue. I do note however that according to schedule 499 that numbers 6-14 Shaftesbury Road will be included in the permit allocation, this is exactly opposite of what was promised when planning permission was sought to build these properties. Objectors to that planning on the grounds of additional parking strain were told they would not be issued permits under any future scheme given they have off road parking. I am also disappointed that there appears to be no restrictions upon the maximum number of permits issued to a household. We have far too many 3+ car households causing issues with their parking and I would have hoped and expected a limit of 2 permits per household to be implemented.
75. Support	Full support for permit parking due to all the high rise in houses being turned into flats : two houses opposite my house has gone from 2/3 cars up to 9/10 cars at any time.
76. Support	I am strongly in favour of residents parking permits on beecham road. It is usually not possible to park on this road if you return later in

	the evening. [REDACTED] I believe the causes of this problem are: - many residents have 2+ cars, whereas the widths of most houses only allow for 1 car per house. - residents from neighbouring streets which do have parking restrictions, or limted parking, parking on our road instead. - vans and other business vehicles from neighbouring streets parking on our road overnight [REDACTED] We need a system that is fair for everyone.
77. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
78. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
79. Object	Because I live on Oxford road and if this proposal goes I will get more difficult to park my car .I m [REDACTED] will be more difficult to park after I think.
80. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
81. Object	Simply put there are too many residents with cars living in these areas. Too many residents have large cars - SUV's or vans meaning the space they take up when parked has increased in recent years. There are houses with 2 or 3 cars linked to them. There are too many houses that have been turned into HMO's all with residents who each have cars. There are houses with off road parking spaces they do not use - preferring to park on the road. Taking all these points into account -the proposal to limit parking to residents only will not resolve the issue of the need to increase the space available for parking. Issuing permits to residents will not ensure that all residents can park in these locations - it will simply be a way of generating more income from residents.
82. Object	[REDACTED] I attended the initial face-to-face consultation session with members of the Council in November 2019. I strongly oppose this scheme as I feel it is just another way for the Council to make money on residents, once introduced there's no getting away from it and residents have no control over future cost increases. As it transpired during the initial consultation there are a large number of households on the road where they have 2 or sometimes 3 cars, this could mean a potential extra cost of over £400/year and we were told a 3rd permit can only be issued by special request and may not be granted year-on-year. Even if there were some exceptions during the day residents would still be forced to pay for visitor permits as well as resident permits, this is all unnecessary extra cost that we don't have to pay for currently.
83. Object	This will encourage more residents to knock down walls and make room for double parking, this will decrease the parking areas in the street especially Waverley Road. I wish to keep the parking as it is now.
84. Support	Would prefer the permit hours to start earlier in the day [REDACTED]
85. Object	I don't feel parking is a problem I am always able to find a space. Would far rather the council concentrated on the speeding in the road. But they don't so I expect it won't be long until someone is killed or seriously injured.
86. Object	I cannot find the proposed fee for a second car, it may be excessive. In addition, the cars parked on this street are predominantly the same ones every day, hence we cannot see how this will improve the situation, apart from generating funds.
87. Object	Increases costs for householders, with NO GUARANTEE for a parking space. Carers often come after 5.00pm putting clients to bed or preparing meals. Tradesmen start work at 8.00 am, The Two hour window allowed is not enough for even a small tradesman job. If a householder needs to have workmen, this will incur extra costs for householders, who will require visitor permits. There are often spaces during the daytime, the premium time for spaces is evening, apart from the occasional dpd van, the spaces outside our property are all filled by local people. So why change it and effectively increase our household costs.
88. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
89. Object	[REDACTED] I feel strongly that a resident parking scheme is unnecessary and unwanted in this area. Firstly, during the day parking isn't an issue, there are always places to park, it only gets full in the evenings when residents get home from work and naturally want to park as close to their own homes as they can. There are large sections of the road where parking is already restricted to one side and limited

	due to drives, we do not need more restrictions. Similar schemes have proven to be unsuccessful - take Wantage Road for example.
90. Support	I believe it may encourage use of public transport and car sharing and promote availability of spaces for residents.
91. Object	I strongly oppose a residents' parking scheme. The scheme will cause many practical and financial difficulties for my family. The vast majority of cars parked in the area belong to residents so a resident's parking scheme will not significantly improve availability of parking and will create real practical difficulties for residents and visitors.
92. Object	The current difficulty with parking is due to the amount of residents cars so permits will not change the issue
93. Object	[REDACTED] I object and wish to log my objection as I don't believe it will solve the parking problem. The issue that I believe is that the majority of houses have at least 2 cars.[REDACTED]Both streets are in the proposal i now a number of houses with up to 4 cars across both streets, in part due to the no. of flats, conversions and HMO's in the area and families with 3 or more cars from one household and I wholeheartedly don't think the proposed parking scheme will work and reduce the no.cars. The cars will in essence still be parking in the street as they're from residents and unless the council improves readings infrastructure improving public transport, making it cheaper and safer and more accessible and encouraging households to not own cars or incentives to own only 1 the issue will still be here after the permit area has been implemented. Parking on the street is an issue in the evenings from 6 onwards and from about 7-8 in the morning the street empties which is a clear sign it's residents at home and not people parking and catching a bus to town as it is really empty during the day which wouldn't be the case if this is what's happening. It a shame it's got this far and if it was trialled for 3 months say it would be clear that the issue is no. Residents cars not non residents parking here
94. Support	I thank Reading Council for including our household[REDACTED] I am strongly in support of a scheme designed to limit impact of non-resident parking within the area, which has been an issue over the past few months, having seen examples of occupied caravans, trucks, transient trade vehicles and so forth occupying spaces. I am not clear if the permits have an upper limit per household, and if guest permits are to be allowed? I might suggest an upper limit per household, given the frequency at which 100% of spaces are occupied within our area. I also appreciate practically there may be households that require the usage of multiple vehicles.
95. Comment	Your form doesn't have "neither support nor object", which is my position. However, I have more criticisms than immediate support. I note that the drawings take no account of existing entrances into off-road driveways, such as [REDACTED] Shaftesbury Road or [REDACTED] Waverley Road, and have drawn the restricted parking zones directly across the entranceways. I trust that the practicalities on the ground will keep these entrances marked as no-parking areas. My position has alwas been that this scheme will have little practical effect, as the problems of parking in the area are that there are too many residents' cars. Thus, ensuring that only residents' cars can park here would change very little. A further concern is that the owners of small businesses with commercial vehicles, such as builders, should not be negatively impacted by any additional restrictions on the types of vehicles for which permits will be issued.
96. Support	As a resident of Longridge Close Im all in favour of restrictions on the hill up to close for one reason it would able the dustcart to empty our bins also if you come home and cars are parked on both sides its very tight to drive up
97. Object	I see no advantage in paying to park when there is no guarantee of a parking space! Also, the the costs differ vastly from those that were originally quoted. I am emphatically opposed to this scheme. [REDACTED]
98. Object	Historically the number of permits is not restricted to number of spaces so parking is still not guaranteed and we will have to pay for your he privilege of still not being able to park in the road. I[REDACTED] have seen the number of vehicles increase due to the increase in number of multi occupancy houses and work vans. Interestingly during the first lockdown parking was not an issue whatever time of day or night
99. Object	I strongly object to this scheme. I feel it is intended for the roads nearer Oxford Rd where commercial vehicles park and does not take into account how different Waverley Road is. I suggest you think of a more innovative scheme that does not negatively impact on

	residents of Waverley Rd the majority of whom oppose this scheme. It will generate huge amounts of money for RBC but be of no benefit to the residents who live towards Prospect Park. We are too far from Oxford Rd to be used for park and shop and we will be greatly inconvenienced by having to use visitors permits(which i believe are limited) for contractors, workmen and visiting family for lunch that may not fit conveniently into your am or pm slots.
100. Object	I think the passive majority in the neighbourhood are against the parking scheme. Problem is the people that shout the loudest get what they want. Same with the speed limit zone which 80%(!) voted in favour of without an ounce of evidence as to why it should be introduced. Unless late at night, Waverley Rd parking is nowhere near as bad as it's made out to be and voluntarily shelling out yet more money to RBC will not solve the problem.
101. Object	Won't solve the problem. Parking is only an issue late at night. It will divide the neighbourhood and cause long term disputes.
102. Object	At the very start of this process, I was in favour of a permit scheme. [REDACTED] Notwithstanding that during office hours, people would park on our road in order to catch the bus/walk into town. However, since lockdown 3, this has lessened and we have, 9 times out of 10, been able to park outside our house or nearby, alongside our neighbours. As such, a permit scheme would only be charging us for the privilege of parking outside our own house 90% of the time, and making parking more complex for visitors. As such I would object to a permit scheme.
103. Object	The main issue is commercial vehicles, this proposal does not resolve this and causes more disruption and expense on residents. Also a lot has changed since this was originally voted on and a permanent change would not be to the benefit of how people live now.
104. Support	Support the proposal if it aims to reduce the number of cars within West Reading and encourages greater use of public transport and more active travel such as walking and cycling. On any given day there are too many cars parked in the streets between St Georges and Grovelands Road often on the pavement. They are increasingly a blight responsible for air and noise pollution - often idling at all hours of the day. Fully support any scheme which improves air quality and makes our streets greener.
105. Object	Parking permits will not fix the parking issues that we face on our road[REDACTED]. The issue I find most often is people from surrounding roads parking on my road, rather than commercial vehicles. The inconvenience of having to pay for visitor parking is something I do not want to have to experience, as it makes larger gatherings near impossible. After hearing from others who already have permits in their area, they say it does not help. This is because we don't have very many people who park on our road to travel in to town, and even if they do, they move again in the evening, and that's when it's harder to find a space. Although there are a few commercial vehicles which park overnight on our road, I don't see why it should be at our expense to remove them. The council should come up with an alternative place for these drivers to park their vans, as they're only going to park on the next road up which isn't permit holders, therefore creating a ripple effect. I think the cost of the permit in the first place is far too extortionate for one car, yes it's £42 to begin with but then it goes up to £150! The council can't honestly claim that all of this money is necessary and will only go towards wardens patrolling our area can they? I also think that charging that much per on-road car creates a harsh division between those who have a driveway and those who don't, and as a result I don't think it's fair that these opinions are equally weighted either. This will impact people who do not own a driveway more than anyone else, so their voices should count for more.
106. Object	I object to the proposal as I feel that whilst parking is at times very difficult this solution will cause financial hardship to people living in this area. The details of the proposed scheme do not include details of the financial cost to the householder of having the scheme imposed. Also the proposed 9am-5pm shared use time is too small - what is this trying to achieve? Caring is not a 9-5 job, why is it not 8am-8pm as it is in Wantage Rd and other roads? What is the rationale for it to be so much shorter?
107. Object	I don't believe that a residents parking scheme will significantly free up parking spaces for residents as I don't believe there is significant parking in this area by non-residents.

	Thus residents will face increased financial costs and administrative burden for little benefit.
108. Object	The primary issue for parking is in the evening.[REDACTED] the issue is parking after 6pm with people from nearby streets parking on my Road. It is simply space. The council agreed to reduce the length of double yellow lines at the very first consultation and then repainted it during the recent relining of the Road, thereby taking away at least two valuable spaces. Your decision has added to our difficulties.This scheme will not prevent people from nearby streets parking on my Road.I have personally not seen people park at the Grovelands Road end of Waverley Road to travel on into town. I would like to see the research to this. Day parking is fine which means we would be paying the council to have the same parking issue and to limit our own visitors whilst paying for this. It would limit social activities, when permitted. It's too expensive, also those with usable driveway will not have to pay, which causes a division in our community. For the few commercial vans that do park here there must be an alternative way to manage their parking. Why should all residents pay to manage this minor issue. It seems different areas within the scheme have different patterns of problems so surely at more directed approach to each would be more prudent rather than an imperfect and expensive parking scheme. This will just push any problems onto nearby streets.
109. Object	Object to permit parking on Waverley Road. No more parking is created, this is simply a way for the council to make money. I do not have a driveway and I can always park somewhere.
110. Object	1) No evidence has ever been submitted by the council that the issue of parking is due to people outside of the area parking in these roads. At the moment it's purely a belief like brexit. Proposing a change without evidence that the proposal will actually improve things and poorly thought through.There are probably better ways to manage parking, but at the moment decisions are being taken based on councillors personal opinion, not fact-checked or based.If this goes ahead there needs to be an automatic review in 12 months (not one called for by residents) to see if the parking situation has changed and improved. If it has then it has worked. If not it's automatically cancelled. Otherwise it's just a money making exercise by the council, not something actually meant to improve parking for residents. 2) The proposed shared parking is not long enough. Many jobs work longer hours nowadays. I frequently (weekly) look after friends children who are not able to pick up until after work and that's often 6pm at the earliest even allowing for travel from work. There should at least be allowance for vehicles to stop for 15 or 30mins without penalty or need to use a permit. 3) Your own enforcement wardens don't appear to operate (never seen) during the hours this is meant to be in force. Obvious from the way many currently park and move cars before they know wardens will be active.
111. Support	There is a real need to provide a scheme to allow residents to part in their local area. Parking in the evenings (including overnight) and at weekends is a real challenge. There are lack of nearby alternatives that are safe for someone to walk from on their own. It also posses additional challenges if there are children and things that need to be unloaded such as shopping. Part of the issue is the number of large vans that park around here late afternoon/ evening/ overnight. There is also the issue of rented properties especially where there are multiple cars owned by the tenants. My only concern is the proposal to allow shared parking for up to 2 hours. Whilst I have no objection to the principle, my concern is on how this will be monitored and enforced - the resource for enforcement is more needed in the evenings/ overnight.
112. Object	Don't do it
113. Object	[REDACTED[This whole thing needs a lot more consideration. Thanks
114. Object	I[REDACTED] bought this house knowing that it did not come with parking and what that meant - this should be blatantly obvious to anybody who lives here. At the time of purchasing our house we were actually particularly happy to see it wasn’t permit parking. I

	personally think introducing a permit scheme is actually very antisocial and just another way to make money for the council. Why should I have to pay to park my car near to my house when I already pay for things such as council tax and and road tax. Why should we have to pay to have family and friends visit us and limit the time in which they can park their cars, the concept is ridiculous. I honestly believe the proposal for a permit scheme is a complete waste of resources and will only cause additional problems. [REDACTED[] People have more cars per household these days. As kids grow up and learn to drive they do get cars much earlier than before, but the idea that introducing a permit scheme is going to reduce the number of cars around the area is laughable. How about reducing the yellow line spaces and actually giving people more places to park on the road. I am 110% against this scheme. I think it's an awful idea, it would actually make me consider moving away from the area as I do not understand why I would want to pay to park my car near my home - do councils think people in the public have an endless pot of money to just throw at these things?! It also concerns me that there is a huge lack of people in the area being informed. It seems there is a lot more noise from those who want it (which I would say benefits the council due to the financial aspect), then when I speak to those who do not want it, they aren't aware of any updates or opportunities whereby they would be able to have their say. The only reason I found this link was due to a neighbour sharing it.
115. Support	[REDACTED]Households have been allowed to drop their kerbs and houses split into flats, leading to many more cars than spaces available. A couple of households have resorted to putting bins into the road to protect the spaces outside of their houses. I daren't use the car in the evening as I know I won't be able to park down my own road when I return.The parking wardens look with glee early in the morning on a daily basis at the junctions of St.George's Road with other roads, but there is sometimes literally nowhere else to park, so what are we meant to do? Where else can we park? Many non-residents, local business vans etc. park down my road, it has become unbearable. How I wish that I could afford to move!
116. Object	I do not feel that this will help the residents. The only people benefit will be RBC increasing their revenue. Residents will be robbed!
117. Object	I initially voted for the proposal to be taken to consultation stage, feeling fairly ambivalent about the proposals. However, after further consideration, I do not think that the problems with on-street parking in the area will be solved by a parking scheme. 1. Any parking issues seem to be an inherent problem of residents owning too many cars for the number of on and off road parking spaces, due to multiple car households (adult children, HMOs etc). This is supported by anecdotal evidence from the parking scheme on Wantage Road, where residents still struggle to find spaces because of the number of permits issued. 2. The changes brought by the coronavirus pandemic seem to have reduced the number of non-residents using the roads as 'park and ride' to avoid steep parking costs in town. 3. The charges for the residents' permits are fairly steep, but not prohibitive enough to discourage car ownership and reduce the number of cars. 4. Problems with parking are most common at night, when parking enforcement officers are not usually likely to be patrolling. [REDACTED]
118. Object	firstly the first parking permit is not free - this is a disgrace. so for that reason alone Im not interested. annual increases in first permits cost will never stop. also the current visitors permits are a joke at just half a day - another reason in its own I will never agree to a permit zone the current double yellows arent enforced (evenings, where they are usually crammed with vehicles) - so I have no confidence in the permit bays being monitored either
119. Support	I fully support the proposal for residents' parking scheme. I am extremely facing difficulty to find a parking space in front or around the areas of my property. It seems that those from outsiders come and park their vehicles and leave there for longer times. It has made our life very difficult.
120. Object	I do not feel that this will help the residents. The only people benefit will be RBC increasing their revenue. Residents will be robbed!
121. Object	[REDACTED] this could put them off coming to see me which would further isolate me. It makes me feel worried and anxious that such a big change and cost has been proposed to roads that do not need any parking interventions. We all manage perfectly fine as residents and many of us are very happy with how it is now. It is friendly and inviting, and happy just like our road and the people that live along

	it.
122. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
123. Object	I object to the parking permit scheme, I don't think this is necessary at all, it will entice more residents to change their gardens into parking spaces, we have already seen that in Waverley road and have therefore lost 3 parking spaces.
124. Object	Poorly thought outmassively overpriced- why should I pay for a first permit at all? visitors permits scheme laughably poor and ridiculously expensive existing restrictions poorly enforced or not at all so what's the point No governance on commercial vehicles or a limit in size of vehicleWhy can't each house be given an allocated bay with their house number? One car per house, no more.
125. Object	I object to having to pay to park on the roads surrounding our house, we already pay council tax, I foresee this additional cost for parking will simply increase every year. It is unlikely the parking situation will change and I will be not be guaranteed a space any more than I am now. Once the scheme is in place will we again be consulted on if we would like to keep it, I very much doubt it. It is a no from me, thank you.
126. Object	This will do nothing to improve parking but will simply move the problem elsewhere while impacting residents with extra costs and inconvenience.
127. Object	Due to the high cost of permits and visitor permits. We pay enough in taxes! I have lived in parking permit areas and they are not well managed and the problem persists. Benefits do not out weigh negatives.Parking problems will be pushed on further. I am in favour of moving parking bays to increase visibility at junctions. Waverley/fro land road double mini round about is awful with poor visibility when exiting Waverley on to Grovelands.
128. Object	[REDACTED], I object to having to pay for visitor permits. I really don't think that the parking permits will solve the problems of parking in the road. It seems a good money making scheme for the council as far as I can see.
129. Object	[REDACTED] will now be forced to pay for parking that previously we didn't have to, for no advantage. Personally it seems more prudent to speak with residents who have made their front gardens into parking without a dropped kerb. That would provide more on road parking if it was monitored more closely.
130. Object	Hassle of visitor parking permits and not having family/friends able to park
131. Object	Apart from dissuading contractors vans, which can be a nuisance, I can't see much of a benefit to residents and is an extra household cost which is inappropriate right now.
132. Object	Just another tax on living. Won't make any difference to number of cars parked. Something else to worry about especially for visitors who may visit for some time.
133. Object	It is not going to solve the fundamental problem of too many ars and not enough parking. It will cost us more but to no benefit. Residents who have paved over their front gardens to provide themselves with their own parking are not going to like people parking legally in the road outside their houses so there could be increased friction between households.
134. Object	It will not create any new spaces. People have more than 1 car/vanwill not get rid of them they just purchase another permit so completely pointless for residents but great for the council. If the wardens bothered to come round before 8am or after 6pm they would make a few quid anyway because the same peoope park on the double yellow lines reapeatedly so they eifher dont pay as not registered to them or they have moremoney than sense. Stop allowing houses to be turned in to HMO'S and flats because you have one house here with 7 cars!!! If each road had their own permits then our roadwould notfill up withsurrounding roads cars. Pointless exercise just making money out of residents. The same amount ofcars will be around
135. Object	I initially supported the proposal as it was clear our road was being used as a car park for people going into town. Since then, I've noticed the vehicles parked are mostly familiar, so I don't think there are as many people using the road to park for town anymore. Parking in the evening can still be hard, but I don't think making it permit holders only will change that - it will just mean the residents have to pay to park outside their houses (I doubt many will reassess their need for their vehicle(s)).
136. Object	The scheme will not solve the alleged problems. For the following reasons.1. Each street has different issues with parking and it is not right or fair to treat them in the same way. e.g. difficulties at different times, too many resident cars for the number of spaces . This

	scheme groups the area as one zone which is destined to fail to address all the issues. An example is in the areas near Oxford Road - they seem to have problems with parking during the day, perhaps due to people using the shops/businesses on Oxford Road, On Waverley Road the opposite is the case. The issue is in the evening as there are too many cars for the number of spaces for residents as people return home from work. A parking permit scheme would not solve the issues. We will just be paying for the privilege of not being able to park. 2. No additional parking spaces are being created. Indeed at the Grovelands Road end of Waverley Road spaces will be lost. 3. All the scheme will do is push the parking issue to the peripheral streets creating the problem elsewhere - I wouldn't want this done to me so I certainly won't approve it done to someone else. Applying a hefty cost for second cars would exacerbate that issue even more. 4. The proposal is already divisive and causing rather ugly debate in the community (like another Brexit - no thank you). 5. I am not aware of any schemes where the permits are - truly universally accepted as - successful. 6. Better ways to approach the issue:6.1. Reduce the number of HMOs, especially in terraced houses. Where there could be multiple cars per house this is exacerbating the problem. HMOs are fine as long as there is the infrastructure to cope with them (e.g. a car park). 6.2. Lobby the government to put in to law that you should be able to work from home if you are able to, thus reducing the need for a car. 6.3. Create truly safe and pleasant cycle lanes in to and around Reading. I certainly would not want to cycle down Oxford or Tilehurst Roads as they are now. 6.4. Free buses and subsidised trains - now that would really shake things up. I work in Chippenham but can't afford the 7k train pass. A car is significantly cheaper. 6.5. Provide more job opportunities at all levels locally, along with bus services, quality cycle lanes so that people don't need cars as much. 6.6. Provide viable electric car hire for short journeys. e.g. like Zipcar. this would encourage people away from having their own car. There would need to be enough to make an impact and they would need to be close to where people live. 6.7. Encourage / subsidise car sharing.
137. Object	I don’t believe it will make a difference. There are no major problems in the day (esp when people back to work). The problem is in the evening from people parking on Waverley road from Surrounding roads. As we will all have permits it will not solve this. I object to paying to park outside my house & the permits & visitor parking are extortionate. It also falls more in the favour of those able to have a drive (of which I am one).
138. Object	I have lived here for [REDACTED] years and know that this proposal is totally unnecessary and will cause more problems than solve any. It will restrict access for visitors and people being able to get work done in their homes by contractors. I also believe this will lower property prices in the area. We already pay tax so buying permission to park outside ones own homes only benefits the council.
139. Object	The parking is not bad. The parking will get worse and other streets will suffer. This is a monetary exercise the the council.
140. Object	1). The vote is imbalanced and not fair to home owners. Your voting system/process is allowing non home owners, specifically people who rent and Tennant properties for short periods of time and don't own property allowing them to vote which will have long term financial impact to residents who own their property and live in them. there's also the issue of affecting sale of the properties long term. 2). another imbalance is that home owners voting with driveways will be potentially impacting and voting on something that impacts ther home owners of terraced housing without driveways, this is completely imbalanced and another example of how unfair this voting process is. 3). Having spoken to the local wardens on a few occasions, it's clear that not each permit area/route is patrolled daily. the fact the wardens patrol non permit areas just outside the permit zone is also a concern and perceived as looking to generate as much revenue by patrolling areas outside of the permit zones! 4).some local residents complain that people are using their streets to park and commute to work. this proposed solution is only pushing the problem to adjacent and other streets that will potentially sit outside the new proposed permit boundary. 5). The local council sees it fit to allow new flats to be built on St George's with in adequate parking and increasing the parking problems to the area. those flats should never been allowed to be built given the current parking issues. I perceove this as the council

	contributing to the problem. 6). Another main issue is that alot of the properties are rented needing HMO licenses which Reading Council do control! HMO's licensing should not be granted to areas where there is parking issues or limited insufficient parking. I spoke to a local Councillor and he claimed the Reading council don't control the HMO which is slightly confusing considering they accept the applications. Another point on this subject, alot of houses are being rented which should be classed as HMOs without license and the council do not have a grip on this situation. If one 3 bed terraced house is rented in a street by say 3 couples each with cars, that's potentially 6 cars for one household...worse case scenario. Now most these victorian 3 bed houses have living rooms and dining rooms that are separated and turned into bedroom housing upto at least 5 or more tenants. This part of the big parking problem! 7). The permit zones don't work, I have lived in them closer to central and makes no benefit to parking or spaces. In addition the wardens barely cover the routes maybe twice as opposed to at least four times. absolutely very rarely would I see wardens patrolling outside of the permitted 2hour parking time frame permitted. People avoid getting caught just by getting up earlier and moving their cars around to avoid tickets. 8). Home owner should not have to pay for parking in their street on their home full stop. the fact the scheme will charge for first permit is wrong. in addition the cost of visitor book permits is extorniate. and more expensive then central private parking in town. Given that the roads in the area are poorly maintained and alot of potholes causing damage to tyres I don't think it's right I should have to pay or my visitors to park on such poorly kept roads! 9). There is no evidence supplied from the council to support that parking permits work. Nor have I seen any survey data from existing permit residents that confirms the solution works. 10). If local parking on central or outside was not expensive as it is. then there would not be any real issues with parking. Central town parking prices are part of the problem. 11). The other concern is that residents will have no control over permit or visitor permit pricing and the council will be free to increase permit charges as they see fit with no price cap, this is unacceptable exposure for residents and should be a concern for all. To be quite frank, this scheme proposes no real benefits for improving parking or change to the contributing factors that are the main issues and the solution only looks to increase revenue for the council.
141. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
142. Object	I don't think the proposed scheme will solve the problem but will be expensive
143. Object	Permits will not reduce parking congestion. Very few cars park in the area that do not belong to residents.
144. Object	After living in a few addresses where parking restrictions like this have been implemented. I am well aware how they work. They will not solve the problems with parking locally as they will not be policed at the time when the problem arises. During the day there is plenty of parking spaces available, but in the evening when people come home from work. The spaces fill up very quickly. This will be at a time when the new restrictions won't prevent non residential parking. The only people who want the restrictions in place are those who have driveways, and they believe this will stop people from parking in front of their drives.
145. Object	I do not believe this would alleviate parking problems as demand is mainly from within the designated area (exacerbated by multi occupancy housing and multi car ownership). I believe it would bring an unacceptable charge to local residents both in relation to paying for their own parking and the parking of visitors for no discernible benefit. I strongly object to the introduction of this scheme.
146. Object	Parking constantly evolves and will continue to do so, I do not think this survey is still relevant or needed.
147. Object	Parking constantly evolves and will continue to do so, I do not think this survey is still relevant or needed.
148. Object	I am against permit parking in our area. And now that I've seen the plans and drawings, even more so. Am happy to be corrected on any of the below - the "vote" that led to this consultation was á la Brexit... A percent or two either way. I'm also so worried this kind of stuff is divisive and drives wedges in communities.

	//From what I can see in the drawings, there'll be a loss of 2 parking spaces on the Grovelands/Waverley end of the scheme (where the dog poo bin is). Although that will definitely improve safety (that corner bloody scares me every time), it's actually reducing the available space to park.
	//I don't understand why the scheme has dotted red lines on the drawings down the Grovelands end of Waverley are whereas everywhere else they're black. Does anyone know?
	//I find parking schemes in general to be completely anti-community. I believe what will happen (and has been said by those already in permit areas above), is that we make the parking situation for our fellow neighbours just outside the scheme, worse. "I'm all right Jack" mentality IMO.
	//Many believe that HMOs are a cause of difficulties parking. But all that happens is that folks who live in HMOs or houses turned into flats - are penalised for no reason other than what type of residence they live in.
	//All the streets in this project will be in the same "zone", so for anyone thinking, it's going to stop people from Shaftesbury parking on Waverley - or Beecham parking on Waverley - as examples - won't stop.
	//There are no plans to increase the number of available spaces - simply to ask residents to pay to park where they currently park for free.
	//I haven't seen any actual evidence or surveys of people parking on our roads and then walking into town or taking the bus - only anecdotal or hearsay. I am not saying anyone who believes this happens is wrong, I'd just like to see some evidence before using it as a reason for permits. For example in our part of the street, it's easy to park during the day - but impossible at night. Other areas may be different... But it certainly won't help down this end.
	//There are no plans to paint bays along the proposed permit area, meaning folks who struggle to park sensibly, will still struggle to park sensibly.
	//Even though the second permit prices are expensive, I don't believe it will stop anyone from borrowing/getting into debt to afford it. Or they will park their second cars in areas not in the scheme.If the council said let's try it for 3 months and then vote again at the end - I'd be more inclined to see what happened. But signing up for something with almost zero evidence behind it working - other than asking residents to vote - doesn't seem scientifically sound.
	t the Wilson meeting, we discussed detailed examples of how a one-way system involving chicanes, could lead to double sided parking - and wasn't really given any factual evidence of why this couldn't work. It also has the benefit of reducing the speed of cars.

149. Support	The plan is essentially fine however if Waverley Road were to be made one way (Wantage to Grovelands), less double lines would be required and more parking spaces could be made available.What is the rationale of making St Ronans Road residents only parking without a two hour waiting period for non-residents similar to other streets.
150. Object	Cost of parking permits. It will not make a difference. I am able to park in my street without any problems.
151. Object	I feel Waverley rd will not benefit from parking permits as it'll cost to park our cars in the road and give another layer of unnecessary stress.
152. Object	Too much cost for too little benefit. We are not near town, shops or workplaces so there is not a great deal of parking by non-residents. I do not see any real benefit to this scheme as parking is currently acceptable. Not great but I don't think it would be improved with a residents parking scheme.
153. Support	I often work late and cannot park when returning late at night. A residents' scheme will mean that I can park safely, close to my home. I would really value that.
154. Object	I do not think that residents of the street should have to pay for their vehicles to be parked on it. As residents we should be able to park where we reside. It's extortion to charge residents, especially those where multiple occupants live with second vehicles being charged in excess of 150 pounds per yr. This scheme doesn't consider the various ways in which people live in property these days, ie HMO, multiple use etc. Days of single car family dwellings are long past. More should be done to provide a solution to irresponsible parking, ie over drives, to prevent commuters using the road, stop commercial vehicles being allowed to park over night ie DPD vans etc. - why are these not returned to

	the depot?!?
155. Object	I would like people to be able to park on the road without having use passes and permits. Having lived on Elgar road previously that does have a permit scheme it is way over priced and causes undue stress for residents whenever you have guests to visit and again costs you a fortune. You shouldn't have to pay to park outside your own house or have guests park outside. I think it will create a division on the street and in what is a really great community.
156. Object	Extra cost see no problem with current situation
157. Object	Cost. Need to look at other ways to sort out parking
158. Object	As we have previously said, the problem isn't people parking their cars who don't live here and going to work for example, the problem is just too many cars for the number of houses. Many houses in my street are HMO's which can mean sometimes four cars belonging to one household. We also have homeowners where their grown up children still live with them thus meaning a household can own multiple cars. I see very few (if any) cars parked here during the day by non-residents.
159. Object	I am totally against parking permits on Waverley road, as this is the 3/4 time that we've had this survey and the answer has always been No. why should I or any resident on Waverley rd have to pay to park our car . We pay enough already with council tax, road tax fuel tax , pay for extra bins if you need them, pay to get rid of rubbish, we pay enough. Plus having to buy a permit so that my family can come & see us is totally unacceptable
160. Support	[REDACTED]very happy about the scheme. The road has a high traffic of trade vehicles parking and taking up space where the residents should be parking.
161. Object	I have concerns about the cost of visitor permits and how long they will be valid for and how many will be available for residents. Also permits for carers who have to visit for more than a couple of hours and several times a day. Also lack of double yellow lines in front of driveways.
162. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
163. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
164. Support	At the junction of Waverley Road and Grovelands Road, Waverley Road south side, the existing double yellow lines have been drawn incorrectly. In the drawing they have been depicted as terminating opposite 239 Waverley Road. This is not the case, they terminate opposite 243 Waverley Road, the same as the double yellow lines on the north side of the road. So, this means that at the moment there is space for parking 2 to 3 vehicles (usually 2) on the southside of the road. The drawing then shows the the double yellow lines on the south side of the road are to be extended to the junction of Hamilton Court and Waverley Road, which would then remove the existing parking spaces. I thought the scheme was to maximise the available spaces for parking and making things less stressful for residents! I believe that the double yellow lines on the south side could retreat 3 meters towards Grovelands Road thus ensuring 3 spaces for parking with no interference of visibility at the junction! I suggest that somebody actually comes to look at the layout at the junction because it is obvious that nobody has as the existing double yellow lines depicted are a copy of those at the junction of St George's Terrace and Grovelands Road, which is an entirely different set-up!
165. Object	I see that there is no need for this, I have had problems parking down this road , I feel that it is just another stealth tax on the people who reside in this area, just another way of the council getting money from the people around this area. The money should be spent on enforcing speed controls down Grovelands road which has way to many drivers speeding up this road there is an accident waiting to happen person or someone's pet. SPEED CAMERAS , ROAD HUMPS, 20MPH SIGNS OR A CHYCANE , these are all ideas that money can be well spent on this road.
166. Object	Hello sirs, i am not objecting the reason behind this permit scheme but I definitely object the payment charges, which you people will start collecting from local residents. Already there are too much financial burden and if you people start charging money to issue or renew the permit then it will be very unfair and there will be opposition.So i will say go ahead with scheme but dont charge money for issue and renew the permit. End of the day you will have enough contribution from TICKETS.

167. Object	[REDACTED]The parking of vehicles has increased with the increase of then of no cars per house to now 1/2/3 cars per household, this is just residents consisting of parents and one grown up child .Therefor the introduction of parking permits will not decrease this part of the problem . We also have a few HMO properties which causes a problem but during the daytime In normal circumstances there are many places to park , it is only when the residents return home from work in the evening there is problem, which again permits will not solve. After talking to quite a few residents/friends around the proposed area it seems that all we will be paying for is a permit to actually be able to park in the proposed zoned area , it will not guarantee a space .[REDACTED]This proposal was has been considering a few times in my residency and also declined , The only winners will be Reading Borough Council and we will end up paying extra hundred of pounds a year for the privilege of WE MIGHT GET A SPACE.
168. Object	I don't think that permit parking will solve issue for me as the problem will still exist. Even if there was permits in place we will still have difficulty with finding parking place , especially the evenings.Most of people has got more than one car and is not possible park in that tight space ,people just park on the roads as they don't have garages. Major problem in uk .Also non-parking zone is no good idea as is too far to town and for those living locally will cause another distress and confusion. And mainly the financial aspect I'm not willing to pay more on top of all bills as every penny is matters. [REDACTED]
169. Object	- The scheme is not wanted, is not evidenced, it will not actually be helpful in practice, and it is short-sighted by foolishly neglecting to notice the enormous EV elephant in the room. - It has arisen from multiple "informal" consultations over recent years which have rejected the need for a scheme on multiple occasions. Yet these consultations continued until the "right" answer has been generated. In such circumstances, one would expect to see evidence of overwhelming support for a scheme in order to override the outcome of previous consultations. No such evidence has ever been produced. - The scheme will not achieve its stated aims, because it is founded on a pair of false premises. It has been assumed that (a) residents are finding it extremely difficult to park near their home because (b) non-residents are parking routinely in the area. The scheme is clearly pointless unless both of those things are true. And yet no evidence has ever been produced to support either point. My own experience as a resident of 17 years standing is that it is no more difficult to find a parking space in the area than it has been previously, and that the vast majority of the vehicles parked in the area belong to residents. - The scheme is short sighted and will rapidly oulive any usefulness it is imagined to have. It is surely obvious that the transition to electric vehicles must be the top priority for transport in the area, and that much the biggest obstacle in making the transition is the provision of EV charging in areas with almost-entirely on-street parking, such as that covered by the proposal. Whatever the EV solution might be in the area, it would naive in the extreme to suppose that this will not have major impacts on parking. Therefore, the transition to EV needs to be properly planned and implemented FIRST before a rational parking scheme responding to those changes can be implemented.
170. Support	The proposals should help by reducing the number of large commercial vehicles parked in the evenings, some of which take up two car parking spaces. Sometimes they are also dangerously parked, reducing visibility at the corners.
171. Object	Much of the problem for St Ronan's Road is people from the surrounding areas parking here. This includes those from Groveland's Road. Much of Groveland's Road seems to be included in the scheme, as are the other areas we get spill over from. I therefore can't see how the proposed scheme is useful. We will just be paying a fortune for permits and the issues will remain - making the situation overall much more frustrating for our road at least. The number of cars in the area is the same. People from out of area park during the day and that isn't an issue generally. The scheme will generate income for the Council but doesn't help local residents. We are strongly opposed to it.

172. Support	Seems a fair compromise for residents. Is it necessary to have such a long double yellow line at the top of Beecham road? If the double yellow line is shorter that will provide more parking?
173. Object	Unlikely to improve parking access so just becomes a tax.
174. Object	This scheme does not guarantee me parking space. The permits for a second car is very high this is not acceptable. Council Tax has already rise by overall 5% this FY and i believe it will continue on rising for the next coming years. Majority of the households have a second car, RBC is using this as a leverage to increase its revenue. Throughout the pandemic many people may have lost their jobs and its not acceptable for the council to charge such a high amount - no doubt it will increased next year.
175. Object	Having permits is just to get more money .there will be no differents in parking the same amount of cars will be the same and with living in the longest road in reading without a turn off and making it just permits with not having any provisins is just crazy. your not guaranteed a space outside your house,most people think if they agree to permits they will have a space outside there property. This is not made clear from the councils.paying for the first permit should be free.this will go up yearly without a doubt . Also when reserdients had a meeting last about the parking it was mentioned that no permits in daytime as this isn't an issue. The vote should be made with people who are on the elector roll. There are so many reasons why people don't want permits , there are more people which are against permits .than that are with. Your percentage do not add up.with the people who have done door to door and spoke face to face .
176. Object	In our household we have no cars, [REDACTED] stays sometimes for multiple days - half day permits are completely useless in this situation [REDACTED]. This scheme doesn't benefit anyone, especially not the people who actually live down these roads.
177. Object	It needs to be no commercial vehicles not permit parking.
178. Support	Hoping permits will mean home owners can actually park on the road outside there house.
179. Object	I have a partner who doesn't live with me full time and who's car is not registered to my address. There is no provision in place for this situation, which I feel is pretty common. It is unfair to have to use up all the visiting permits for when he is here, especially as I do not own my own car so am not using any of the residential permits I could be.
180. Support	There are a lot of non residents that use the roads for parking. Sometimes leaving their cars parked for weeks at a time. This has a detrimental impact on finding a space near the house and with small children makes for a less than ideal situation.
181. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
182. Support	Lots of cars blocking pavements
183. Object	Doesn’t seem like this will resolve parking issues in the area as there are just too many cars/multiple cars/house. It will just make life more expensive.
184. Object	The proposed restrictions in Beecham Rd make inadequate provision for and show poor understanding of the needs of the elderly and disabled who need care visits, often several times a day, and from multiple care providers.
185. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
186. Object	I do not see provision for [REDACTED] who has daily healthcare visits 7.30 am to 8.30 am from multiple carers. The current carer's permit will not allow for this in Beecham Road, as far as I can see.
187. Object	[REDACTED] My understanding is that there are Carers permits available which allow visits to residents who need carers, however [REDACTED] carers arrive earlier than these permits allow and she has more than the three carers (and hence registrations) who rotate. This would mean that [REDACTED] would have to buy additional expensive parking permits which again would not even be valid at the earlier hour when her carers attend. What will happen to her care if the agency refuse to run the risk of their employees getting parking tickets regularly? I can understand the desire of residents in a difficult parking area such as Beecham Road to have the security of a permit, but I believe the council needs to think carefully about the huge impact the scheme will have on certain vulnerable residents and their carers and

	families. [REDACTED]
188. Object	I object very strongly that I will have to pay to park outside my own house, when no other alternative. I already pay what I strongly believe to be an excessive council tax. I received a 1% salary increase last year. Energy bills are increasing and now this. I do not understand this charge. Why do I have to pay it? What is it for? What do I get? I can tell you what you won't get from me, my vote!
189. Object	I do not support the change to Permit Holders Parking Only at Beecham Road
190. Object	[REDACTED] I seriously object to having to pay for the privilege of parking or not in this area!
191. Object	[REDACTED]I feel household with no car should be given 1 visitors permit which can be used numerous times the same as household with car being given one for their car. Waverley road parking is not that bad and very rarely can you not find a space. Especially as lots have drives.
192. Object	1. Parking permits do not guarantee a parking space, despite having paid for a permit. 2. Parking permits do not guarantee a parking space outside your house, despite having paid for a permit. 3. Parking permits cost, and parking is currently free. 4. What about addresses where there are more than two cars which is perfectly possible in cases where adult children are still living at home, or flats, or multiple occupancy houses? 5. What about people who have a van which they use for work? 6. What about people who need carers or relatives to call two, three, four times a day? 7. What happens if an address requires workmen to call over an extended period? 8. What purpose does this scheme serve other to than raise revenue? 9. All this is proposed at a time when: a). those who are vulnerable, or live on their own need more social contact; and b). when more people are struggling financially through no fault of their own. 10. If the scheme goes ahead, then parking will become a problem in other non-permit areas.
193. Support	There are so many HMOs in the area, all with multiple cars. So there are more residents/cars than the roads can handle.
194. Support	There are far too many cars in the road. A lot parked by nearby residents who do not wish to pay for parking places associated with their homes. Stopping this will certainly help the parking
195. Object	It is a way to collect more money by council. There will be no more space for parking.
196. Object	[REDACTED]. Parking restrictions would make their work very difficult as it would be almost impossible to find parking in the area. It is bad enough now.
197. Object	I object to the fact that carers would not be able to park down Beecham Road anymore.
198. Support	It is frequently impossible to park on the street in which I live and hopefully these proposals will help improve that situation
199. Object	[REDACTED] we have a need for 3 cars. All of which are required for our commutes to work. The scheme only allowing 2 cars maximum would be completely unfeasible for us.
200. Object	Inconvenient and costly to the residents who are forced to pay for the permits. This will not solve the over population on the roads of west Reading
201. Support	I support the parking scheme. Please do implement it.[REDACTED]
202. Object	The scheme is not needed; [REDACTED] Earlier consultations have consistently showed insufficient demand to justify a scheme. Further, the scheme as proposed reduces the total number of parking spaces available by increasing the length of double yellow lines. Finally, the need for parking in the area is in flux as charging infrastructure for electric vehicles develops, working habits change as a result of Covid-19, and public transport improves. There is no need to make a change at this time, and there are good reasons to delay while the position develops.

203. Object	It will not improve the parking situation as it does not address commercial vehicles
204. Object	A large sum of money paid by residents which cannot even guarantee a parking space outside of their home. This scheme will also force people to park in other non permit areas where volume of traffic and parking is already overstretched. I therefore strongly object to this scheme.
205. Object	I object to this proposal as it would not be good for the area by taking out the double yellow lines would cause more congestion in the long run.
206. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
207. Object	permits are too expensive. This is not a fair scheme for residents who can't afford the permits. Also, there is less parking because of the proposed new double yellow lines. The 2 hour limit for visitors is not acceptable. People with access needs will find this inaccessible as it does not allow them sufficient time to park and get from the parking space to the house and back again in a reasonable time, and they will be unable to visit family and friends.
208. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
209. Object	Generally unnecessary inconvenience, particularly to renters in multi person households (where more than two residents may have a car)
210. Object	Its too expensive for permits. I don't want visitors to be restricted to 2 hours. We have no problem parking and do not need this scheme
211. Object	I rely on my car to get around as I am elderly and cannot walk far. I cannot afford another £42 out of my pension. I approve of a charge for a second car, but please, not for one. You will make me housebound.
212. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
213. Object	I rely on my car to get around as I am elderly and cannot walk far. I cannot afford another £42 out of my pension. I approve of a charge for a second car, but please, not for one. You will make me housebound.
214. Object	[REDACTED] We cannot see why we should should have to pay for parking or why persons visiting us should have to worry whether they will be exposed to receiving a parking fine. We have a car and pay road tax. We see this proposal only as a way to raise further tax for the council and there is no good reason other than that for it. WE STONGLY OBJECT TO THE PROPOSAL!
215. Object	I object to this as I've moved here some time ago as you did not need a permit to park here think this is a good place to live for my family as now you will be bringing a parking permit out this will cause a big problem as seeing your not given a commercial vehicle as this I my work and my main vehicle. My company vehicle this is for work use and private use, so you can see why this will be a problem as I can't park my vehicle, this will mean I will have to find a another place to live and put on pressure on my family to find a another home ,if there is a another way please inform me.
216. Object	[REDACTED]. I want to keep the parking as it is
217. Object	I shouldn't have to pay to park at my house
218. Object	I would simply prefer the present arrangeemnt for unrestricted parking along most of Waverley Road to continue. Although parking can be more difficult at certain times, I am usually able to find a space, [REDACTED]
219. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
220. Object	Parking permit do not guarantee a parking space in this area. [REDACTED] We don't want to pay extra money for nothing. We can find parking space. I have been living here about four years now. You have tried push us to pay for nothing many times. Could you please stop it? It is getting so annoying. We don't want to pay for nothing.
221. Object	I object due to these reason below, Cost of living is high enough and now you want to add permits. Where would you expect people who may not afford these to park??

	Possible yellow lines being added, will this now just push vehicles into other areas which will also cause other issues,[REDACTED] .
222. Object	i object due to high exspence of permits.[REDACTED]I worry about my friends and support system not being able to come visit me
223. Object	I strongly object. There is simply not enough space on the road for all the cars. I don't believe that introducing permits will change this. I will simply then be in a situation whereby I am charged for not being able to park on my road . It would be better to put marked parking spaces on the road to park in , as then people would park better. Introducing permits should not cost me as a resident. If permits are introduced for visitors and there is a cost that is one thing I still don't agreed with it however. But residents should not have to pay to park near their homes. It seems like another way to extort money out of residents and once introduced it will never be revoked and will only go up each year.
224. Object	There's share houses with 6 rooms, meaning probably there's also 6 residents cars..... Ther isn't other car parking around and even if we want pay for the permit ,we can have only 2 for house.
225. Support	Despite having reservations about a permit scheme in the past, the time has now come to try and limit the amount of vehicles parking on street in this area. It is only due to several households now owning/operating multiple vehicles including trade vans that this need for a limit has arisen. Where people who have the use of a company's van will park them in future remains to be seen, there are no areas for them to be left conveniently except for nearby streets outside the permit zone, thus putting pressure on the residents of those streets to find parking for themselves, so the vicious circle continues. I also feel that owner/occupiers of homes in the area should be granted one permit free of charge with further permits chargeable as most multi vehicle premises tend to be HMO's or rental properties. I would be grateful if RBC would consider this, [REDACTED]
226. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
227. Object	I object because there is no guarentee that the parking scheme will help residents parking. I begrudge paying for permits and still not being able to park anywhere near my house.
228. Support	we need a limit to the number of vehicles trying to park here. houses are only 1 car wide, so more than that are going to create issues . Is there a size restriction for permitted vehicles?
229. Object	I object to the parking permit as there is no guarantee that I will get a parking space any time of day. This is an extra expense.
230. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
231. Support	I support the proposals. It will have an immediate effect [REDACTED], it will immediately free up some space to park. I would like to confirm what the position is regarding the parking of motorcycles is[REDACTED]
232. Support	are you planning to deal with the issues of strategic bad parking that effectively stop cars taking spaces ? also what about people placing bins or cones in the road to "reserve "spaces on a regular basis?
233. Support	I am in support overall however my only hesitation is whether the scheme will be enforced after 5pm as this is when we struggle to park on Beecham Road?
234. Object	No permits . There is no need for them . Nobody wants them .if the road was near town then I could be understandable but it is not . We pay enough on council tax . Should not have to pay to park in the road .
235. Object	I live in Waverley Road and I currently park for free, I do not see why I need to pay for parking. I gain nothing by having to pay for parking. This scheme will mean I have to pay for parking, increase the levels of bureacracy on an annual basis when currently I do not need to and for what benefit, none as far as I can tell as this scheme does not guarantee me a parking space. This cost, as with all such costs, will continue rise on an annual basis again for what benefit. [REDACTED] If parking is already a problem why are more yellow lines being added restricting parking even further? I urge you to reconsider as a parking permit scheme is not the answer to overcrowded parking on our Victorian terraced streets. On a final note I am disappointed that this issue keeps being raised as I thought we had already been consulted on this and the answer was people didn't want this scheme, however it has been raised again and this time received a slim majority, surely it would have made sense to have a super majority otherwise we are worringly entering another Brexit scenario and we all know how well that has turned out!

236. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
237. Object	I live on Waverley Road and have difficulty parking now. If further resrictions are made on other roads it will be impossible. I pay my tax and shouldn't be penalised for parking outside my own house. Why do you think the answer to everything is tax ? If some people can park for free , why should others be charged ? I will vote for the opposition if this goes through.I arrive home from work in the early hours, its no fun trying to find somewhere to park at that hour.
238. Object	St Ronans Road is part of purely residential area which is even not being a main road. This is far away from Reading Town Centre, therefore I do not see reason for assuming excessive parking in this area, by non-residents.Additionally parking permit do not guarantee parking space, therefore I do not agree with introducing parking permit area.
239. Object	We do not believe it will increase the amount of parking in our street. We do not want to have to pay to park in our street.We have always been able to find a space in our street.During the day, there are always plenty of spaces and no problems to park at all.Parking restrictions mean that workers, friends and family will not be able to park without a permit (which comes at a cost and inconvenience[REDACTED]Your proposed parking restrictions (the yellow lines) at the bottom of Longridge Close, means there will actually be less parking. I think it is very wrong to do this during what has been an incredibly challenging and financially difficult time for most people. People's circumstances will have changed permanently because of this pandemic and I think this needs to be considered.
240. Object	[REDACTED] As my car is not registered to the house I cannot receive a permit. The visitor permits would not help as we would go through those permits too quickly. The house itself does not have a car so they and myself do not gain anything from this proposal. The 5 massive vans that park down the road are the issue. 100% object to this proposal as so many people are put out because of it. We are more than happy to buy a permit but we are unable because my car is not registered to the road.
241. Support	Since the pandemic parking has not been such an issue, however previously finishing work and getting home any later than 7pm meant you could not park on your road and would spent 15 mins driving around to have a suitable space. I feel in these times we should be encouraging households to car share and /or use public transport or make use of the new cycle lanes for local journeys, to help reduce emissions and protect the environment. It's a simple fact that multiple adult occupancy is now part of modern life with children boomeranging home in their 20's and many people house sharing, however it simple isn't feasible to have 3 vehicles per household on a road where each house is wide enough to park 1 car outside. As much as I feel each household should have 1 permit for free as we pay our council tax for road use, I do think a permit system would help tackle the parking problems we experience on Beecham Road.
242. Object	Why should we pay for parking and then not be guaranteed a parking space? I would like the research made available that you have completed which has led to the decision to introduce permits. A car is approximately one length of a house on beecham road if there are houses with two cars or houses that have been turned into flats and have two cars we'll just be paying to not have a space still? I understand from your article from July 2019 it is to encourage residents to use alternative forms of travel close to the city centre but many use their cars to travel to work outside of the city centre. [REDACTED]
243. Object	This proposal does not offer assurance that the parking/trsffic situation will be improved.
244. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
245. Support	Supporting these proposals will reduce excess vehicles from the road, thus allowing fairer parking for all. However, a solution needs to be found whereby, those who professionally give care to residents, are allowed to do so without fear of reprisal (or stress to the residents). The proposals for the top of Beecham road are unclear regarding the double yellow lines, which are currently in place. The proposals only comment on one side of the road, but not the other. Will there be changes to the current road markings in this area, as there are residents on Waverley road who have driveways accessed from Beecham road. We are concerned that changes made will block the entrances to these driveways ?

246. Object	Houses were built before families had cars. Now they are also being given council permission for changing to flats so 1 house often has 4 cars. It's frustrating to come home & have to drive in ever increasing circles searching for a space but this will make us pay for the privilege - [REDACTED][I understand that RBC has been kept woefully short of funds by this & the last government but this isn't fair. We have no parking because there are more cars than spaces; PLEASE don't charge us for having limited space. There's also no need for daytime restrictions- vehicles parked here then are all visitors or people working in houses. No one parks here to go elsewhere as in the days of Elm Park or in the hospital area where permits have been a big help. I'm rambling but am so upset about this. PLEASE abandon this proposal.
247. Object	[REDACTED] having to pay an additional fee for parking would too much for me to bare.
248. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
249. Object	As a resident, I do not agree you should have to pay to park on your own street. We pay enough tax. Tax commercial vehicles who seem to be parking up over night more and more on these residential roads. If you provided free permits with proof of residence and vehicle registration to addresses within the scheme I would consider supporting it but to charge residents seems counter intuitive. I would have thought the scheme's only benefit would be to prevent those from outside the area coming here to park. If this is the case, why not provide residents with FREE permits?
250. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
251. Support	Please have parking permit restrictions for Brisbane Road. Impossible to park as a resident on a regular basis.
252. Support	To many bed sits with up to 4/5 cars in each house so after 4 pm lucky to have a parking space for residents who don't have a drive way/ dig up their garden
253. Object	Parking is not actually that bad down Grovelands Road.
254. Object	Not needed. Would be paying for non guaranteed parking. Money making scheme that doesn't benefit residents
255. Object	No I don't support the proposal for grovelands road I live on the 27 grovelands road and happy as it is free parking
256. Object	Though we can appreciate the inconvenience and annoyance that can sometimes occur when trying to find parking in the proposed area, the introduction of a paid for parking scheme managed by an inept council is NEVER the answer. It seems that some are willing to sacrifice the rights of others and the current FREE parking area on the ONE possible positive outcome - that they MIGHT get a parking spot on their street - BUT THIS IS NOT GUARANTEED. On the other hand there are a swathe of NEGATIVE effects of such a scheme, including but limit not limited to, the PUNITIVE effect on families that need two vehicles due to work and children. The £150 odd for a 2nd permit is highway robbery and will only harm those who can least afford it - families on YOUR STREET. Add to this the already maximum increase by this council on council tax, and a family needing two cars will be landed with an increase of over 10% on their already outrageous council tax bill, just for the privilege of parking on THEIR STREET - and it gets worse. With the need for 'Visitor Permits' the council will directly dictate how many visitors you may have at YOUR HOME and how long they can stay. These permits are not 'free' you are already paying for them in the original permit, but a limit of 40 half-days is not even ONE PER WEEK and that's only if they stay for half a day, if you have visitors staying overnight then this is not even ONE PER FORTNIGHT unless of course you are willing to fork out EVEN MORE money. So much for the grandparents visiting or coming to visit the family for Sunday lunch or having other relatives or friends to visit and stay over. What happens if a family relies on a relative who does not live in the area for child care during work hours, or even as social support? Well that's pretty much gone with this scheme. Keep in mind that once this occurs it will be here to stay and will not just affect people who live in these areas today, but for GENERATIONS to come. I[REDACTED] we have only really had a major problem parking a handful of times and we consider this a small price to pay for the FREEDOM of being able to park without having to prove who we are and that visitors to our house can enjoy that same FREEDOM without the tyranny and oversight of the council.

	DO NOT SUPPORT this proposal!
257. Support	Support this for Beecham Road - very narrow road, many large white vans park in this road, mounting kerb, causing obstruction. There are many challenges for services using the road, deliveries, emergency services. With permit parking, hopefully this will help.
258. Object	There is no clear benefit of permitting the road, The only time there are issues parking are during road works in the surrounding areas forcing people to park on our road, this is very occasional.
259. Support	As a resident of St Ronans road I strongly support parking permits. The entrance to the road is often very crowded and is hard to see on coming traffic, making it dangerous. People often park on the pavements and on the corners further increasing danger to pedestrians and blocking access for wheelchair and pushchair users.
260. Object	I already pay road tax...Why would anyone want to pay more for having a car parked!!! I am not going to pay for people not being able to park. Your just making people more stressed and possessive other their area!!
261. Object	[REDACTED] we have not had issues with parking and quite frankly we have just had a rise in council tax however no pay rise not even a cost of living pay rise and are not likely to get one for the foreseeable. We do not currently pay to park on the rd we live on and pay council tax for and do NOT agree that this should be approved.
262. Object	[REDACTED] I really do not feel that having permits will change the parking situation. The people who park on this street live on this street. It will be the council benefiting from increased revenue. I strongly object to this proposal
263. Object	I live on the west side of Grovelands road, where no restrictions are being considered, I am concerned that people on the east side will just park over here rather than buy a permit
264. Object	You will be charging households £200 a year to park near their home, in areas over a mile from the town centre. This is immoral.
265. Object	[REDACTED] I can't always park in my road or out side my house and object to paying to not park outside my house or any of the surrounding streets Everyone has a car in most of the proposed areas and you are taking away spaces people already park in So where will we all park ?
266. Object	Parking Permits DO NOT guarantee a parking space in this area. *But we have to pay ever year for park permit.* In this pandemic situation, council tax are raising, new park permit is coming, this is not good for any one.
267. Object	I object to this proposal as it is another scheme for taking money from the local residents and there should be better use of double yellows lines and stricter controls by the traffic wardens.
268. Object	I do not believe the proposed parking scheme will improve the parking situation. MY SUGGESTIONS 1) If traffic wardens issued more parking tickets. 2)If vehicles on yellow lines were towed the situation would improve over time. 3) Introduce stronger penalties for commercial vehicles such as dpd vans in residential streets.
269. Object	We already have limited parking so introducing the permit scheme will still not guarantee us a space but we will now be charged for not being able to park near our homes.
270. Object	Too costly for permits and visitor books, whilst 2 hour slots are still provided to the public the worry is how this will be monitored and the fear is we will pay for permits but still have an issue.
271. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
272. Object	We already pay enough council tax to Reading council and as a family of 5 I really cannot justify spending out more money for the ability to park on our road. We have never had an issue parking outside or near our home. We also moved to this house to get away from the parking scheme in our previous residence as we could never park anywhere near and still had to pay.
273. Object	To have to pay to park my car outside my house is a outrageous, another cost I can't afford on my low income. I have no issue parking and never have, and with a permit it won't solve any issues anyone currently has. Just another money making scheme for the Gov...!

274. Object	Cost, I will be paying to park exactly where I park now,[REDACTED]. And limiting visitors unless you can afford more visiter permits is rotten .
275. Object	Cannot afford the permit charge, we park without additional cost at the moment. We already pay road tax. Permits won't guarantee parking. Under the new proposed plans there will be fewer spaces available.
276. Object	I object to permit scheme as it would not make a difference to number of available spaces. I don't have a problem with finding a space. The only difference would be is that i would pay additional fees on top of tax and insurance etc.. also I have a company vehicle which I would not be able to obtain a permit for. [REDACTED]
277. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
278. Object	I[REDACTED]I feel that such a big scheme should not be implemented without a strong majority (e.g. over 65% support), and not slip through on a slim majority. I feel that we live so far away from the town centre or major shopping / work area that permits are a huge change to a neighbourhood without a clear reason for them to exist, and a clear benefit to the residents who will have to pay for them. I am against residents having to pay for their first permits when we live in "suburbia" and no where near the town centre. I think it will displace parking problems to other streets and then the permit schemes have to move further out and further out. If other residents feel the issue has got worse in a year or two, I would be happy to support a permit scheme then - it can be brought in in the future but I can not see a scenario where a permit scheme would be reversed. I think there needs to be a strong majority, not a slim one to make such a huge decision. I personally have heard no support from neighbours who park on my road for a permit scheme. I have heard a fair bit of anecdotal feedback from residents who have experienced permit parking elsewhere in Reading and have not found it to help the issue of parking in the evening which is when residents have said it can be tricky to find a parking spot near their house. I do think the council needs to look at the issue of oversize / business vehicles to see if there are alternative solutions to an entire neighbourhood being penalised due to oversize commercial vehicles. I appreciate there may not be as I imagine many are leased to the driver and are in their name. It sounds like some of the narrow side streets such as Beecham Road need parking bays painted , and vehicles parked outside them and causing an obstruction on road or pavement to be actively fined, rather than all residents being penalised via a paid for permit scheme. If an issue is due to increasing number of HMOs, then is there a potential solution for them to require a license from the council? I know nothing about this!
279. Object	I do not believe this will sort the parking problem and residents will be charged and still may it be able to find a parking space. I object to this scheme being implemented
280. Object	Wantage Road has used permit parking for years and it's still difficult to get a parking space and prices keep going up. Visitor permits have gone down from one per day to one per half day and the number of books allocated has also gone down and prices have gone up. It's all turned into a money making system and the residents haven't benefited at all. The Councils planning department keep giving permission for houses to be turned into flats and the parking department keep issuing more and more parking permits and it's becoming more and more of a nightmare for residents. Council departments should communicate and make sure communities are looked after instead of squeezing them for more and more money.
281. Object	I believe that while parking is often limited, it is not worth the cost of a permit, nor for visitor permits when family visits (when they're allowed to visit). I have rarely struggled to find a space along the road and have only once needed to park around the corner.
282. Object	Parking permits will not help with parking as there are not enough spaces in the area ! I object to having to pay for the privilege of not being able to park in my road or surrounding roads
283. Object	I object to the proposal because I do not believe it will be practical for the residents living in this area. [REDACTED] £42 is very high to pay for 1 permit especially when it doesn't guarantee a space so you can be paying £42 for nothing and to park further away from your property at a cost. [REDACTED]I do not agree with this change as it will cause more of a hassle for visitors and myself parking at convenience. £42 is a lot of money to pay each year and I am sure it will go up yearly! At least give us one permit for free if this change

	HAS to be made. Even to get more visitor permits you are charging a fee which people can not afford and penalising people who own businesses that can't even park their own business vehicle outside their properties how is that fair? £288.75 to park your business car is ridiculous.
284. Object	I do not think permits will solve the issues around parking on Beecham Road
285. Object	these proposals you have put forward will not help the parking in are area , it cost residents nothing to park at present. to allow permits to oxford rd residents is not a good idea. you should try and find space for them in august end car park there are spaces there The council have tried on at list three times to get permits in this area and failed, but keep asking. if by what means you get it this time can the residents have a new vote to change it back .
286. Object	[REDACTED]. Also many people living in terraced houses are on lower incomes and will struggle to find the money for the permits.
287. Object	I reside on Beecham Road and have always found parking on kerbs an issue which by the way is necessary for larger vehicles to be able to use the road. Creating a parking scheme means that cars will have to still use kerbs to ensure access for other vehicles along the road and so people will be paying to use kerbspace due to the nature of the road layout which really is not fair. [REDACTED] I am completely opposed to the use of visitor permits that last 2 hours and that I have to pay for in the form of booklets. Also if my son stayed for a number of days this means that he would have to find free parking somewhere away which is unlikely and very inconvenient when before covid he didn't have to and all was ok. I object to the scheme and having to spend my money which is hard to find currently in order to park outside my own home.
288. Object	I object to this proposal hugely. The reasons why, due to being a resident on the road in question, parking is absolutely awful. There is never enough spaces, and it's not due to the fact that others park here, it's because there's more people who have cars than there is spaces. I think it would be hugely unfair, for this scheme to come into effect and us residents having to pay for a space that you just wouldn't get, and then to find other parking spaces in surrounding streets, very inconvenient.
289. Object	The scheme will cause cost and inconvenience to residents
290. Object	Dont need permit parking no guarantee of parking outside your property to expensive for permits
291. Object	I do not believe that reducing parking (DYL) and making residents pay to park is the way to alleviate the parking problem for residents on Grovelands Rd. I have always suggested bays being painted either diagonally at a 30 degree angle facing SE on the terraced side of Grovelands Rd, or bays added to the already parallel parking space. Everybody who I have spoken to has welcomed the idea. The 30 degree angle creates a safe reversing radius while also securing almost 75% more parking opportunities. I can provide you with a diagram to show my thinking. The problem is when two adjacent cars leave and another new car arrives, and parks in the middle of where those two cars just were, thus removing the potential for 2 residents to park. With bays painted, at least residents and non-residents will be conscious of the space they are taking up.
292. Object	No guarantee of parking spaces for residents. No impact assessment on how much space would be freed up for residents if the restrictions prevented non-residents' parking. Lack of information and public discussion.
293. Support	We need as many resident only spaces as possible please. Not sure why there needs to be shared parking when there are so many visitors permits given per year?
294. Object	The only people that park here live here there are no schools, hospitals supermarkets etc. that they are accessing. One car "cheap" permit per house is okay for small households, younger and poorer people that rent out rooms in shareue d houses shouldn't be penalised. No commercial vehicles? Is this true? What counts? company cars? Vehicles with advertising? - More penalisation of workers. Why is it so expensive!!!Whay are the rules so opaque. [REDACTED]
295. Object	Parking in the area currently is unrestricted and this doesn't create an issue. We feel it will create more of a problem for local residents in the following aspects 1) Tradesmen when working in the area at one of the addresses. This currently isn't a problem. In previous experience the road is relatively empty during work hours.

	2) Visitors are restricted under the proposed scheme and it will create plenty of hassle and introduce more loneliness to residents 3) Properties on this address were purchased with unrestricted parking and the effect this could have on prices etc hasn't been taken into consideration 4) We have already had enough road works outside (including the unannounced telecoms works which have caused disruption) we don't need more. Ultimately the current system isn't broken. It is only annoying during certain short windows of the day, but I have yet never failed to get parked at least a short walk away. Even during peak hours. My last point is that a large majority of the cars who park down this road are already owned by residents. That means that the current parking availability will still persist. This is evidenced by the parking being worse in evenings and Sundays (non-work hours) and better during the work day. All of this effort will be for nothing.Please take this into careful consideration. Thank you for your time.
296. Support	Good proposals and about time! Parking has been a nightmare in these areas for many years. Large business vans park in these streets regularly and should not be given permits unless the business is within the zone.
297. Support	My wife and I support the proposal on the grounds that the Grovelands Road area is over populated with vehicles of all kinds. Many of the vehicles are the overflow from streets with a permit parking scheme near by. The area is populated with HMOs and conversions, very often tenants bring one or more vehicles with them. For example a small terraced house converted to 5 rooms with 5 or more tenants often attracts multiple vehicles. Restricting the number of vehicles per household can only be done through a permit scheme. Parking in the Grovelands road area is becoming untenable.
298. Object	This would depend on how genuine local resident are guaranteed their parking spaces as opposed to households with more than say two cars who feel that they have an entitlement to park in your area because of the knock on effect of permit parking that has also sprang in their area pushing the problem on elsewhere plus the inconveniences of large commercial vehicles taking up multiple spaces.If off-road parking are provided for commercial vehicles especially for households where it is their main means of transport then it might receive my support.If there is no support for visitors to park because they are from outside the area then I would be objecting to the proposal.
299. Object	Because I am living here,and i don't see any reason to pay for parking like when i go in town center.
300. Object	Does not stop non-residents parking. Does not help the community.
301. Object	The plan is complete confusing.
302. Object	Fewer parking spaces available, so even with residents only parking there will not be better access to parking near home.Cost of permits and guest parking permits means cost of living increase for no additional benefit.No permits for commercial vehicles, so scheme is biased against working class people/self employed people.
303. Object	Permits will not ease parking difficulties as they will issue far more permits than there are residents. I think we should firstly introduce paint bay markers along the roads to help people park better. It would be unfair to have to pay extra to park outside my own home and pay extra for visitors.
304. Object	There is no evidence to suggest that introducing permits would increase the availability of spaces on my road (Beecham Road). The only evidence I have seen (albeit not very scientific) was during the first lockdown, when you could assume all the cars in the road were owned by residents, the road was full. Had the permit scheme been in place then, it’s unlikely to have made a difference to parking. Therefore if the council were prepared to run a trial for 6/12 mths, share the results and analysis - then go to a vote, I think that would be a much more informed way forwards. But until that happens there simply isn’t enough information to support permits.It’s my guess that the real problem is multiple cars associated with 1 building. Either where the building has been converted to flats, or where 1 household owns more than 1 car. In all of these instances everyone has a justification to park on the road.
305. Object	It will actually make it harder for residents and their visitors to find parking near to where they live, plus they will even have to pay for the privilege.

306. Object	It’s just another way for the council to make money which alienates resident feeling towards the council, at the same time as it makes it harder for residents and their visitors to manage their own parking.
307. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
308. Support	I am in full support of a Resident Permit Scheme for several reasons. Firstly I have mobility issues and can have difficulty walking very far especially if carrying shopping or other heavy items. Secondly returning to Beecham Road after 4.30 pm can result in great difficulty in finding a space anywhere in the road so shopping, appointments and evening outings have to be planned very carefully. Lastly, if I am unable to find a space there is nowhere else to park in the local area as they are all permits only.
309. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
310. Object	object to having to pay to park outside our own house, and the need to buy permits for visitors to park outside our house .[REDACTED]
311. Object	We are not aware of any parking issues in this area and have always been able to find somewhere to park. [REDACTED]To introduce a system that would cost money to initiate and enforce seems counter productive especially where there is no problem and which incurs no cost to residents and council presently.
312. Object	As a resident within the current residents parking scheme on Waverley Road I object to this proposal. At present you are unable to effectively police the current scheme, despite promises made when you first introduced increased charges. How can you justify extending it when currently cars /vans park all day / overnight on a regular basis within the zone, often unchallenged. This should be seen for what it is, an opportunity to make more money for the council. These are difficult times for many people and to present this during the current pandemic is insensitive. It adds potential costs of £200 for residents with 2 cars, on top of the top increase you chose to apply to the council tax.
313. Object	I can see no real advantages of this scheme to me as a resident.Parking is neither protected nor guaranteed for me as a resident.It feels like I will be being charged for literally the exact same situation as currently.
314. Object	Permit parking does not solve parking problems in this area. Small terrace houses with multiple families and/or multiple cars living in a street that was not designed for that many cars is the problem. Fewer cars and purpose built flats for multiple family housing is a solution. The number of non-resident cars parking in these streets is negligible
315. Object	[REDACTED] I drive a van for work , which under your proposals I can't park . Plus why should I have to pay over £200 to park my car and a second vehicle just a money making scheme by the council and think it's disgusting [REDACTED]
316. Object	Think it just a money making exexrsice , I've not voted for this result
317. Object	I do not want to have to pay for on-street parking.I should not have to pay £42 and £157.50 a year to park outside my own house!!
318. Object	The number of non-resident vehicles in this area must be very small as we are a long way from the town, therefore it is difficult to see how permit parking will provide extra spaces.Given that the bus fare to town/station is the same from here or Tilehurst it does not make sense. What is the evidence? [REDACTED] It is unfair to those who cannot create off-road parking on their property or who are reluctant to do so. The 'green' answer ultimately is to discourage multiple car ownership.The last vote on this issue was very close. It is a divisive issue and will cause additional stress to people already overloaded at this time. Could not some of the present yellow and white line restrictions be removed along with an enforced low speed limit? This could actually create spaces. [REDACTED]
319. Object	Why should we have to pay for the privilege to park down our road outside our house. 1 permit should be free but it is not. It also does not guarantee parking on my road
320. Object	The proposal will increase the cost to households without improving parking for those who live in the area.
321. Object	Care agencies would be fined for using this area for parking to care for vulnerable people .

322. Object	The reason I am objecting is that carers won't be able to park close by to give their services to the elderly
323. Support	Anything to help residents to park!
324. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
325. Object	It will make it impossible for a Beecham Road resident's career to visit without risking a parking fine.
326. Object	The residents parking permit scheme is taxing poorer people who live in busy areas. Residents in more prosperous areas such as Caversham Heights do not have to pay for residents parking permits. The extension of residents parking permits in some areas of the borough and not others discriminates against poorer members of the area.
327. Object	Parking permit do not ensure parking space. This is a residential area not in close proximity from town center or other public and leisure areas.
328. Object	Your proposal is wrong in that the parking will not be relieved by the introduction of the scheme. The proposal will not reduce commercial vehicles parking overnight and this is bourn out by evidence from residents and other similar imposed schemes around Reading.The only way to relieve parking difficulties for residents is to prohibit commercial vehicles from parking in residential streets overnight. This can be achieved by either a costly permit scheme or by simply installing marked bays in problem streets and having these monitored by CEO's.[REDACTED] and the increase in parking difficulties (and damage to residents cars) can be correlated directly with the amount of commercial vehicles parking overnight. I strenuously object to the proposed scheme.
329. Object	[REDACTED]Why should we have to pay to park?? We don't have a choice as most of us don't have driveways and struggle as it is!!
330. Object	After reviewing the proposals for parking permits in Waverley Road Reading.We are strongly opposing the plans.Our understanding is that even with permits this would not neccessarily provide better parking for the residents.[REDACTED]and have never had parking issues with residents and non residents,many of us have some form of off road parking which eliviates this area.we realise that either end of the road have parking issues(terraced houses) which could be difficult with the rounderbouts.our thoughts are this is a money making scheme by the council with no benefits to the residents,and almost a £200 bill every year from most households,who already pay council tax and road tax .all the years we have lived here ,there has never been a problem.[REDACTED]
331. Object	I do not support the scheme, as this is not going to achieve anything substantial about parking, but additional charge to the local residents. And this is on top of constantly increasing road tax, council tax etc. in current financial climate with Covid affecting job security and reduced wages. I'm not entirely against it, but these changes should happen when family's got more security about their budget.
332. Object	Don't believe it will make any difference. All the vehicles I can see from my window in Beecham Rd belong to residents. The problem is HMOs which should never have been permitted.
333. Object	I want to support to our local residents respect their opinion
334. Object	I object because I don't want to have to fork out another bill just to park in front of my house. I have lived on Grovelands Road for nearly 30 years and I don't understand as to why parking permits need to come out now. In my opinion it's just another money making scheme.
335. Object	We object to the proposed permit scheme on the following grounds: - 1. We do not feel that having a scheme will reduce the perceived parking issues, and certainly in our area – Waverley road – there is no need for this scheme. 2. If one of the issues that is being attempted to be addressed is the parking of commercial vehicles – over length and over height – then any parking permit scheme will only move the problem to other areas. 3. If current road traffic regulations were enforced properly, then the commercial vehicle issue would not exist. 4. It feels like this is a money-making exercise for the council – taxation by stealth – and we do not recognise the argument that 'we are only covering costs of administering the scheme' 5. We would have to buy 2 permits, and this cost will only rise on a year-by-year basis, and we already pay enough.

	6. If people are parking during the day to travel into town for work purposes, or other, then with the current pandemic, and ongoing work/life changes, then this will reduce the instances of this anyway. 7. Going forward anyone who might have used public transport previously, will most likely take a car and use the town centre carparks! 8. Any parking scheme does not, cannot and will not guarantee a parking space within the permit zone, and as you would have to do today, if you can't find a space, you go to the next street to find one so this only pushes any problem further out and will lead to more permit areas being introduced with more stealth taxation – where does this end? 9. Paying to have visitors is wrong! 10. At a time when the community has come together, this scheme will only bring discord.
336. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
337. Object	1.The proposed scheme does not seem to resolve issues faced by residents with parking: we pay our money but are not guaranteed a space in which to park within the zone 2. For people who rely on visits from family or friends for contact with the outside world, help with daily tasks etc, the 2hr "window", whilst helpful, penalises those who work, and visit residents outside of this time. This will soon use up the book of tickets and means buying more...an additional cost. 3. For families which have three (or more) vehicles who may not now be allowed space within the zone, they will put additional pressure on areas on the boundary of the zone, which seems unfair on those residents 4. There are ways of creating more parking spaces within the zone, along Longridge close, with parking bays either side, part on the pavement, part on the road, and still allow access for bin lorries, emergency vehicles etc (The yellow lines on the corner where Longridge Close joins St Ronan's Road will increase safety and is very welcome)Making the section of Waverley Road between the final turning and Grovelands Road one way, and doing away with the yellow lines altogether here, will also significantly increase parking spaces and ease pressure in roads such as Beecham Road 5. We shall be paying out money every year, for really very little, if any, improvement with parking locally. Already three residents from our road have moved for this reason: it such a big impact on everyone's lives. As children get older and have their own car, they cannot guarantee being able to even park it... another reason two further families are attempting to move!It just feels this is being pushed upon us, with a very large minority of almost 50% not being in favour
338. Support	I believe we should be discouraging car use wherever possible, and discouraging non-residents from parking in the area is one way of doing this. Will the council be restricting the number of permits to match the number of parking spaces? How will permits be allocated to residents of HMOs? Will vulnerable residents be given any priority? What will the dispute resolution process be?
339. Object	I am 100% completely against this scheme and have set out my reasonings for this below: • I shouldn't have to pay to park at my home, especially when a scheme still does not guarantee a space. • I should not have to pay to have family or friends visit me and park there cars here. • People who live here, will have bought or rented these houses, knowing that they do not come with allocated driveways/parking in most cases. • I find the scheme to be incredibly antisocial and it puts me off living in the area. • I have already found it is causing a huge divide in our community and many are finding the prospect of the change quite concerning. [REDACTED] • Introducing a permit scheme is not going to change how close people can park to their home. • To me, permit schemes are simply another way for the council to make money, from people who already pay extortionate amounts of council tax. • I honestly believe, that if people have a need to park on their literal doorstep then buy a house elsewhere. There are houses with driveways around reading, far cheaper than Waverley/Grovelands and surrounding. I know this, because I have checked. • Having spoken to 10+ of my neighbours, I am yet to hear somebody say that they want this scheme.

	• Rather than a parking scheme, I actually think it would be far more beneficial for the council to review the space in which is taken up by yellow lines. Many of us have discussed how an additional 5 - 10 spaces could be introduced, whilst still providing enough room for moving traffic.
340. Support	I strongly support the proposal. There are a significant number of large commercial vehicles that park in the road, usually straddling and obstructing the pavement to allow traffic to pass. The number of HMOs (licenced or otherwise) has grown recently each with several cars which mean that there is reduced capacity for parking for everybody else. [REDACTED]Similar parking schemes have been introduced nearby which, according to residents, have been a great success and have alleviated many of their parking difficulties so if that works for them why should not residents in the Grovelands Road area benefit in the same way? I support the shared parking between 0900 and 1700 Mon-Fri because the road does normally have capacity for this. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
341. Support	More flats and too many commercial vehicles taking up spaces. Been an issue for yearsbin shaftesbury.
342. Object	I believe that this scheme will ultimately reduce the availability of parking and also forcing residents to pay for parking seems counterintuitive to the point. Rather then permit parking there should just be marked bays that are painted to help people parking appropriately mark where they should put their car, even when other cars are not there. Many people will park according to another car and it ultimately limits how many cars can fit along the road. I would prefer this step to be taken before moving to residents paying for permits.
343. Support	We support the council's proposal of resident's parking with shared parking between 9am and 5pm .
344. Support	In principal I support the proposal, as the huge majority of areas in Reading require Parking Permits to park or are paid areas. With that being the case, then it's only fair that a resident is entitled to one Parking Permit per house. However, I do not agree having to pay a considerable amount of money for parking where I live: I'm not a house owner and I believe I already contribute enough on Taxes. This should be supported by residents who require more than one Permit and by those who do abusive parking that are not residents in the area.
345. Object	Basically another additional cost with no extra provision for spaces. People will still need to park but will have to pay for the privilege
346. Object	[REDACTED] This will cause a drop in house prices. Visitors will no longer be able to stay for the weekend without a lot of messing about. There are no additional parking spaces it is just an extra tax we will be expected to pay for no additional parking spaces.[REDACTED] I will take legal advice on this as this whole process has been decided prior to a residents vote. We live in a democracy and at the next council elections things like this unnecessary tax on motorists will be made an issue by me.
347. Object	I object to this proposal as it is an unreasonable and grossly unfair to those who reside here as well as to the impact this will have for families and friends visiting due to the fact that this is for 7 days a week . This isolates people especially elderly and single people even more. I would have never chosen to live in this area if this was planned and especially in these difficult times .
348. Object	This is an outrageous proposal and I will most definitely not be voting this local council back in. You are dictating how many visitors that I will be allowed for the year and given the difficult year we have all had this has a grave impact both mentally and socially. What an uncaring borough whereby finances come first before the welfare of the community.
349. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
350. Object	I live on Beecham road. The only times parking is readily available is during working hours and that is not helpful as I and most others will be at work. Around 6pm, the parking spaces extremely difficult to come by and we are then forced to look on Waverley Avenue and sometimes St. George's Terr. But under the new proposed parking scheme, both of those roads will also be subject to the new scheme. The rates you are proposing for to get permits are ridiculously high and it's not like we don't pay enough council tax already which is always going up. And this too will also increase annually and we will not see any benefit in it as we won't be guaranteed a parking spot. Also with the proposed yellow lines, this will reduce the areas where we can park.I am vehemently objecting to these new proposals as they do not benefit the residents of Reading and only the council who stand to make even more money from this. I would suggest you see the perspective of the residents rather than from the perspective of your own pockets.

351. Object	The proposed scheme appears to involve charging without the guarantee of a parking space.
352. Object	Introducing parking permits will not guarantee a parking space. Although difficult to find parking at times, it is always possible to find something within 1/2 mile. The more parking restrictions are introduced, the harder this will become. The simple fact is there are more cars than spaces available. Marking designated parking bays on the road and penalising incorrect use would improve parking etiquette and maximise use of the space available. Banning parking of long wheel base commercial vans would also be highly beneficial and create more space.
353. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
354. Object	We often have family relatives staying with us; they are retired and rely upon us to care for them in our home on a regular basis (they do not hold Blue Badges). They are now expected we assume to pay for that privilege because they will require a permit to park their cars. Will this not discourage them from seeking the assistance they quite clearly require? It is obvious that no thought has been given to the proposal other than the obvious financial benefits for the Council.
355. Object	If the Council insists on implementing the Permit Scheme the erection of additional poles and increased signage will be detrimental to the ambience of the Drive. It will affect our enjoyment of the locality, adversely affect the 'street scene' with additional furniture and there will be a significant detrimental impact on the value of our home
356. Object	Family and friends would not visit as they do now.
357. Object	Similar proposals previously presented did not get the local residents' support. The current situation isnt ideal but his wont improve things it will only add an additional cost to residents who are all struggling financially with the COVID situation. Shows the mentality of the local council when this is the priority in the current climate!
358. Object	I feel the council are penalising us hard workers, and instead, should be looking at other means of making money.
359. Object	I strongly object to the proposal since having a little struggle with parking is rather more acceptable than the significant financial burden that this scheme is going to impose on the residents.
360. Object	Many people cannot afford to pay for parking and will no doubt park on the surrounding streets, causing congestion. This ridiculous a idea if you live in Longridge Close.
361. Object	[REDACTED] needs to park a company vehicle at his address in order to be able to carry out his work, He has had no difficulty with parking before, and introducing a permit scheme will complicate matters.
362. Object	What about the ability to pay, not everyone can afford to pay for parking. Currently its free. Now you expect us to pay. We will be unable to afford our friends and family coming to stay anymore. Please dont do this and make all our lives more difficult in these trying times.
363. Object	I dont understand why residents in Longridge Close are being penalised in this way. You intend making it impossible for guests to come stay during weekends without incurring charges? Other streets in this scheme do not apply these charges at weekends. Totally unfair.
364. Object	I object because we had a vote a few years ago which objected to the permit scheme , but then some people weren't happy, so we have another vote, & now it seems the scheme is going ahead, it's just a money making scheme by the council. Also we had resurfacing in Waverley Road this year with no yellow lines in place , & there were no parking issues or accidents. The yellow lines in some area's are not needed, & now I understand they are adding more. [REDACTED] I'll be parking on the road, so less room for others to park who haven't a drive, the whole things a joke & should be scrapped, it's going to make things worse, people having to park further away from there homes. Will it go to another vote if it fails, probably not,too much money involved .
365. Support	I support permit parking to be introduced in Beecham Road because we have a selection of work vehicles that park in the street taking up half of the pavement making it difficult for a buggy to get by or an emergency vehicle. There are some houses with multiple vehicles. There are vehicles not belonging to Beecham Road taking parking space.
366. Object	[REDACTED] there are no parking restrictions and the distance enough from the town centre for parking not to be a problem. Many friends have been and are residents on the street and always have a space. I do not feel that the permit parking would make a

	difference to residents being able to park, and feel it would just be an added cost for residents.
367. Object	This road does not need permits, the cars parking on the streets belong to the owners of the houses and therefore only adding to our outgoings making us pay to park our own cars or pay for visitors.
368. Object	The proposal to make Beecham Road permit parking is unfair as it is mostly residents parking on the street. Also, I live alone and it makes it harder and less desirable for people to visit me and I rely greatly on help from my family and friends.
369. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
370. Object	The new measures do not guarantee parking outside own home which many mistakenly believe will be the case. It will be very restrictive for us having visitors for the day or a longer period and what is currently free, we will now have to pay for ! Appears solely a money making project for the council. We don't want it and we live here,.
371. Object	[REDACTED] The same amount of cars will be here but just under permits and making it tricky to have visitors.
372. Object	[REDACTED] feel that the addition of parking permits is a money making exercise by the local council, and will not contribute to a significant or worthwhile change in the number of parked cars, or competition for spaces on our road. No data has been supplied to residents to show that the scheme would help reduce congestion, nor have we seen anything to show that in locations where similar schemes have been implemented, the majority of residents continue to be satisfied with it.We are disappointed that the council plan to charge for every permit, including the first one, at a time when household incomes are squeezed due to significant council tax increases, increased unemployment, and general inflation. To introduce permits would cause further inequality, with those that are well off able to easily afford them, and those on lower wages having to pay yet more from already minimal incomes. We object wholeheartedly to any permit scheme. And if one were to go ahead, we object to the introduction of any cost for the first permit. We believe that the cost of the scheme should be borne by the council from existing funding, and where this is not available, the scheme should be self funded from the income made from fines - not from charging the local residents who are unfortunate enough to live here.We have also noted that our street (Beecham Road) would not benefit from the 2 hour waiting period which others would, putting us at a disadvantage to other local roads where this has been proposed. This would negatively impact on day to day activities, for example, deliveries of goods and prescriptions, short visits from family and friends etc. It also has a potential to impact the value of our property in comparison to similar properties on surrounding roads. We hope our objections and comments will be taken into consideration and that this scheme will be rejected. If the scheme goes ahead, the objections to certain elements of it should be taken into consideration as given above.
373. Object	It is not needed, it won't reduce the amount of cars as we all live here! Rarely do others park here to go to town or train station etc, so is just home owners and their visitors. You are now proposing restrictions which we don't want ! Why should we now have to pay yearly for something that is presently free, and it is a disaster for having visitors; the books of tickets do not cover longer term/ regular visits, very restrictive and Dickensian, so no,
374. Object	- It will cost us to visit our family. - There will be less parking spaces on our road due to oxford road residents getting our spaces. - I do not believe this will solve the parking problem, it will only make it worse.
375. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
376. Object	The issue in the area is not the types of vehicles in the parking area its the standard of parking and random non permitted disabled bays, we can't park outside our house becuse next door has adisabled bay outside!For example if all vehicles parked well enough, you could still reduce the amount of parking and just stop commercial parking (i.e vehicles from Oxford Road) and people leaving cars to use the train station/shopping Assign parking spaces in the roads - job done, no need for over extortianate priced parking permits that I already pay car tax for. I need a car for work!!
377. Object	Permits will not make parking any easier as 99% cars belong to residents living in the area and I don't want to pay to park miles away when I can do that for free already
378. Object	[REDACTED] o The council should be seeking to try to preserve the integrity of such houses and not encourage owners to degrade them. The proposals fail to take into account the greater pressure we will subjected to and the lack of any alternative the new scheme will

	provide for us, such as membership of the proposed scheme. We vote against and propose you devise a new plan which will take our needs into account.
379. Object	Having reviewed the detail in the proposed plans, I cannot identify tangible benefits to be gained from implementing the scheme for residents, only downsides including complexity and new costs. I am concerned that the plans may disadvantage some residents, without providing any corresponding upside or benefit for the greater community.
380. Object	Having revised the conditions for this, although I was supporting the proposal before I believe I have to object now. I don't agree having to pay additional taxes for parking where I live and not having a parking guaranteed, so that's pretty much how it is at the moment anyway.
381. Object	Having revised the conditions for this, although I was supporting the proposal before I believe I have to object now. I don't agree having to pay additional taxes for parking where I live and not having a parking guaranteed, so that's pretty much how it is at the moment anyway.
382. Object	As a resident of Waverley Road and long term resident of this area, I strongly object to the forced introduction of this scheme, particularly after we fought off such an proposal a few years ago. - [REDACTED] parking has always been an issue for residents. The simple fact is, that residents of this area, as in many others, own more cars than there are spaces. Unfortunately, those cars will be needed, once people return to their daily commutes. - [REDACTED] - this would also be discriminatory against poorer and larger households - especially those where children can't afford to move out of the family home - introduce permits and you are not going to reduce the number of cars owned, just force people to park in other areas (I'm pretty sure the residents in and around Windrush way are going to be inundated) or dangerously and antisocially - e.g. and around the borders of Prospect park where there are already huge problems with blocked pavements. - Pressurising the Government to block HMOs and the building of flats without adequate off street parking would be a better option - Anyone that seriously believes that such a scheme is going to miraculously solve their parking problems is deluding themselves, and once introduced, this scheme will not be removed even after they realise this.
383. Object	Having permit parking does not give me guaranteed parking on Beecham Road. I always come late from work and most of the time have to park at random spots on Beecham Road, sometimes at the top of the road and walk down to my house which is the end of the road. If permit parking goes ahead i will be paying £42 to walk up or down the road to get to my car. I do support Designated parking spot for each household with permit parking
384. Object	I strongly object to the parking proposal for the following reasons: 1) There has always been difficulty parking in the these roads because there are not enough parking spaces for the amount of cars belonging to residents. This is compounded by the conversion of family homes to HMOs without consideration of parking availability. However, the HMOs are not going away and the proposed limit of two cars per house will cause problems for those currently living in HMOs. This scheme will not create the number of spaces required. Where are they going to park? 2) Families with children live here. What happens when the children begin to drive and wish to buy their own cars? They will not qualify for a permit if both parents already have cars. Where do they park? 3) The parking problem will be pushed elsewhere. During the consultation at Wilson Primary, we talked about the residents of Windrush way being involved. I don't think this has happened and I'm certain that the parking situation (which is already bad on the estate) will get worse, as will the parking around Prospect Park. Parking difficulties will be also be pushed out to roads on the other side of Grovelands. 4) Paying for a permit will not guarantee a parking space, so residents will end up paying up to approx £200 pa (+ cost of visitors permits) for what they already have. 5) The cost of two permits per household per year as well as paying for the privilege of receiving visitors arriving by car is no small outlay

	and, as always, those who are living on tight budgets will be further disadvantaged. 5) I have no doubt if this proposal is imposed it will pit neighbours against each other and risks damaging the sense of community that this area prides itself on. Living at the Prospect Park end of Waverley, opposite a stretch of permit parking, I have seen this first hand. And again, family houses and HMOs with more than two cars per household are unable to fit in the stretch of road. 6) I may be cynical, but if this is imposed there is no guarantee that the costs won't be ramped up each year. 7) Once imposed it will be extremely difficult to remove. Please, please don't impose this on us.
385. Support	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
386. Object	1)The area covered by the scheme is way too large and hence will not solve anything. 2)This is simply a money-making scheme by the councill / an additional tax. Making me pay for something that is currently free without providing any additional services. 3) even though i would be parking one car on the driveway and one on the road i would still have to pay for two permits, as they are home at alternating times (shift workers). - total ripoff.
387. Object	We currently have difficulty parking near to our houses in Beecham road as it is. I feel that for residents, we would have to pay for a permit and that still won't guarantee a space. If it were to guarantee a parking space then I wouldn't object to paying for a permit.All this does is guarantee Reading Borough council more revenue and changes nothing except additional costs for residents who already pay enough council tax I feel.Whilst I appreciate what you are trying to do, if you travel to other areas where this is already in place and speak to residents they will tell you exactly that. The only thing that has changes for them is that they now have to pay and still struggle to park anywhere near their house. I'd prefer one free permit per household, problem solved. Some residents I believe, have 4 vehicles per household and whilst I appreciate some have no vehicle, this doesn't balance out so one per household with no charge for that permit is surely an option to be considered?
388. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
389. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
390. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
391. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
392. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
393. Object	There is no need for this scheme. These roads are not used by persons visiting the town centre and parking here (otherwise there would be no parking available during the daytime/weekends) It disproportionately affects those who live in houses with high occupancy (shared houses, adult children sharing with parents etc). The scheme will financially cost (the residents) to administer and there is no overall benefit to them. Also - there is no proper method using this type of poll, to ensure that multiple responses are not sent in by individuals, therefore the results of this consultation cannot be considered valid.
394. Object	Parking permin will jot guarantee any parking space for me. This will not change my parking situation on Shaftesbury Road. The only benefit is for council from the parking permit fee. It will make sense if parking spaces will be assigned.
395. Object	Poll allows multiple submissions - Also the scheme is pointless and not required - it will only persecute persons living here - the myth that people park here and travel in to town to avoid town centre parking fees is erroneous.
396. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
397. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
398. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]

399. Object	Not required
400. Object	How else do people with a works van park?
401. Support	I support the proposal but with reservations. If I could be sure that I could park on Beecham Road with a permit I would rest easy with the decision. Having to park streets away and walk, sometimes in the dark is not a safe option for residents.It is not clear whether the term 'relevant' permits applies to being able to park on all roads in the Grovelands Road area this would be made worse if the permit were only for the road on which an individual is resident and if there were no spaces on the road and charges incurred for parking on a road nearby that would be unreasonable. For Beecham Road without the option of 2 hours with no return within 2 hours parking for non-residents Monday - Sunday 9am - 5pm ,residents will be using up their half day unit permits quicker and will therefore be paying more to have visitors than residents on the other roads in the Grovelands Road area where there is provision for non-permit holders. This is unfair. If residents have family who live elsewhere necessitating an overnight stay this will also incur further payment for visitor permits. During this past year of loneliness and isolation this is an unfair penalty for residents. It is not clear what the 'limited waiting' time would be for parking for 'non-permit holders and whether the zones for this include Beecham Road. If residents require deliveries or tradesmen to undertake work on their properties this will again incur an unfair charge in using up the permits. on Beecham Road. It has been a while since views were taken initially and at that time there was to be no charge for a first car, then it went to £20 for one car now it is £42. This is an unreasonable increase and not in line with the much smaller % increase of other household bills. All of the charges are targeting people who by nature of the area are in the lower income bracket. If there are to be permits, all parking should be for Beecham Road residents only, the businesses at the bottom of the road should not be taking residents spaces. Beecham Road is the longest road in Reading with no o other roads leading off of it and is often used as a 'rat run' by cars speeding down to the Oxford Road. with no regard for residents and their young families.. Money should be invested in resolving this
402. Object	just dont like it
403. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
404. Object	Resident parking is not required in this area.
405. Object	I have one car in my household, most households in my immediate area, with a few exceptions, have more than one car/van so parking has always been a challenge for me. However from the information, proposed permit restrictions and the fact that this time we are not offered one free permit per household as before, I cannot see there will be any parking benefits or improvements for residents. So sadly I have to object.
406. Object	This proposal has been raised a number of times in the very recent past & was previously objected to by the majority. Is it Reading Borough Councils policy to keep re-raising/re-hashing proposals until they (& the FEW local residents that this will benefit) get the result that they want?
407. Object	This scheme will result in residents spending even more money for living in the area, and it will not resolve the parking problems of the area. Not suggesting a similar scheme for the west of Grovelands Road will result in those on the East side parking on the west side.
408. Object	I strongly object to the proposed parking scheme. Where I live on Waverley road there is never a problem parking during the day so I see absolutely no need for for daytime parking permits. In the evening the parking is busy but I always find a spot within 50 meters of my house. All the cars I see parked in the evening in my area I recognise as my neighbours cars, so permits wouldn't change anything.[REDACTED] I'm sure this is the 2nd or 3rd time I have been asked to vote on permits. It appears to me the council will just keep on asking until they get the answer they want. When it was rejected a couple of years ago that should have been it for a substantial amount of time. Once we are forced to have permits (as it appears the council is hell bent on forcing them on us) will we be able to vote on the issue every 1 to 2 years? As this has been the case with trying to introduce permits. I think not. The cost of permits is a joke and goes well beyond merely paying for the scheme this is just Reading council trying to levy some extra money and looks very underhand. I haven't seen any evidence to support that the permits will alleviate any parking issues. Another issue is in this time of loneliness

	especially among the older generation this would be yet another hurdle for them to be able to invite friends to visit them. In short I feel the parking scheme is not beneficial to the grovelands/Waverley road area and will prove to be very divisive in a very friendly community.
409. Object	I do not believe the scheme will benefit the residents other than the council in terms monetary returns.Having observed parking recently I have noticed there is ample parking for residents, which in my opinion does not warrant a parking permit for local residents.Factoring in the economic circumstances were all in, this scheme will would be detrimental to our finances and wellbeing as local residents...
410. Object	If you have a permit and cannot find an available space where can you then park.
411. Object	There is no reason to put in a permit scheme in this area. I am deeply against paying for parking outside my house (Waverley Road) where at the moment I get it for free.There are always plenty of spaces available in the day, a day schema is completely pointless and just a money grabbing exercise by the council.There are hardly ever problems at night. 99.99% of the time there are spaces available. Where are the reports that justify this scheme? Where is the proof that it is needed? where is the analysis that the standard scheme that runs in Reading is suitable for our area based on the above arguments? There aren't any. Not only is the scheme much more expensive than other areas (for example Cardiff is 7.50 for the first car and then £30 for subsequent ones).Again why should I pay to to park outside my own house and where is the proof that this schema is only being implemented because the council sees it as an easy revenue earner?
412. Support	I have lived for many years on Waverley road and this road needs a parking permit ASAP! It's an absolute nightmare with parking and more often than not I cannot even park on my drive because someone has blocked it. The amount of cars parking on double yellow lines because there is nowhere to park is getting ridiculous now. I strongly urge this parking scheme to be put in place. It would be a life changer!
413. Object	No guarantee parking, shouldn't have to pay to park outside my household!
414. Object	It would be an absolute nightmare!I hope & pray nobody is naive enough to vote for this expensive and totally unnecessary action.There are many reasons for my objection ... The main one being that I do not wish to fork out what little money I have to pay for some thing I can have for free. The whole idea is a rip off and I object very strongly indeed.
415. Object	This is my third attempt and I am loathe to type out my views in full yet again!I object to this permit scheme totally and utterly! Yet more (unnecessary) expense, red tape, complicating our lives unnecessarily.
416. Object	Whereas I support the need for better parking control on these roads, I object to the obscene cost of permits for residents. I feel the 1st car should be given a free permit & then subsequent cars are charged accordingly. There is only 1 car in our household & we have a drive so aren't directly affected but we do get cars constantly parking over our drive & would rather see warden patrolling for those & dangerously parked vehicles.
417. Object	To actually expect people to pay to park in there own street in the present climate is almost criminal
418. Object	Asking people to pay to parkmin there own streetbwhen some have lost jobs because of covid is ridiculous
419. Object	It is an unnecessary expense that will not improve the parking in the area. It feels like just a way to get more money out of residents which will not improve the current parking issues.
420. Object	Re PT/016506 Permits will not increase the space available within an area that was built prior to mass car ownership. The proposed scheme would not guarantee parking to residents, particularly when returning home at night, the time of highest demand for spaces. We would be paying to park on another street. Residents in multi-occupied and multi-generational households will be penalised as they are likely to own more than two cars. Residents would benefit more from encouraging each other to park considerately, using available space; and not losing existing parking areas. I foresee the cost of permits increasing over time. Roads in this area are mainly used by residents and their visitors, so I don't see a need for a scheme which will cause administrative costs to the Council (in terms of producing permits etc) and actual cost to residents.

421. Object	The proposed scheme is most unlikely to improve the parking experience of local residents and visitors and will involve unwanted inconvenience and cost. There will be fewer parking spaces available and the calculation made by the council fails to take into account the increased size of modern vehicles.
422. Object	There will still be no gaurentee of being able to park, I am a student midwife and borrow my grandmother's car on days I need to travel because the car is not registered at my address and I do not use it all the time I will constantly have to buy visitor parking permit books.
423. Object	Seems to be no provision for those needing care visits early morning or bedtime. Three names on a Carers'permit is impractical if employing a private agency and not enough visitor permits can be obtained.
424. Support	I support this scheme because residents should be able to park as close to their own homes as possible. However, visitor permits should be available in larger packs
425. Object	[REDACTED] I would struggle to visit them, or drop things over, with this scheme in place as public transport is not a viable option. They and I feel that the proposed permit scheme will detrimentally affect people living with certain medical conditions in this area. Especially those who currently have access to a large support network.
426. Object	[REDACTED] Having this scheme in place would make it difficult to visit them, both for the social benefits to them and to provide support and assistance when needed. The location of my residence makes public transport an unsustainable option, particularly if I'm helping out by dropping items over such as shopping etc. Having discussed this with them we have both come to the consensus that the proposed permit scheme will adversely affect their lives because it will reduce the ability of non-residents from outside the immediate local area to visit and support residents[REDACTED]
427. Object	I do not want to pay for parking which is currently free. I do not wish to pay for parking as parking is NOT guaranteed.
428. Object	You will be selling more permits than there is space in the road. All carers should be exempt all day as 2 hours is not enough for those going through hospice at home care or other long term care. Nobody going through this should have to worry about whether they have enough permits or can afford more - those on their own will not be capable of managing permits if they are in long term care.This disproportionately affects those who don't own cars and may need too car share or occasionally rent. Limiting household permits to cars owned by residents is not good environmental policy as it encourages car ownership. It disproportionately affects those who live alone, such as myself as a recent widow, who may need more visitors and so use more permits. It disproportionately affects multiple occupancy households who have to buy more permits for space that doesn't exist. All areas should have a 2 hour unlimited parking not just Grovelands, St George's and Waverley - all of which roads have some off road parking anyway. Why should those in other roads have to use visitor permits for contractors to visit but other these roads don't. This is an unfair policy. As a non car owner I should be entitled to nominate a car for a resident's permit - why should I not be entitled to the same as everyone else.
429. Object	This will not solve parking issues, it will encourage people to turn their gardens into parking spaces. People who live at the end of Waverley Road that has parking permits, said that they never see a parking warden so no tickets get issued, and even though they have permits they still can’t park. I object
430. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
431. Object	Please don’t do parking permits on this roads
432. Object	I pay road tax No space guaranter Any proper reason in statement of reasons
433. Object	I strongly object to the installation of a residents' parking scheme as there is no genuine reason for it to be imposed across the whole area. Parking permits require an annual renewal, per vehicle, which would naturally increase with inflation or if the decision was made to increase prices. The same stands for the purchase cost of visitor half-day permit books. Together, these tax us for being able to park in our own street and I think this is wrong. There is no shortage spaces during any weekday, which makes the proposed 2 hour parking restriction overzealous and unrequired. Residents drive their vehicles to work, therefore there is always space to park during the day. There is no reason for daytime parking restrictions to be introduced as there is no problem during the day.

434. Object	There is no shortage of parking spaces during the daytime in this area; any restriction of parking during the day is not required as there is no problem. Residents take their vehicles out of the proposed scheme area when they go to work or to the supermarket, for example. Parking permits are an additional cost to us as residents and everyone's circumstances are different.The scheme reduces the amount of spaces available in some streets, which is not logical.
435. Support	I am against the introduction of the Permit on Waverley Road as it is an additional cost for the occupants
436. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
437. Object	Parking permits do not improve the parking situation, I used to live in an area that had parking permits and it did not improve the parking at all and I would often struggle to find a parking space. It does also not benefit the residents in this area, as some may have children that have vehicles, as well as two other vehicles in the household and I know from first hand experience that it is virtually impossible to gain a third permit, as my own request for a third permit in my old area, for purposes of travelling to higher education at the time (6th form) was denied. I would also like to see data which supports your decision to implement parking permits in this area.
438. Object	There is no proof that this guarantees a space or helps the parking situation as it is. The only difference is that we will be paying to have the same issues.
439. Object	[REDACTED] sometimes parking is difficult, but on the whole it has not been a problem. The only reason to have a parking permit system would be if non-residence's were parking in these areas when they are not a visitor or service provider to the residence, I have seen no evidence of this behavior. The only other reason I can see for this proposal is to create a hidden tax to supplement the Reading council tax. I believe the idea of visitor parking areas will actuality reduce the number of current parking places for the residence. If this proposal goes ahead I would recommend that there are no visitor parking areas, but the residence have visitor parking permits which allows occasional visitors or service providers to park where they can, as is happening now.I feel that it also introduces a very unfair system where on the south side of Waverley road many of the houses have parking on their property wheres on the North side there is only street parking, depending on who has a right to a parking permit I can see this causing a lot of friction between the residence, and will never be fair.The vote you had to prompt this consultation had an extremely narrow margin. In a society which has being very polarized by narrow margin votes, such as with Bexit, and the recent presidential election in the USA and its associated anarchy, the best course of action in narrow in narrow margin polls and not to damage society is to take no action, hence no parking permit system. I believe this permit system will damage the community coherence and so damage the quality of life. for the residence of Waverley Road. I object to this proposal very strongly as I see no reason for it, and that it will damage the quality of life to the residence of Waverley Road.
440. Object	Afraid to tell
441. Object	Because it creates more restrictions for parking, more cost and in an area that is not necessary. If its within the town centre, I would agree but not in this area.
442. Object	I have a friend who lives here with his partner of reduced mobility. I would struggle to visit them, or drop things over, with this scheme in place as public transport is not a viable option. They and I feel that the proposed permit scheme will detrimentally affect people living with certain medical conditions in this area. Especially those who currently have access to a large support network.
443. Object	I object strongly to this proposal for a number of reasons. [REDACTED] 2) This scheme will actually significantly reduce the number of spaces available in the road as residents will no longer be able park across their own driveways as this would be deemed a parking office by a warden and they would be ticketed. A large number of Waverley Road residents currently do this to create more space. So we will end up with an even bigger problem. And the scheme will actually have the exact opposite affect of the stated intention. 3) The The hours proposed by the scheme have been copied and pasted from other areas without any real consideration for the problem. There is absolutely no problem at all with spaces between 06:00 and 20:00, so only allowing 2 hours visiting is incredibly unhelpful and seems to completely ignore real world scenarios. When my parents come to look after my children for the day while I am at work they

	would now need to buy a permit at a time when one definitely isn't needed. 4) None of the feedback from the previous consultation seems to be have been take into account. 5) I don't like the way multiple roads are lumped together in this, individual roads should get their own say. In summary this is a really badly and lazily thought out scheme. No consideration has been given to the actual problem (e.g. hours) which is incredibly disappointing. If the scheme goes ahead the problem will actually get worse and it will cause a great deal of unhappiness and extra expense to the community by the council who are supposed to work to make life better for residents. [REDACTED]
444. Object	The area concerned doesn't suffer from out of area parking other than visitors and deliveries to local residents. The introduction of this scheme will only add a financial cost to local residents and a burden to council budgets and do nothing to alleviate parking congestion within the area. Increasing the difficulty and financial burden on local residents is no reason for the council to waste good tax payer money in debating or introducing a scheme like this.
445. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
446. Object	Parking Permits will not change how people park![REDACTED] I have seen the changes and cars are only getting bigger. The trouble is, that over the years as the residents have changed, many are not used to terraced house roads. People just seem to expect to park right outside their House.... which selfishly creates large gaps between the other cars, that are just too small for another vehicle.If everyone just parked responsibly and thought about the community, we are all in the same boat - only then would things certainly change for the better. As if times aren't hard enough. This would be such a waste money.
447. Object	[NO COMMENT PROVIDED]
448. Object	I would like to object to the proposal because I do not believe that it is required in the area. Introducing a permit scheme will only cost the local people money for something which they currently have for free. It will only increase annually and I see it as another means of raising revenue for the council which not everyone will find it easy to afford. The cost of the permits are extremely high and I think that as a Labour council should be ashamed of yourself for considering this especially when local elections are due. Having a permit scheme will not guarantee a parking space in your street as there are many more cars than spaces. The planned changes will reduce spaces even further. It will not be easy for many people to give up a car, if that it the hidden agenda of the council. There is no problem with parking in this area during the day as it is not used by people coming from out of the area to park, so why should we have to subject visitors or tradespeople to half day permits. This is completely unnecessary.
449. Object	What an unfair scheme to suggest. It will put such pressure on people just trying to live, at a time when so many lives have changed and the cost of everything is going up. The amount of cars will not be reduced by many - if any.People in need of a Carer or Multiple Carers each day will have to pay even more to be kept safe and get the real Care they need.Bus Routes do not always connect with the vast areas of Offices, Warehouses or other places of work, whether that being Employed or Self-Employed. Children still living at the family home cannot afford to move out and rent, equally, they won't be able to have a car to get to and from their places of work easily or enjoy the amazing areas of interest around the country….. Said areas proposed - '2hr Parking Provisions for Non Permit Holders' One Being - Waverley Road -This road has the main amount of Houses with their own off road parking, some with enough space for more than one car - not only will they have that - but also, the luxury of applying for 2 Permits, with their visitors or Carers, easily parking near where they live and with not too much stress of distance.'Permit Holders Only' One being - Beecham Road - The longest road and the only access to the '2hr Parking for Non Permit Holders' Roads will be VIA - the Oxford Road or Waverley Road. For some the 2hrs, might be far too limiting and stressful, equally for their own health as residents and/or for the others that are just trying to visit or help them! A year is a long time for the small amount of free half day permits per household.
450. Support	as a resident in the proposed area it is clear that permits is the only viable way forward. Many vehicles parked in the area appear to be non residents from adjoining areas, and a significant number of large commercial vehicles. The rise of HMOs in the immediate and

	surrounding areas also contributes to the problem and is not sustainable. The proposed plans however do need to provide for the continued safe use of partial parking on pavements where this does not cause an obstruction to pedestrians (e.g. St Ronans Road)
451. Support	[REDACTED]. Whereas many houses in streets like Waverley Road have off-street car parking and in some cases room to park more than one car on the street outside the properties, houses in Brisbane Road and in some areas within the proposed parking zone area such as Beecham Road are only wide enough for a single vehicle outside each house. Car ownership levels are therefore the source of much parking congestion on streets - this probably applies anywhere in Reading. I am am therefore of the view that the allocation of permits needs to be looked at closely, and most likely a two-tier system introduced. For houses with no off-street parking, a relatively low fee should be attached to the first permit but the cost of a second permit should be sufficient to provide incentives for car parking providers to compete with the second permit fee, by offering long term parking at a price competitive with a second permit. This would probably result in a second permit price that many would view as draconian - however this should be considered in the light of the Council's climate emergency and community health objectives. Perhaps temporary parks could be provided at sites such as the future housing sites in the Dee Road estate. For houses that have off-street car parking, permits should only be available at the higher price, to disincentive multiple car ownership.Exemptions from the second permit fee should be available for those living in flats in HMOs - many of these residents will be on lower incomes and in the absence of properly functioning car club, it would not be workable to share a single vehicle between the occupants of a multi-occupancy dwelling.
452. Object	I am are resident of Grovelands Road and object to the parking permit on the following grounds: 1. There is no issue with parking on Grovelands Road, we have had no incidents in the 4 years of our residence where we have been unable to find parking. Even during the past 12 months when more people have been at home during the day time. 2. We believe it is unjust to charge for 1st permit. There will be residents who will be unable to afford the permit costs and the additional costs for visitors permits this could be detrimental to people's well being if they are unable to cover these costs. 3. We have frequent visitors to our house as we assist with childcare for our family. These visits are for a short duration (10-15minutes) to collect children and do not warrant using a half day permit. 4. I am aware of residents on the street who rely on healthcare visits, some multiple times a day. This scheme will have a huge impact on them.
453. Object	This is not required, it will cause more problems and we are not near town. Please don't this! I'm just seeing it as a money spinner for the council.
454. Object	This is not the centre of the town and it really isn't fair to charge for parking.
455. Object	I object in the strongest possible terms to the introduction of parking permits Grovelands road and the surrounding roads. On Grovelands there is no issue with parking, the introduction of such scheme will have a detrimental effect on parking. The permit scheme will place an unnecessary financial burden on some households who simply cannot afford additional expenditure, especially since the past year. The provision for visitor permits is inadequate and will have a negative effect on well being, for example those with carers. It seems to me that if there is a problem with parking on the other roads in the area this will just shift that problem somewhere else.
456. Object	I strongly object to the introduction of any parking scheme for our area. Here are my thoughts: 1. Do Non-Residents have a serious impact on parking during the day? No - I don't think they really do, certainly not to the extent that a parking scheme is needed to manage them across our whole network of residential roads. For a residents' parking scheme to be required you have to assume that non-residents are causing a significant parking problem in the area, otherwise what problem is the scheme trying to address? I have repeatedly walked and cycled around all the roads listed as being in the proposed parking permit area at different times of the day to see how the parking is working currently and from the evidence of my own eyes I do not believe non-residents cause a significant problem. If the suggestion is that a very few cars belonging to non-residents are being parked in the zone during the day, by definition

	there were spaces available for them to park, which were not being used by residents, so what particular parking problem are they causing? If they arrive to park in the morning and leave later, that means they park overnight elsewhere, so they are not competing for spaces with residents who are themselves not there during the day. Let me put it this way - if I'm not at home I don't really mind who parks outside my house. 2. Why are Daytime Parking Restrictions proposed at all? They shouldn't be - on a normal weekday there are plenty of free parking spaces in the roads in this zone. On Waverley Road, cars start leaving before 6am and there are spaces available in the road from then right up until the evening. Every day of the week. The same goes for the other roads: residents leave to go to work and there is no pressure on parking until they return. As an example, when I drove away from my house in Waverley Road today at 9am (16th April), I counted 11 free parking spaces between Beecham Road and Wantage Road. This is completely typical. On what basis would anyone feel the need to restrict parking during a weekday, if there are spaces available? This will simply add an onerous and unnecessary need to manage parking times for anyone visiting or having visitors, and of course a significant cost. The conclusion for me is that no blanket parking restrictions are justified at all right across the zone during the day under any circumstances. 3. Size of a Car v. size of a House If you look at the width of a typical terraced house and then measure a typical car, you'll see they are approximately the same width. Add a little extra to the dimensions of the car to allow it to manoeuvre in and out of a parking space and it may require more space to park outside a house than the house width. If you assume there is on average one car per house you immediately see that if everyone who owns a car is at home, space will be tight for them all to park. This is not something new. So, residents, especially those in a road of predominantly terraced houses, should expect that all the parking spaces in the road will be filled by cars owned by people living in the road, if they are all at home at the same time. A parking scheme cannot change that fact. 4. Parking at Night – is this impacted by non-residents? The first question is - is there enough space for everyone in the entire zone to park their cars overnight? If you assume each house has at least one car, the answer is probably not. Which then begs the question – how many cars cannot park in their own road overnight when they would like to? Actually, probably not that many. Of course, those cars will have to find alternative spots elsewhere – this is what happens at the moment. The only other thing that might make it harder for these cars to park in their own road is if was proven that there are a significant number of cars coming in to park overnight from roads outside the zone, that take spaces away from residents. It is possible there are a few but from observation I see the same cars day after day parking near to my house and down the road - and they belong to people who live here. Occasionally there may be a car I do not recognise but that is the exception rather than the rule, and even then, it is almost guaranteed to be a car from within the network of local roads that we are considering. I do not believe cars originating from outside the proposed parking zone massively affect the ability of residents to park overnight somewhere in our area overall. 5. Costs - and the fact they always go up

	On principle, I do not think residents here should pay to park outside their own houses. Paying for parking schemes only ever becomes more expensive. The accusation is often raised that parking is a soft target for raising revenue for the council. In the local meeting that was held at Wilson School, questions were asked about how much parking permits would cost. There was no clear answer available although it was suggested that a first car permit might be free, with a charge for a second car. This was clearly a procedural mistake – a clear guide to costs should have been made available as part of the consultation process so that residents could have been better placed to make informed decisions about the scheme. Now that the charges of £40/£157.50 have been published, many neighbours are quite shocked and feel the scheme is designed simply to raise money. For comparison, in Cardiff, the residents' parking permits are £7.50 for the first car and a second car permit costs £30. This doesn't make Reading's charges look like good value. In fact, it makes them look extortionate. I do not think residents should pay for parking that is 'free' at the moment – it would be an unjustified expense for every single household in the area, and likely to make many people unhappy. 6. Affordability – a real problem for some Parking charges would be an unwelcome extra expense at a time when many people are in financial difficulties. This is not a minor issue - many people have used all their savings during lockdown or have lost their jobs, and really do not need any extra financial burdens. People on lower incomes are always affected disproportionately by schemes such as this. 7. Have the council actually tailored the proposed residents' parking scheme to the needs of our area, as they said they would? No, I do not think so. The proposed scheme is identical in every respect to most other schemes running in roads in Reading. The suggestion that any special requirements have been assessed or taken into account is inaccurate, rather the 'one-size-fits-all' approach has been taken. It is easy to suggest that a scheme is good because it is used elsewhere, or put slightly differently, "Let's not change a winning formula". In this case I feel it would be detrimental to our area. I would say that no views have been taken into consideration at all except the very marginal preference for a scheme from the last vote, and then applying the 'standard scheme' by default. Where is the free thinking? Why is no-one analysing whether this proposed scheme is actually a good idea? It seems to have rushed straight to the plan for fine detail of parking layout with no proper assessment of what actually happens with parking in our area. 8. Street furniture I would not look forward to seeing ugly parking signs in our roads, like the ones used in Wantage Road and elsewhere. I don't know any neighbours who would like one outside their house. 9. If you have a Driveway - will you be able to park across it? If you can currently and would not be able to if the scheme was introduced, that would be a short-sighted restriction, reducing parking in the road still further and completely counter-productive. Several people have felt forced into converting their front gardens to parking spaces recently, in part as a direct safeguard against the proposed parking restrictions – because they don't want the scheme. 10.Builders and SkipsHow is anyone going to cope with having a house extension, loft conversion, central heating installed, patio laid, or driveway done, with all the comings and goings of bricklayers, carpenters, plasterers, electricians and all the other trades needed, including the need to have skips which can stay in place for quite a few days, if parking regulations make that difficult? 11.Traffic wardensWardens have an important job to do in general, but the idea that they are needed to manage parking during the day in this area is ludicrous. There is no need for permit-controlled parking management during the day. It is total overkill. Cars leave this

	area during the day and return in the evening, they don't flock in from outside to fill up all the parking spaces. The cost of assigning wardens to patrol this area would also be unjustified. Conclusion [REDACTED] When you move to a road like the ones in our area, you must expect that sometimes you might not be able to park right outside your own house. That is not a 'problem', it's just what happens when you live in an urban area with a reasonably high density of housing and therefore cars. I think the proposed parking scheme is not justified, would impact many people negatively and please only a very few.