

Red Route West: Norcot Road & Oxford Road Bays, Appendix 2

Feedback to Traffic Regulation Order (Norcot Road only), Updated 06/04/20.

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.

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
Norcot Road	Summary of responses: Objections - 1, Support - 1, Comment - 2, Mixed Response - 0.
1)Resident, Comment	<p>The survey attached to the consultation is very poorly worded and completely unclear. It is impossible to answer the way it is written.</p> <p>I am being asked if I support or object to...what?</p> <p>Do I support the red route? Absolutely not. But the council was not interested in resident objections. And we have already been sent two frivolous PCNs for literally parking in our own driveway. Will the council fix potholes to make cycling safer? No. Their money is being spent to maintain an unnecessary and pointless red route and to send unwarranted fines to residents who must protest their innocence over something that an incompetent council put in place. I'm guessing this red route is someone's vanity or income generating project rather than a scheme to make the lives of Reading citizens better.</p> <p>Do I support the parking bays? As we are now forbidden the parking places we have used for decades, then yes, I am forced to support them as there is no other option. Are the parking bays logical? No. But then, neither is the red route. I am at a loss to understand the thinking behind being told to park directly on the road versus on the driveway crossing that does not obstruct the walkway or the road. How is that possibly better? But I would take the bays over no parking places at all, obviously.</p> <p>Please do not remove the parking bays. They are the only parking places we are allowed now. Since the survey is useless, accept this email as my response to the consultation.</p>
2)Resident, Object	<p>Norcot Road, schedule 799.</p> <p>Currently on the south side there is a parking bay 58m southwest from the junction of Links Drive on the opposite side to the houses. Outside the houses they have slopes outside which are large enough to park a car on and have two wheel chairs pass at the same time without a problem, however they can no longer be used. Even when driving in an out of the property's drives residents are being ticketed. This is ludicrous , unnecessary and a waste of time for both the council and residents as parking on these slopes will not impede the busses. It would be better if the parking bay was extended to cover from 277 to 285 on the opposite side (North side). The view around the shallow bend would not be unsafe, I can't see a problem (Institute of</p>

	Advanced Motorists member since 1978). When you compare the parking bay further up the hill above the school it is on the inside of the bend that is tighter with less view than my proposed ammendment therefore the argument of "its on the inside of the bend therefore its unsafe" is moot as the precedent has already been set by yourselves.
3)Resident, Support	We like having the parking on Norcot Road on the sides they are. It enables an over flow for visitors.
4)Resident, Comment	Thanks for the clarification - it's a pity your website and survey design were not better implemented to avoid the confusion. If you are going to retain the red route on Norcot road, then the parking bays are absolutely essential. However, the effect of introducing the red route and parking bays has actually introduced traffic hold-up where previously there were none. The red route is a pointless waste of money that has no effect - it's just more council virtue signalling. The route should be scrapped and the council CO2-emitting spy-cam cars decommissioned. I have now received 2 invalid fines for simply driving on to my driveway. Parking on driveway crossings (which there are many on Norcot Road) should be allowed - i.e. the boundary-to-boundary rule should not be enforced. Instead of red routes, the council should focus its efforts and expenditure on properly maintaining the roads. Although I am a motorist, I exclusively commute by bicycle (32 miles/day) and I can categorically state that potholes are a serious safety issue for cyclists.
5) Resident, Comment (post-consultation)	<p>Our concerns with the red route is that it obstructs our driveway and makes leaving/ entering our driveway almost impossible. This is because our driveway is only partially dropped (front the previous occupant of the address where we suspect they had the driveway extended).</p> <p>When we moved in around September 2018, the was no red route surrounding our house.</p> <p>In August 2019 (when the red route was extended to across our driveway) we immediate raised our concerns [see email trail].</p> <p>The concerns we had are quoted below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is impossible to reverse onto my driveway when travelling south/ up the hill • I cannot safely reverse off my driveway when I wish to travel north/ down the hill - I have to block both sides of the busy road to leave • When we have visitors, visiting vehicles cannot leave our driveway without having to remove another vehicle first • The parking spots are stopping the flow of traffic when buses need to pass • When turning onto the driveway when travelling north/ from the top of the hill when using my work van, I cannot access my driveway due to the extremely tight turning circle. I need to pass my house, do a U-turn at Links Drive, and go back up the hill. • The above point is also applicable when leaving the driveway for if I wish to travel south/ up the hill. I need to go north/ down the hill and do a U-turn at Links Drive."

	<p>To extend upon the above points, we are increasingly getting people parking outside of the allocated space which is making it impossible to get on or off of our driveway. I have attached a photo taken 10 minutes ago to clearly demonstrate how we now cannot use the driveway.</p> <p>Officer Comments: It is the view of Officers that the dropped kerb access, which is the legitimate footway crossing, is not obstructed by the location of the parking bay. The dropped kerb has an access protection marking across it also.</p> <p>Officers appreciate the point that the respondent is making about access to their drive but although the front of the property is paved, the dropped kerb does not cover the whole area of paving. It has been suggested that it may be best for the respondent to apply for an extension of the dropped kerb to cover the whole of the paved area. This would clarify for everyone what needs to be kept clear and enable legal enforcement if the dropped kerb is encroached. It would also enable better maneuverability of their vehicles onto and from the wide paved area.</p>
--	--