## **ACTIVE TRAVEL SHINFIELD ROAD- APPENDIX 1**

Summary of letters of support and objections received to Traffic Regulation Order

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.

School	Purpose	Objections/support/comments received
Shinfield Road	The implementation of traffic restrictions in	Summary of responses:
	the form of double yellow lines along Shinfield	Objections - 4, Support - 17, Comment - 3, Mixed Response -0.
	Road between its junction with Elmhurst Road	
	at Christchurch Green and the borough	
	boundary with Wokingham which is the entire	
	length of the scheme. This is intended to deter	
	obstructive parking or loading/unloading	
	activity, maintain the free flow of traffic/public	
	transport and increase visibility and road safety	
	to create a safer environment for pedestrians and pedal cycles.	
1. Support		ne pavements on a daily basis in the Shinfield Road/University area which are causing obstructions to both
i. Support		problems for residents by obstructing driveways and the view of the road - this is a recent issue, possibly
		epper lane, which seem to be unused possibly due to cost. The new restrictions would resolve the above
		to the implementation of the cycle path, which also needs the restrictions to achieve it's desired purpose.
		have dedicated parking for the University, it's probably worth looking in to why this isn't being used and or
		parking for students or encourage them to use public transport
2. Support	I support double yellow lines on Shinfield road fron	n Cressingham road junction to the start of Christchurch road, which is the only problematic stretch in my
	view (lots of cars parked outside the university are	
3. Support		ars parked on the pavement as it was a lawless town.
		ers driving off their houses. On 12th of May 22, I saw a car completely parked on the pavement and following
		of cycle lane, both in Shinfield Rd. (I can send you photographical evidence if necessary) Some adjacent
		ars parked on the pavement in these roads. Cars must park on road, pavement is for pedestrians.
4. Comment	, ,	gain, as you have already done consultation on whole changes planned, which included the double yellow
	lines.	
5. Support		n, including pavement parking, is causing congestion, increasing emissions and poses a safety risk to
	pedestrians.	
6. Support	, , , , , , , , ,	ng problems for residents and pedestrian have been going on for much too long. This scheme needs to be
7 C	implemented asap.	
7. Support	"I support the overall aims of the proposals.	on the read and feetways on Chinfield Pead between the junctions with Elmburgt Pead and Depper Lane
	which is currently causing safety issues."	on the road and footways on Shinfield Road between the junctions with Elmhurst Road and Pepper Lane,
9 Cupport	I support the plan purposed by RBC	
8. Support	i support the plan purposed by NDC	

9. Support	"I strongly support the implementation of double yellow lines on Shinfield Road.	
,, support	Cars parked on the road, cars parked on the pavement and cars parked on dropped kerbs blocking drives are a real problem:	
	-they considerable reduce the flow of traffic impacting ambulances and bus services	
	-they increase the pollution levels	
	-they obstruct disabled people on pavements	
	- they increase the likelihood of serious accidents	
<ol><li>Objection</li></ol>	I am writing to express my objection to the proposals of double yellow lines on Shinfield Road.	
	Myself who is a student urgently requires this road for parking. I commute regularly to university as I don't live on campus. I cannot afford to pay for parking and this road is perfect for myself. I have used this space at multiple times of the day and even when busy the parking on the road causes no disruption. There is plenty of space for all traffic and there is no danger for any traffic. If Reading council hasn't already noticed the roads with permit/paid parking in the surrounding areas are hardly used and in my opinion these spaces are already being wasted so I don't want even more potential free parking spaces to be wasted. I have assessed the houses which may be affected by the parking and can't see any reason why yellow lines should be implemented for resident reasoning. No cars park over driveways and access to driveways are not affected by the parking on Shinfield Road. Furthermore the money being invested into implementing yellow lines is not something necessary for tax payers to have to pay for and can be better invested elsewhere especially as the yellow lines are only going to make life financially and practically more difficult for students such as myself. I hope this email finds you well and you have considered all of points and choose not to go ahead with the implantation of double yellow lines.	
11. Support	I am in broad support of the council's plans to improve provision for active travel.	
12. Support	This will make Shinfield Road much safer for cycling, especially near the University entrances where currently there are often many parked cars on the road .I assume that this is an intermediate stage of the process and the proper cycle lanes will be installed in the near future?	
13. Support	Recently many cars have started parking either side of shinfield rd outside the university entrance. This has made the road difficult to pass at times and created hazards on the pavement.	
14. Objection	I use this road everyday and it doesn't present any problem at all.	
15. Support	Firmly supportive. Will enhance safety for pedestrians, cyclists and residents with driveways, and will improve accessibility of road to emergency vehicles.  An excellent proposal.	
16. Objection	With changing parking restrictions in the area, students and staff will be displaced from the Shinfield road, with the proposed changes to other smaller streets. It is important that before the changes in the parking are made, the council actively engage with the university to address the root cause. In looking at the university itself, there are extensive car parks on the site, which are very underused during the working day/Academic year.	
17. Support	This will make life safer for cyclists, pedestrians, emergency services and residents with drives. The current position is not tenable.	
18. Support	Whilst I support the proposals I am very concerned that the 30/40 cars parked daily on Shinfield Road will migrate back to The Mount where the majority of residents are currently seeking to make the extremely lenient parking restrictions (10am - 4pm 2 hours waiting Mon to Fri) due to non permit holders taking advantage of the scheme. This was happening large scale 2 years ago. We have been monitoring the situation on Shinfield Road and have recognised many reg nos of cars previously using The Mount. We hope due consideration will be made to approve The Mount's proposed changes in view of this.	
19. Objection	The only requirement for a no waiting zone on Shinfield road is between Elmhurst Road and Pepper Lane.  Currently the single yellow line system in operation close to the traffic lights at the junction of Elmhurst and Shinfield Road works, so perhaps a permanent double yellow line on the university side and a single yellow on the residents side is the answer, especially given the need for access by delivery drivers and building works.  Currently only the parking taking place on both sides between these Elmhurst Road and Pepper Lane is dangerous for residents and people exiting the University Campus.	
	Between Pepper Lane and Elm Road, parking has never been an issue because of the existing cycle lane designation.  The cottages close to Elm Road have always used on street parking and this needs to be guaranteed as part of the plans, as no other parking is available for residents. This is either by the creation of a residents parking bay or no lines.	

	I support the proposals as they should make the area more attractive to cyclists, which in turn will help with pollution. Please consider measures for the Christchurch green /shin field road/ north court avenue/ elm hurst road junction where cars are frequently speeding and jumping red lights. This junction
i i	is very busy with pedestrians including young unaccompanied children walking to and from school
21. Support/Comments   I	I agree in principle to the parking changes on Shinfield Road. However I feel that Reading Borough Council should give consideration to where the vehicles displaced by the proposed restrictions will go next. Any illusion that they will simply vaporise is misplaced and foolish.
	Vehicles parked on the pavement by the University are likely to be either university administration staff who resent paying parking charges at
	Whiteknights, or students whose vehicles could be accommodated at Whiteknights, but for the University's misguided and unenforcible 'policy' which
p	pretends to prevent students from bringing cars to university. I feel that if I was paying £9000 plus a year for tuition (which has been distinctly lacking over
t	the last two years) I would expect on-site parking to be provided.
F	Reading University should be made to take responsibility for the traffic they cause to be created, and a responsible council should take steps to proactively
	RESOLVE traffic problems, rather than just moving them or distributing them over the surrounding area.
	I am in broad support of the proposal with one major reservation. I have been a resident of the University area for nearly 30 years and have observed
	parking restrictions being introduced and gradually tightened over this period in various roads. I have therefore observed parking problems being pushed
	from one road to another on many occasions.
7	The Shinfield Road problem has migrated from Elmhurst Road - which used to suffer from dreadful double parking until parking restrictions were tightened
t	there. Elmhurst Road is now virtually deserted all the time.
F	For the last 7 years I have been a resident of The Mount (Number 20), where we have very lenient parking restrictions compared to all the roads
	surrounding us.
	Over the last few years, as nearby roads have tightened their restrictions, parking on The Mount has become more popular with non-resident permit
	holders, meaning that residents (especially on the North side where I live) can find it hard to find a parking space in a reasonable distance of their
	house. Personally I frequently have to park on the East side of The Mount, and I know that my North side neighbours have to do the same. Whereas the
	lucky South siders always seem to be able to park near their houses; I never see their cars parked elsewhere!
	The point of this is to demonstrate that many residents of The Mount are reliant upon "spare" if you like, spaces on The Mount in order to be able to park in the area for which they pay for a parking permit.
	Such "spare" spaces are increasingly being utilised by non-residents and I have no doubt that the introduction of yellow lines on Shinfield Road will solve
	that problem but only push it onto The Mount, thereby subjecting residents to months of great difficulty in parking.
	(I should mention here that Mount residents have been seeking to tighten parking restrictions here, but agreement on the proposal has not been reached
	because the problems are not evenly experienced by all the residents currently.)
	In conclusion therefore I urge the Council in considering the Shinfield Road proposal, to take a longer term, strategic view on where the parking problem
V	will be pushed to. I cannot believe that Councillors have not seen this happen - as I have - many, many times. If this is understood and appreciated then I
l v	would further urge Councillors to do whatever is in their power to forestall a problem in another area, rather than just waiting for it to happen and
	apparently prioritising non-permit paying non-residents above permit-paying residents.
	~ Lb