

[Waiting Restriction Review 2018B]- OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER
APPENDIX 1 - Summary of letters of support and objections received to Traffic Regulation Order

UPDATED: 26/02/19 10AM Consultation Ends: 28/02/19

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
CA1_Amersham Road	Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 0, Comment - 1, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, Comment	It does not seem you are introducing yellow zigzag school lines outside the actual nursery allowing parking on the road. Whilst the no stopping lines are a massive step in the right direction as will stop parking on the blind bends i am still concerned there will be parked cars next to the nursery a child could run out from in between and you could miss them checking for on coming traffic as you are driving on the wrong side of the toad.

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
KE2_Denby Way	Summary of responses: Objections - 1, Support - 0, Comment - 1, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Petition from 25 Residents, Objection	Signage has gone up in a number of locations on the Potteries Estate indicating that double yellow lines will be introduced on Denby Way and into Pottery Road with no waiting or parking permitted on the double yellow lines in the area adjacent to Denby Way. Pottery Road is already used by a large number of vehicle drivers who are not resident of the road and the concern is that the introduction of the double yellow lines will make this situation worse as the residents of Denby Way will be forced to seek parking in Pottery Road, where parking is already a challenge. Many of the residents of Pottery Road & Denby Way have lived on the estate for many years and cannot understand why it is felt necessary to introduce the double yellow lines. We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now to stop the introduction of the double yellow lines.

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
KE4_Lower Armour Road	Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 4, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.

1) Resident, Support	I would like to register my FULL SUPPORT for these proposals. I have lived in Armour Road [REDACTED] and the have experienced numerous issues, accidents (and near-accidents) as a result of inconsiderate parking along the road. Most issues are caused by stopping/parking on the left-side of the road (when approaching Armour Hill), and I am delighted to see this is the area where you propose to install restrictions. I hope this proposals receives the support of the local residents and I hope restrictions can be installed as soon as possible.
2) Resident, Support	I fully support the restrictions proposed because I live on this road and find the parking on this side of the road has caused myself and others on numerous occasions to very nearly have accidents. The visibility along this road is poor as it is and when cars are parked on both sides it exacerbates the problem and makes manoeuvring extremely difficult and unsafe.
3) Resident, Support	I wholeheartedly support this proposal. We live at [REDACTED] Lower Armour Road and the parking at present is incredibly dangerous. It creates blind spots and makes it impossible to move safely. There is simply no way that any emergency vehicles would be able to get through from Armour Road to Armour Hill given the way cars are parked. There are frequently cars double parked on both sides of the road. It should also be noted that there is a park and nursery at the end of the road and this is another reason that safety is, in my view, paramount.
4) Resident, Support	I fully support the proposal to install "No waiting at any time" as per published plan. My reason for support is that, living just round the corner in Armour Hill, I frequently use this road, both walking and driving and have witnessed many "near miss" traffic accidents due to inconsiderate parking on the west side of Lower Armour Road, which obscures the view of cars, vans, etc. on the bend. This inconsiderate parking also usually includes parking on the very narrow pavement, which forces people with pushchairs, wheelchairs into the road adding to the already hazard.

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
KE7_Thirlmere Avenue	Summary of responses: Objections - 6, Support - 0, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, Objection	I wish to give notice of my 'objection' to the proposal for "No waiting at any time" in the area of the roundabout in Thirlmere Avenue (drawing # WRR2018B/KE7). Having lived at our address [REDACTED], and with only single car ownership during that time (I have off road parking), I have relied and continue to welcome availability of parking in the roundabout area for several good and valid reasons. Friends and family staying or visiting

	<p>Deliveries being made</p> <p>Emergency services</p> <p>Current local social benevolent understanding and goodwill of the status quo</p> <p>A slowing of the traffic speed (safety)</p> <p>I acknowledge the Avenue does become congested during the evenings as people return from work and park their vehicles; however, current arrangements do seem to work without 'incident'. With the outlined proposed restriction for parking on the roundabout area, this will undoubtedly make parking here very difficult for the future. I believe the social impact to my family and the local residents and visitors would be both profound and detrimental. The parking issue will effectively be 'pushed' into other areas of the Avenue that do not have the necessary spaces in lieu of the proposed roundabout restrictions (double yellow lines for 60 metres on South and North of the Avenue). At no time during my [REDACTED] here have I seen the current status quo of parking making the area 'impassable' to traffic; there is always a social recognition of parking 'order' and an agreed courteous nature in the unspoken arrangements between the residents. The proposal would I believe be 'anti-social' not just to my household, but also my neighbours and all potential visitors of all kinds that wish or need to come to the area. It will undoubtedly cause social friction and tension for the future as further pressure is put on a finite parking resource. I also believe speed of cars will increase as a consequence of 'clearing' the area due to the restrictions, with potential safety implications to local residents. I do welcome the idea of continuous improvement, but my view is that perhaps removal of the roundabouts and deploying speed restrictions in the area would be a better solution and improvement to the road in Thirlmere Avenue.</p>
2) Resident, Objection	<p>Currently there is a lot of pressure on parking and the imposition of DLL on the roundabout would take away at least 4 spaces, so unless this can be mitigated in some way I would like to object to this proposal.</p> <p>In my experience parking on the roundabout is mainly used as a last resort and overnight so ordinarily there is not a problem with obstruction.</p>
3) Resident, Objection	<p>It is hard enough to find space to park in the evenings and as a last resort most use the island on the roundabout. At anytime it poses no risk or obstruction to maneuvering around the roundabout. Also in the daytime as people use their cars for work there are rarely cars parked there. I object to Adding Double Yellow lines as it would remove 4 parking spaces in what is a very restricted and congested road as it is for parking.</p>
4) Resident, Objection	<p>I wish to formally object to RBC's proposal to introduce 'no waiting at any time' markings on the mini roundabout directly outside my property. This proposal is CMS/011093 drawing no: WRR2018B/KE7.</p> <p>I bought my property ([REDACTED] Thirlmere Ave RG30 6XJ) on the understanding that I can park my car outside my home. I paid for a single white line to be painted to prevent people from blocking my small parking space in. If the proposal for 'no waiting at any time' markings goes ahead, my visitors & deliveries will struggle to find somewhere to park. My neighbours will suffer the repercussions of greater demand for street</p>

	parking outside their homes. It is also likely that, in the future, my household will increase to a 2 car household. Therefore, I strongly object to this proposal.
5) Resident, Objection	There is a lot of pressure on parking in this road DYL on the roundabout would take away some 4 spaces, I would like to object to this proposal as it will mean that I will find it even more difficult to park. Anyway the roundabout is mainly used as a last resort and overnight so normally there is not a problem with obstruction on the roundabout.
6) Resident, Objection	I am emailing to object to the proposed no waiting at any time parking restriction being proposed to the frontage of my property in Thirlmere Avenue. This is a residential area and enforcement of these restrictions will compound an already overcrowded street parking problem. It seems unfair that I will be prevented from parking outside my property due to it fronting onto a roundabout when cars can do so in other parts of the road where access is just as much of a problem. In addition you should also consider what these restrictions would mean to visitor, carers, etc. parking. Would reducing the roundabout in size not solve all issues and still allow me to park outside my property rather than someone else's?

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
MI1_Berkeley Avenue	Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 1, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, Support	Please note I am happy with this introduction as it is required. All going well, please can you ensure there is clear signage stating 'No Parking at any time' all around the area where double yellow lines will be introduced, as the single/double yellow lines get covered with leaves and people start to park again. Appreciate if this can be added to this plan

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
MI2_Bexley Court	Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 2, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, Support	I support this proposal.
2) Resident, Support	I support this proposal and would like to know the outcome.

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
PE3_Quantock Avenue	Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 0, Comment - 1, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, Comment	I have no objection to this proposal but consider it (and maybe some of the other similar ones) to be a waste of money. We have [REDACTED], and while it is true that on occasions cars are parked near the corner I have never considered this to be dangerous or causing undue inconvenience. Further, it would not improve the more dangerous corner at the nearby Newton Avenue / Montpelier Drive junction where, frequently, parked cars in Montpelier force cars onto the wrong side of the road. The sight line driving out of Quantock is impaired by a large hedge and it is common to see cars going east on Montpelier brake sharply and swerve into the kerb. Another problem is pedestrians are forced into the road at this corner as there is no footpath. I was driving along Park Lane in Tilehurst in good daylight recently and the mini roundabout markings are almost non existent, perhaps this money could be better spent there. A stranger could easily get caught out.

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
TH1_Chiltern Road	Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 2, Comment - 1, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, Support	I support proposals for no waiting on Chiltern Rd for the Henley road shops. However, better parking provision must be made at the shops for parking as the spaces are unsuitable for larger cars/vans. The whole of Chiltern Road's parking situation should be looked at. It's a hazard for vehicles to get down and for crossing the road especially with children. If people must park on the road it just be clear that they must only park on one side of the road.
2) Resident, Support	Welcome the change, but I am more concerned about the lack of enforcement of the loading restrictions that are flouted daily by the co-op.
3) Resident, Comment	I don't believe further restrictions are needed and in fact a formal loading bay should be introduced to allow local shop deliveries. If it is made too difficult to service the shops then it may cause them to reconsider their location and this would be a detriment to the local community.

--	--

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
TH3_Hemdean Road	Summary of responses: Objections - 2, Support - 1, Comment - 1, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, Support	We generally support the proposals but feel that it should be 8am to 5pm every day (not just Mon to Fri). The weekends are particularly busy and it is being used as a park and ride for the local bus stop including the football service.
2) Resident, Objection	I object to the full proposal of waiting restrictions on all 4 roads around the roundabout on Hemdean Road as they are unneeded and excessive and the only currently problem is being caused by cars parked opposite the bus stop outside no 237. This part of the road should have parking restrictions in place as major inconvenience is caused for Reading Buses. The proposed restrictions for Oakley Road and Grove Hill/Rotherfield way are a waste of money as there is no problem with parking on the approach to the roundabout. Whilst there is a lot of on kerb parking on upper Hemdean Road it's usage is reasonable given the lack of a bus service to that part of the road, and people parking there are doing so frequently to avoid driving into Reading by catching the 23/24 bus. This usage should not be discouraged by excessive parking restriction as there is minimal impact to local residents there.
3) Resident, Comment	<p>I have studied the plans for the introduction of 'No Waiting' restrictions around the junctions of Hemdean Road/Oakley Road and Rotherfield Way my comments are below;-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I welcome the concern around this junction which has prompted the proposed introduction of revised waiting restrictions. 2. The area shown on the map attracts mainly 9-5 weekday commuter parking with some resident parking at the southern junction of Hemdean/Oakley roads. 3. The proposed changes hopefully will ensure improved sitelines and traffic flow. 4. On looking at the map I feel the waiting restriction area at the junction of Hemdean Road (south)/Oakley Road should be extended further down Hemdean Road. I believe the parked cars here make this a dangerous junction as the 23 bus turns into Hemdean Road from Rotherfield Way. The map only shows a 7m which I feel should be extended to at least 10m. 5. My final and most important comment is that the waiting restrictions will result in displacement parking in Hamden Road/Sheridan Ave, Oakley Road and Rotherfield Way. Hemdean Road south is already full of 9-5 parking which causes many problems with schools/buses etc. I would ask that after the restrictions are introduced the situation regarding any displacement parking is monitored and perhaps other restrictions

	introduced.
4) Resident, Objection	<p>We are writing to express our views/objections on the proposal to introduce parking restrictions as shown on Drawing No. TH3_Hemdean Road dated Jan 19:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●As residents of [REDACTED] Hemdean Road, we are unaware of any significant congestion or safety issues in relation to the Hemdean Road junction closest to us that necessitate the proposed parking restrictions as compared with other approaches (Oakley Road, Rotherfield Way and Hemdean Road East) to the roundabout. In fact, the other approaches have considerably more traffic and safety issues - heavier congestion, Caversham Primary and Highdown school children using these roads for crossing during peak traffic and greater numbers of cars parking on these roads. ●If there is a perceived issue, the extent of the proposal is completely out of character with the local area. ●We have [REDACTED] and although we have a drive, it is unfit for purpose due to its narrow width, steep incline and the steps that it has down the middle of it (which is the only pedestrian access available to our property). ●The proposal has a direct impact upon us by removing our ability to park at the front of our property and in addition, not only ourselves but our elderly neighbours [REDACTED] will be inconvenienced. ●Parking further down the road, in front of our neighbours' dwellings, would also inconvenience them and reduce the parking provisions that are at present available to them. The proposal will therefore cause additional residential parking issues in the near future. <p>If this proposal is to be implemented, we would ask you to consider as a minimum reducing the 'No Waiting' area to the front of our property to approximately 30 metres from the junction which would allow us and our elderly neighbours to park directly in front of our respective properties - please refer to the annotated copy of the drawing (attached). We once again ask that you consider our views and our request so that it does not adversely affect those in the community that we believe you are trying to support.</p>

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
----------------	---------------------------------------

WH3_Longships Way	Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 1, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.
1) Resident, Support	In support of this given the number of cars parked along this road despite the width of this road. A full review needs to take place along Longships especially by the junctions where parked cars on the road create blind spots for traffic as well as those entering Longships from the junctions and car park entrances. There are usually taxis waiting in the mornings on the bend which cause problems to navigate round.