

WAITING RESTRICTION REVIEW 2018A - OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER
APPENDIX 1 - Summary of support and objections received to Traffic Regulation Order

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
<p>AB2_Fobney Street</p> <p>1) Resident, comment</p>	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 0, Comment - 1, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p>1) I am an owner/occupier on the Holybrook Estate and have been since the flats were built in 1988.</p> <p>I note from the Reading Chronicle you are intending putting restricted parking in Fobney Street outside Riverside House and opposite your council offices.</p> <p>As you know you already have restricted parking on one side of the road (outside your offices) in Fobney Street which is an absolute waste of time. Cars constantly park on the restricted parking to pick and drop off workers etc for the Oracle. We have difficulty exiting and entering Fobney Street due to the parking of these cars and now particularly as the bus lane has been installed in Bridge Street. I have mentioned the illegal parking to police officers who occasionally walk through the estate and pointed this out to them but they tell me the responsibility of manning the illegal parking of cars is the council. Could you please let me know if this is the case.</p> <p>Is it not possible to install RED ROUTE lines on both sides of the road in Fobney Street which would then hopefully discourage drivers of cars from parking there.</p>

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
<p>CA4_Marsack Street South View Park</p> <p>1) Resident, objection</p>	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 1, Support - 0, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p>1) I am writing to object to the proposed introduction of "no waiting at any time" at the junction of Marsack Street and South View Park.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the need to keep the junction free from parked cars, the timing of this proposal is illogical.</p> <p>There is a parking problem in Marsack Street and neighbouring streets caused largely by:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • staff and visitors to South View Park parking in residential roads, because of insufficient parking provision at the business units • commuters, shoppers etc. taking advantage of free all day parking <p>This results in residents being unable to park near their homes if returning during working hours</p> <p>Over six months' ago I completed a council survey on a residents' parking scheme in Lower Caversham. I have since been advised by my ward councillor that any proposed scheme will be subject to traffic management sub-committee approval in the autumn and statutory consultation before implementation i.e. considerable further delay.</p> <p>The introduction of a residents' parking scheme will resolve the parking problems listed above and it would be sensible to implement the proposed "no waiting at any time" at the same time as residents' parking is introduced. To implement red lines 5m east and west of the junction prior to residents' parking will further reduce available parking near the junction whilst doing nothing to prevent all day on-street parking by employees, visitors and commuters, so making the current problems worse</p>
--	--

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
KA2 - Milman Road	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 12 (1 Petition, 57 signatures), Support - 0, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Resident, objection 1) It is proposed that some of the residents' parking spaces might be taken away. its already a very activity street and doesn't think this should be done. 2) Resident, objection 2) I object to the part of the proposal that proposes removal of residents parking in front of nos 71 and 69 Milman road. Parking in this road is already very hard to come by as a resident and this proposal will merely make the existing poor parking provision worse. It will mean more people having to park in front of the school overnight and will only serve to further inconvenience residents who now have to pay for the "privilege" of parking on their own street. I appreciate that access to the school gates is difficult for larger vehicles, but this is because the entrance is wholly inappropriate for such vehicles. 3) Resident, objection 3) 1. Parking is already limited on the Milman Road; there are users and staff at the health centre, parents and staff at the school as well as residents, including those in Boults Walk and the nearby estate who have no parking of their own. Reducing parking spaces on the road just makes an already difficult situation worse.

<p>4) Resident, objection</p>	<p>2. Traffic on Milman Road at peak times can be appalling, including parents (amongst others) driving on pavements, driving carelessly and parking or idling on double yellow lines and school 'keep clear' signs. If child safety is really a consideration, then parents need to be discouraged from bringing their cars down this narrow Victorian residential road in the first place; not make it easier for them to manoeuvre once there.</p> <p>3. The Victorian brick wall at the west end of Milman Road is already damaged where reversing cars have gone into it. If child safety is a concern, then the structural stability of the wall should be a priority as there is a school path directly behind it, and traffic should be *discouraged* from manoeuvring here.</p> <p>4. The north and west sides of the road near the school *already* have double yellow lines or 'keep clear' markings which are widely ignored by visiting parents at school pick-up times. Many cars idle their engines here, adding to local pollution levels, in the pretence that they aren't really parking. I am unconvinced that adding more double yellow lines would do anything other than encourage more idling engines and pump more pollution into the faces of schoolchildren - which is also a safety consideration - which means that the implied benefit of a new turning space would be lost anyway.</p> <p>5. It seems disproportionate to deprive local residents of the ability to unload shopping, furniture, children or elderly relatives *for ever* and *always*, as well as reducing the available parking to people with mobility problems who need vehicle access to the health centre, because it might (but probably won't) allow parents to more easily negotiate a road incapable of handling the traffic.</p> <p>6. Allowing traffic to turn more easily in a narrow cul-de-sac doesn't make the road safer for anyone, including children. Children only use the far western end of the road when parents have parked there to pick them up; the school exits are further east. If the western end of the road is dangerous for children at school pick-up times, then the solution seems to be to discourage parents from going there in the first place, not making it easier for them to turn around.</p> <p>4) The restrictions to the parking regarding Milman Road (next to the primary school) are an absurd, especially on the grounds that the residents influence negatively the health and safety of primary school children. It is the parents and parents alone that cause that threat. The way they drop off their children or pick them up from school is ridiculous. They have no limits as of how much congestion they cause while waiting for their children. They leave their cars in the middle of the road and don't care that those are residents' parking spaces that they paid for. Coming back from work around 3 p.m., I was frequently forced to wait around half an hour for the road to clear out as it was impossible to come near that school at that time. It is the school's responsibility to ensure parents are aware of parking</p>
-------------------------------	---

<p>5) Resident, objection</p>	<p>regulations and it is their responsibility that parents follow it. Instead of introducing several parking restrictions, they should educate the parents and inform the authorities if necessary to stop that from happening. There was a parking officer walking many times around the school at that time and not making a single comment about what was happening. I presume it was because of the parents' attitudes who would just shout at that man and ignore his instructions despite him being a public figure. Taking that into consideration that it is a public figure, something should have been done in cooperation with other officers. The easiest way is to introduce another restriction which would not work as children's safety would once again be jeopardised by the irresponsible and comfortable parents who find it impossible to walk to the school from the other end of the road or roads nearby. Why should the residents be punished for that especially that it is already a problem at times to find a parking space on this road outside of the school working hours?</p> <p>5) I would like to object to any proposals to restrict any further parking in Milman Road. This road is already over subscribed with parking issues and to then take away parking from residents at the lower end of Milman Road would only cause bigger problems. There is a Health Centre and School both located at the bottom of this cul de sac and very limited parking which was allowed to happen for both the Medical Centre and The School beyond. The council allowed The school to be extended into the car park of The Christchurch Centre, adding additional classrooms to an already congested road and in so doing so taking away valuable parking from the area for teachers and staff. Again permission was given for the Medical Centre to be enlarged so bringing more vehicles to this busy road without any further parking provisions. The safety of the school children should be paramount and by giving parents a bigger area to turn their mostly large vehicles around or leave them ticking over on the road/ path would be inviting more chance of accidents happening and the children inhaling all the car fumes. The wall at the bottom of Milman Road has already been reversed into and behind that wall is a pathway for the school children who wouldn't stand a chance if it was damaged further or knocked down when a large vehicle is turning/ reversing. You should not be encouraging vehicles to be adding to the bottle neck at the bottom of this road. I am a resident of Milman Road for 35 plus years and have seen so called improvements over this time which always seem to be at the detriment of the council tax paying residents. The road has many houses now that have been allowed to be put into multi occupancy bedsits which again has added to the amount of cars in this old Victorian Road. I think enough is enough Milman Road has had more than its share of congestion through allowing devopments to be agreed without the facility of parking the additional cars that this brings with it.</p>
<p>6) Resident, objection</p>	<p>6) 1. There is already limited parking on the Milman Road for the various users, which include residents, users and staff at the health centre, parents and staff at the school, plus residents in Boults Walk and the nearby estate who have no parking of their own. By further reducing parking spaces on this road it just makes an already difficult situation worse.</p>

<p>7) Resident, objection</p>	<p>2. Having traffic turn more easily in a narrow cul-de-sac does not make the road safer for anyone, including children. Children only use the far western end of the road when parents have parked there to pick them up and one would hope that caring parents would be meeting their still young children at the school gate rather than waiting for them to run out in to the road. The school exits are further east. If the western end of the road is dangerous for children at school pick-up times, then the solution seems to be to discourage parents from going there in the first place, not making it easier for them to turn around.</p> <p>3. Traffic on the road at peak times can be appalling and include parents and others who drive on pavements, drive carelessly and park or idle on double yellow lines and school 'keep clear' signs. If child safety is really a consideration, then parents need to be discouraged from bringing their cars down this narrow Victorian residential road in the first place; not make it easier for them to manoeuvre once there.</p> <p>4. The Victorian brick wall at the west end of Milman Road is already damaged where reversing cars have gone into it. If child safety is a concern, then the structural stability of the wall should be a priority as there is a school path directly behind it, and traffic should be *discouraged* from manoeuvring here.</p> <p>5. The north and west sides of the road near the school *already* have double yellow lines or 'keep clear' markings which are widely ignored by visiting parents at school pick-up times. Many cars idle their engines here, adding to local pollution levels, in the pretence that they aren't really parking. I am unconvinced that adding more double yellow lines would do anything other than encourage more idling engines and pump more pollution into the faces of schoolchildren - which is also a safety consideration - which means that the implied benefit of a new turning space would be lost anyway.</p> <p>6. It seems disproportionate to deprive local residents of the ability to unload shopping, furniture, children or elderly relatives *for ever* and *always*, as well as reducing the available parking to people with mobility problems who need vehicle access to the health centre, because it might (but probably won't) allow parents to more easily negotiate a road incapable of handling the traffic and is a solution that seems to bring more safety concerns than fixes for those it purports to be helping.</p> <p>7) I have been made aware that there are changes being put forward to the parking in Milman Road relating to the school. This will entail creating a turning place by removing residents car parking spaces.</p>
-------------------------------	--

<p>8) Resident, objection</p>	<p>1) This is a local school so students should be within walking distance. It is also very close to a bus route.</p> <p>2) There is already chaos with parents dropping off or collecting their children. They have been rude when challenged (politely) after blocking in residents, which is unacceptable.</p> <p>3) There are two roads people already use as turning places. Spring Gardens is down the side of the school so is not really suitable but Mitcham Close can be utilised.</p> <p>4) If you remove several spaces, where are you expecting residents to park. Or are you hoping to generate more funds from parking fines?</p> <p>8) I strongly object to the proposals for Milman Road, and together with other residents wish to put forward the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Parking is already limited on Milman Road; there are users and staff at the health centre, parents and staff at the school as well as residents, including those in Boult's Walk and the nearby estate who have no parking of their own. Reducing parking spaces on the road just makes an already difficult situation worse.</p> <p>2. Traffic on Milman Road at peak times can be appalling, including parents (amongst others) driving on pavements, driving carelessly and parking or idling on double yellow lines and school 'keep clear' signs. If child safety is really a consideration, then parents need to be discouraged from bringing their cars down this narrow Victorian residential road in the first place; not make it easier for them to manoeuvre once there. A school based "walk to school" campaign could be promoted at the school with several positive outcomes, one of which would be to reduce congestion in the road at peak times.</p> <p>3. The Victorian brick wall at the west end of Milman Road is already damaged where reversing cars have gone into it. If child safety is a concern, then the structural stability of the wall should be a priority as there is a school path directly behind it, and traffic should be *discouraged* from manoeuvring here.</p> <p>4. The north and west sides of the road near the school *already* have double yellow lines or 'keep clear' markings which are widely ignored by visiting parents at school pick-up times. Many cars idle their engines here, adding to local pollution levels, in the pretence that they aren't really parking. I am unconvinced that adding more double yellow lines would do anything other than encourage more idling engines and pump more pollution into the faces of schoolchildren - which is also a safety and environmental consideration - which means that the implied benefit of a new turning space would be lost anyway.</p>
-------------------------------	---

<p>9) Resident, objection</p>	<p>5. It seems disproportionate to deprive local residents of the ability to unload shopping, furniture, children or elderly relatives *for ever* and *always*, as well as reducing the available parking to people with mobility problems who need vehicle access to the health centre, because it might (but probably won't) allow parents to more easily negotiate a road incapable of handling the traffic. This is especially true during school holiday time when parents do not drive their cars down Milman Road - approx 10 weeks a year.</p> <p>6. Allowing traffic to turn more easily in a narrow cul-de-sac doesn't make the road safer for anyone, including children. Children only use the far western end of the road when parents have parked there to pick them up; the school exits are further east. If the western end of the road is dangerous for children at school pick-up times, then the solution seems to be to discourage parents from going there in the first place, not making it easier for them to turn around. Again, a school based "walk to school" campaign would yield benefits here.</p> <p>9) I wish to object to the proposal.</p> <p>Milman Road is a cul de sac. The double yellow line and 'no waiting at any time' proposed will turn the end of Milman Road into a manoeuvring zone for parents dropping off and picking up children.</p> <p>For cars that drive down, there will still be a blockage while they try to get out. Almost all cars will have to do a three point turn to accomplish this. This will increase the amount of dangerous manoeuvring around the school, not decrease it.</p> <p>Overall, this will be no safer than currently where some parents attempt to drive down Milman Road and then create a jam around the Spring Gardens or Mitcham Close junction as they try to get out while other cars are still trying to drive down.</p> <p>At the end of the school day, the area will become a zone where parents hover with engines running to pick children up. Idling of cars on the street will increase. This will be polluting and annoying to residents because of engine noise.</p> <p>To accomplish a nil overall road safety benefit to the school, residents, and others who can park for two hours in this area during the day, are being deprived of 2-3 parking spaces.</p> <p>This change to parking was advertised during the school holidays and only at the western end of the terrace where almost no one would see it. Consequently parents at the school, residents at the Mitcham Close end of the terrace, most people who use the Health Centre or pharmacy and cannot</p>
-------------------------------	--

<p>10) Petition, 57 signatures, objection</p>	<p>park in the car park would not see the advertised change.</p> <p>Milman Road has real problems with parking, dangerous driving, pavement surfing, idling cars and parking on double yellow lines and in the ambulance bay at peak school, pharmacy and surgery times. This change will not help.</p> <p>10) The proposed change: Milman Road, West End, Both Sides: Introduce 'no waiting at any time' from its western end to a point 10m east of that point (in front of 69 & 71).</p> <p>Milman Road, South Side: Reduce existing shared use: 8am-8pm permit holders only or 2 hours no return within 2 hours. At all other times permit holders only from a point 8m east of its western end to a point 5m west of its junction with Mitcham Close.</p> <p>Reading Borough Council's reasons for change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To allow vehicles to turnaround more easily. • For the safety of children. <p>Reasons to oppose proposed changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing parking spaces on the road just makes an already difficult situation worse. Parking is already limited on the Milman Road; there are users and staff at the health centre, parents and staff at the school as well as residents, including those in Boult's Walk and the nearby estate who have no parking of their own. • Traffic on Milman Road at peak times can be appalling, including parents (amongst others) driving on pavements, driving carelessly and parking or idling on double yellow lines and school 'keep clear' signs. If child safety is really a consideration, then parents need to be discouraged from bringing their cars down this narrow Victorian residential road in the first place; not make it easier to manoeuvre once there. • The Victorian brick wall at the west end of Milman Road is already damaged where reversing cars have gone into it. If child safety is a concern, then the structural stability of the wall should be a priority as there is a school path directly behind it, and traffic should be discouraged from manoeuvring here. • The north and west sides of the road near the school already have double yellow lines or 'keep clear' markings which are widely ignored by visiting parents at school pick-up times. Many cars idle their engines here, adding to local pollution levels, in the pretence that they aren't really parking. We are unconvinced that adding more double yellow lines would do anything other than
---	---

<p>11) Resident, objection</p>	<p>encourage more idling engines and pump more pollution into the faces of schoolchildren - which is also a safety consideration - which means that the implied benefit of a new turning space would be lost anyway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It seems disproportionate to deprive local residents of the ability to unload shopping, furniture, children or elderly relatives for ever and always, as well as reducing the available parking to people with mobility problems who need vehicle access to the health centre, because it might (but probably won't) allow parents to more easily negotiate a road incapable of handling traffic. • Allowing traffic to turn more easily in a narrow cul-de-sac doesn't make the road safer for anyone, including children. Children only use the far western end of the road when parents have parked there to pick them up; the school exits are further east. If the western end of the road is dangerous for children at school pick-up times, then the solution seems to be to discourage parents from going there in the first place, not make it easier for them to turn around. • We have consulted with the Governors and Head of New Christchurch Primary School and they have not requested this change. • We the undersigned are lodging our objection to the proposed parking change as is our right in the consultation. We expect Reading Borough Council to take note of residents' views. <p>11) I strongly object to the changes being proposed to the west end of Milman Road for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is already a chronic shortage of parking on Milman Road for residents who also have to share road space with the likes of Boults Walk and Spring Gardens. We cannot afford to lose more parking spaces. The matter is only made worse with people attending the surgery and parents waiting to pick up their children from the school. 2. Residents overlooking the proposed area of change report that the ability to safely turn and exit the area is not improved when cars have not been parked there. Each visitor has their own "unique" way of how they turn their vehicle around at the end of our road. The level of stupidity and lack of common sense being displayed by drivers during either of the school runs is breathtakingly staggering. 3. It is ludicrous to make these changes to supposedly alleviate a problem that exists for parents for a period of 20 minutes at either end of the school day. The proposal will selfishly deny valuable parking for residents and surgery visitors for the other 23 or so hours of the day and weekends and school holidays, etc. Utterly ridiculous. 4. There is never a school weekday that goes by without a vehicle being illegally parked by the school.
--------------------------------	---

12) Resident, objection	<p>The area of proposed change will still be used for parking, illegally, or for parents waiting for their children while keeping their engine running. Surgery visitors are also guilty of this and present the same problems to safety and the environment. Road markings are simply ignored.</p> <p>5. The council and school should be discouraging parents from using vehicles to bring their children to school and pick them up. Walking should be encouraged for health benefits as well as environmental ones.</p> <p>56 residents on Milman Road have signed a petition to show their strong objection to the proposed changes. This will be handed to CJ Brooks, Head of Legal And Democratic Services at Reading Borough Council by [REDACTED].</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p> <p>12) I wish to object to the proposed reduction in residents parking spaces as it is totally unnecessary. Currently residents struggle to find parking during evenings and weekends. Also, any spaces which become available during the day are often used as overflow parking by patients visiting the Milman Road Health Centre. Our parking spaces are extremely precious and any reduction in availability will only cause more aggravation to residents.</p> <p>I understand that the reasoning for the reduction at the bottom end of the road is in the interests of safety for the pupils attending the Junior Christ Church School but this is not logical. The congestion caused before 9.00 am and later at 3-3.15 pm is caused by parents of the pupils when they are dropping off their children and collecting them later in the day. I would point out that these young pupils are not allowed to wander out of the school grounds unless accompanied by a parent, also all of these vehicles are driven by the parents and they are totally aware of the safety issues.</p>
-------------------------	---

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
PA1 - Cumberland Road 1) Resident, objection/comment	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 63, Support - 1, Comment - 3, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p>1) I have read the proposals to allow for wider access for vehicles such as fire service trucks by not allowing parking on the west side of Cumberland Rd. Parking is already a problem in the Cumberland Road area. These proposals will make parking for residents even worse. Would you consider as an alternative to make the west side of the allotted parking space encroach onto</p>

<p>2) Member of Community Centre, objection</p>	<p>the pavement by about one foot? There would be still enough room for pushchairs etc, and the east side would have the full pavement if extra space was needed. Hope you will give my idea some thought before you make the final decision.</p> <p>2) We are writing as [REDACTED] of the Warehouse Community centre on Cumberland Road.</p> <p>We object to this proposal because the loss of amenity to the residents of Cumberland Road is completely disproportionate to the benefit gained and we will in turn be affected by unauthorised parking in our car park and potential difficulties in making the left hand turn from our premises if parking is re-arranged.</p> <p>Before this scheme goes ahead we would want to understand why the existing access to Cumberland road from the top, from Norwood Road & Orts Road in the middle and from Amity Street (with some widening of the bollards from Cholmely Road) & School Terrace at the bottom are deemed insufficient. Granted Cumberland Road is too narrow to navigate but one would have thought that hose lengths from these 4 access points would be long enough to reach all of the road.</p> <p>Lastly we would want to understand why, if Cumberland is deemed too narrow then why is the same scheme not being suggested to residents in Amity Road as well, and numerous other streets round East Reading?</p> <p>Please halt this scheme that will make the lives of 100's of people utterly miserable.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p>
<p>3) Resident, Objection/comment</p>	<p>3) I understand that access has been a concern, and I certainly agree that we should make access down the road as easy possible, but I fail to see how removing parking spaces will achieve this.</p> <p>At present finding space to park on Cumberland Road is challenging enough, and people often have to use side streets or take advantage of the school lines. Not to mention all the parking that already occurs on the double yellows, especially at the London Rd end.</p> <p>By removing legal parking bays but not replacing them in sufficient quantity, surely cars will move further into Newtown merely moving the access issues and preventing residents on those streets being able to park near their homes. Or if people don't move down other roads I imagine there will be an increase in the number of people parked on double yellows, school lines etc. which is already an issue. Will these not increase the issues with access?</p>

<p>4) Resident, Objection</p>	<p>The removal of space to park does not mean that the cars will go with them. If this scheme goes ahead there must be suitable alternatives to replace the lost spaces.</p> <p>4) With due respect, we strongly object to your proposals to cut down Cumberland Road parking spaces when we already are facing a shortage of them (spaces).</p> <p>We think cutting down these parking spaces especially at the proposed scale will not be a very wise step as parking spaces in and around Cumberland Road serve the users of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cumberland Road Mosque 2. Sikh Gurudwara (Temple) 3. St. John's Church 4. Warehouse Community Centre 5. Sun Street Community Centre 6. St John's Primary school 7. Newtown Primary School 8. Amity Road Mosque 9. Of course Parking Permit Holders 10. Guests of the residents <p>We are parking permit holders and quite a few times, we couldn't park our car on Cumberland Road after we came back from either work or shopping.</p> <p>So kindly reconsider your plans and cut down the minimum number of parking spaces and keep this in mind that you are planning this for fire safety and convenience of the residents and NOT to cause them an inconvenience for the lifetime.</p>
<p>5) Resident, Objection</p>	<p>5) Parking is already drastically limited on the road where often, I struggle to get a space.</p> <p>The limited parking is already abused by gudwara patrons and on certain days, there is zero parking opportunities, never a sign of a warden on these days I note! On previous dealings with the police, I was informed patrons had permission to park in the college grounds or behind the cemetery gates yet no enforcement of this has ever taken place</p> <p>I appreciate we have no right to park outside of our properties but you are alienating good residents by investing no time, Money or effort into cemetery junction. Instead you are making our lives harder.</p>

<p>6) Resident, objection</p>	<p>Perhaps if the council even bothered to respond to reports of dumped vehicles, people wouldn't be forced to park dangerously.</p> <p>If it were possible to instal a drive way, believe me, I would!</p> <p>Can you tell me how many times you've tried to do some driver awareness in this regard, perhaps a leaflet drop may make a difference rather than taking this pathetic drastic action. In my time here I think I've only ever seen 1 awareness leaflet!</p> <p>At one time there was a fly tipped sofa IN the road, I reported this to the council and no action bar a pointless yellow sticker after about a week! If it wasn't for my partner moving it to the pavement, that would've been a massive hinderance to a fire engine.</p> <p>There is an absolutely wasted green space behind the garages that is never maintained. If you refuse to maintain it correctly, why don't you turn it into a car park...two birds one stone!</p> <p>My cars have been damaged on numerous occasions, I think, as a result of overcrowding. Why make this matter worse?</p> <p>Where do you propose we park when this stupid restriction comes in? Surely you're just moving the problem to neighbouring roads.</p> <p>I would like to be notified of any progression of this matter and I strongly oppose and will fight this.</p> <p>Stop alienating your residents, have some compassion and sort the problem, don't make it worse.</p> <p>We pay enough to park our cars under the pointless permit scheme, why don't you put that money to good use! When you pay for something, you expect a service.</p> <p>I can't wait to move out of reading, I'm ashamed to say I live here and your ludicrous plans do not make my feelings any better.</p> <p>6) I am a resident of Cumberland road, Reading. I am objecting to the proposed reduction in car parking spaces on Cumberland road. In my opinion this is a knee jerk reaction to a problem. The issue of access raised by the fire service is a valid one, however the solution proposed is nothing but a shortsighted, heavy handed and misguided idea.</p>
-------------------------------	---

<p>7) Resident, objection/comment</p>	<p>Cumberland road is not the narrowest of the roads in the new town area, in fact Amity road (the next street along) has greater issues with access due to its narrow width. By reducing the spaces by approximately 50 residents will be forced to park on adjacent streets, thereby exacerbating their own parking issues. Parking is a problem across the whole of the new town area, this proposal will cause a knock on effect across all streets and I wouldn't be surprised if the fire service complained about access on these streets.</p> <p>Nationwide trends show that car ownership is still on the rise (519 per 100 people) and for a Victorian area such as New Town which wasn't designed with cars in mind it is clear that a solution which increases parking whilst not affecting access is required.</p> <p>One of the simplest solutions centres around driver education, residents should be informed of the need to park close to the kerb or when in a wide vehicle such as a van or SUV to park up on the kerb. This also applies to corners, I have observed on many occasions drivers park on corners and therefore massively impede drivers trying to make the turn. I believe that parking wardens should (amongst their other duties) ticket drivers who park in this manner. Placards should be installed beneath the permit signs informing drivers of their duty to park properly.</p> <p>Parking on kerbs is unsightly and if this isn't acceptable, I suggest reducing the width of the pavement by 6 inches each side therefore providing an additional 1 foot of road width. This along with the driver education could greatly help the situation.</p> <p>A more radical approach would be to attempt to increase the numbers of parking spaces by building on currently undeveloped or underdeveloped land. I include with this possible changes of use of land in the area. For example, between 96 and 106 Cumberland Road is a row of garages. I do not know the state of ownership of these garages however through compulsory purchase orders and redevelopment of the land additional parking could be provided. Another site such as this exists near to number 5 Cumberland Road.</p> <p>As a young professional home owner in the area I would be devastated if the proposal went ahead, in fact it would be a reason to move away from this area. Please think this through before acting.</p> <p>7) I am writing to ask that you pause the plans to restrict the parking on Cumberland Road until at least a fair period of consultation has taken place and the council has had time to consider the views of the residents. Ideally this needs to include the creation of alternative spaces within an already built up area where</p>
---------------------------------------	---

<p>8) Resident, objection/comment</p>	<p>parking is already a serious problem that affects the daily quality of lives for residents. For example it is already commonplace that people are worried about going out on a Sunday as they will have no space to park on return.</p> <p>This consultation needs to be done at a time that is more representative of the parking issues in New Town ie. Not the school holidays when there are fewer HMO student residents and both schools are closed.</p> <p>I understand the issue of fire safety and access and this is something that most residents who have lived here a while understand and park their cars considerately and will go outside and move cars obstructing the road. Generally they would do this anyway to avoid damage so maybe educating people could be another option. I also was under the impression that fire fighters have implicit permission by nature of their role that they can remove any vehicle obstructing their path, although I appreciate that this is not always practical in an emergency. But this fact could also be highlighted to residents.</p> <p>Also I would be interested in looking at alternative routes into Newtown via Orts Road for emergency vehicles only as a partial solution to wider vehicles gaining access.</p> <p>8) I am writing with regard to the Waiting Restriction Review Program 2018A (Reference: CMS/009816). My comments are in relation to the proposed parking restrictions on Cumberland Road.</p> <p>I am concerned about the proposal to reduce parking availability by somewhere in the region of 50 spaces in an area that is close to capacity for residents parking. To compound this, at certain times of the week, parking overflows due largely to visitors to the nearby Gurdwara, Mosque and Church.</p> <p>While I understand this proposal may have been submitted under the safety banner (fire/ambulance access ?), I also believe that unless adequate nearby replacement parking is provided then the unintended consequence will likely be that the roads become busier/gridlocked as people attempt to find spaces and surrounding roads will suffer from lack of parking.</p> <p>Cumberland Road is typical of many of the roads in the Newtown area, being narrow with parking down both sides of the road, however I don't think effectively cutting in half the available parking is a sensible solution to an occasional access issue caused by bad parking or oversized vehicles.</p> <p>Other solutions could potentially include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Negotiating use of additional parking if available, for example the warehouse, church or sun street center car parks. •Constructing additional parking, although I suspect there aren't many potential locations for this. •Reducing the 2 hour wait period without a permit to perhaps 30 minutes. •Restricting certain larger vehicle categories from parking within the zone (maybe with the exception of deliveries and collections).
---------------------------------------	---

<p>9) Resident, objection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Providing Fire Engines/Ambulances that are capable of negotiating narrower roads, there must be numerous places around Reading that this would be beneficial. <p>I hope that a sensible solution can be found.</p> <p>9) I write to lodge my objection to the planned parking changes to Cumberland Road in Newtown. I live on Sun Street and already there are parking difficulties with people from Cumberland Road parking in Sun Street. We have the added complexity of visitors to the Community Centre, the Gurdwara and the Mosque taking up space in the streets.</p> <p>Motorcycles take up two spaces and do not have not display permits, we have commercial vehicles (DPD vans) and dumped cars that are around for weeks until they are towed, plus cars cars with no permits, park at all times.</p> <p>I measured the distance on the road between the park cars on each side and Cumberland Road is as narrow as the other streets. The one way system has helped with congestion, however, Sun St and Amity Street are hugely affected by traffic at all times. Perhaps further investigations into the one way system would be better than taking out parking.</p> <p>I think that this plan, to remove parking will impact massively on the surrounding streets and that more difficulties for residents will be experienced.</p> <p>We pay for a garage and a parking permit and use our garage to park in and one car on the street. This will really impact upon our ability to park near our home.</p>
<p>10)Resident, objection</p>	<p>10)I would like to raise my objections to the proposal to remove car parking spaces from Cumberland Road. I am a resident on the road and at times it is already difficult to find parking. Not all residents even have cars and it can still be difficult at times. It is even more difficult when there are events in the Church, Mosque and Gurdwara in the area.</p> <p>I am sympathetic to the fact that it is difficult for emergency vehicles to navigate the street - as well as them not being able to access an emergency they sometimes also damage vehicles in the street (the same applies to lorries).</p> <p>I would like alternative solutions to be explored. For example, the pavement can be reduced by 6 inches on either side; this, combined with driver education on parking close to the kerb, would create the extra space on the road for large vehicles. Some of the roads in the area already have narrower</p>

<p>11) Resident, objection</p>	<p>footpaths. Smaller emergency vehicles would also be able to navigate the street more easily.</p> <p>If a no waiting zone on one side of the street must be introduced then alternative parking very close by must be provided. There is a section of grass between Cumberland Road and Amity Road next to the garages. This could be converted to additional parking. Other areas of no waiting on the other side of the road must be removed.</p> <p>Ultimately I would not like this proposal implemented as it would cause great inconvenience to the car owning residents of Cumberland Road.</p> <p>11) I saw the notices put up on Cumberland Road recently outlining changes to the parking areas on Cumberland Road and am writing to object to the proposal.</p> <p>I understand the importance of making the road accessible for emergency vehicles, however, I believe this is not the only way that can be achieved, and that this proposal is the lazy solution.</p> <p>Firstly, you could make the entire street permit holders only all the time; this would reduce the number of vehicles generally, especially on Sundays when there are a lot more people trying to park on the street to access the Sikh temple.</p> <p>I understand the people running the temple have arranged for parking at the college site, which helps somewhat; however, I have noticed that there are still a lot of people parking on Cumberland Road and nearby roads to have a shorter walk. I have also noticed that a lot of people park on the double-yellows around this time without PCNs being given. This is disappointing as it makes driving down the road extremely difficult and dangerous.</p> <p>So, to bring this back to my point, if you have permit holders only, there will be fewer cars to start with, and an easier population to educate on parking sensibly.</p> <p>Another step that could be introduced, although this does come with a cost...but given the high costs we have to pay for the permits I am assuming you have a pot of money ready for this...is to widen the road slightly. There are streets in Reading with much smaller pathways than Cumberland Road has, so there is room to bring them in enough to make space for fire engines to easily drive down the road. Or you could go for a cheaper solution of re-painting the lines to make the spaces thinner, encouraging cars to park on the curb, creating more space in the middle of the road.</p>
--------------------------------	---

	<p>I am objecting to the proposal, however, I am aware of the problem, and would like further thought made into solutions that don't cut the number of spaces. The reason I am objecting to this specific solution are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of cars will remain the same, therefore, the problem will just be moved elsewhere - this isn't a solution, just a problem-redistribution. - There are other ways to combat the issue (a couple of which I have highlighted above) - Cutting parking will reduce value of homes on the street as fewer people will want to buy a house if there is no parking available (I certainly wouldn't have bought a house on this street if I knew this proposal was coming along eventually) <p>However, if for some reason this manages to get through planning, I will look forward to my 50% refund on the vehicle permits for my house (I assume the cost of parking will halve if the number of spaces are halved...right?!).</p>
12) Resident, objection	<p>12) I am disappointed that you have resolved to cutting the number of parking spaces in Cumberland Road without looking creating alternative parking spaces to compensate the loss. During the day most cars parked are not for immediate residents as the evidenced by the reduced number of cars parked after midnight. This is wholly an issue about enforcement which you are responsible as a council. Secondly you can create parking space on the empty space by the letter box in Cumberland road.</p> <p>Hope you going to be reasonable and consider the impact this has on locals.</p>
13) Resident, objection	<p>13) I have been made aware of the possibility of the parking on Cumberland Road being cut in half. I am seriously worried that this will make the already over-crowded parking in Newtown even worse. Surely there are another alternatives to just cutting the parking areas on the road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Newtown Primary has allocated parking, can this not be used once the school is not in attendance. 2) There is also additional parking at the bottom of Cumberland Road, can this not be extended, currently it is used as a dumping ground for people to flytip. <p>I can see that people will start to park in The Warehouse, the Wycliffe Church and Sun Street Centre, these areas have allocated parking for their use.</p>
14) Resident, objection	<p>I find it just very "gobsmacking" that you will just take away parking without provide an alternative especially as people now have to have a permit to park outside their house.</p> <p>14) I understand that you wish to limit parking as currently fire engines may find it difficult to access</p>

<p>15) Resident, objection/comment</p>	<p>Newtown due to the narrowness of Cumberland Road. As you will be aware, it is not always easy to find a parking space in this area of Newtown and reducing the number of spaces will only increase the stress and inconvenience of a large number of people. However, there is a very simple solution, one that the people of Amity Road have adopted for many years - simply allow motorists to park with 2 wheels on the kerb. 8-10 inches should be sufficient to make the road wide enough for access for emergency vehicles, while still allowing wheelchairs and pushchairs to use the pavement safely. Although technically illegal, many motorists already park like this in a number of roads in the area without causing any problems. Please could this be considered as a solution, rather than denying many people the chance of parking outside their properties?</p> <p>15) Please find my comments and objections to the scheme of changes to the waiting restrictions and residents parking bays in Cumberland Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The changes proposed will result in a significant loss of parking spaces for residents in the road, meaning that despite Cumberland Road being a long road of 140+ houses, residents will no longer be able to park on their own road, nor will there be room for visitors to park. These are such drastic changes to a scheme that has been in place for many years that they need further consideration and amendment before implementation. 2. The changes will also negatively affect at least two (and possibly three) of the religious institutions on Cumberland Road. The Masjid and Gurdwara are welcome and important neighbours to the local area, who have worshippers travelling from around Reading and Wokingham to attend and pray. The Wycliffe and associated Warehouse have private off-road parking space and so will be less affected, but they will be under significant pressure to manage their parking space were these changes to go ahead. All three operate not just as places of worship but as community centres for local residents. These parking changes, with little or no additional spaces found in the road or local area, will have direct and significant negative impact, especially on elderly and disabled worshippers. 3. The effect of these changes will not only be felt on Cumberland Road, but throughout Newtown, as people parking in the existing space will be pushed to the other local roads. Amity Road, Cholmeley Road and all others will feel the impact of the displaced parking, leading to more cars on already crowded streets. Large vehicles and emergency vehicles could then find the problem of access to Newtown significantly worsened. Any changes to roads in Newtown should be considered on an area basis. 4. There are numerous suggestions from local residents where additional parking space can be found (for example, at the top and bottom of Cumberland Road itself) and these seem practical and worthy of
--	---

<p>16) Resident, support/comment</p>	<p>consideration. These should be considered and additional parking space implemented at the same time as any reduction to allow additional waiting restrictions to one side.</p> <p>5. No justification or reasons for the proposed changes have been published (that I am aware of) other than that these changes are 'either in the interests of safety or in response to demand'. The lack of a clearly stated reason with evidence to support it has left residents on Cumberland Road and Newtown unable to properly understand what these are for and therefore respond appropriately to the consultation. This should be remedied before any changes are implemented.</p> <p>6. Access to Cumberland Road, and Newtown, for emergency vehicles is important, but other solutions should also be looked at in tandem to on-street changes. Driver education to ensure cars are parked appropriately should be thoroughly attempted, as should education for fire and ambulance crews accessing Newtown. Emergency vehicles should have appropriate 'narrow street' information on every call out, as Cumberland Road can be accessed via Orts Road or the 'wrong-way' via School Terrace when required.</p> <p>In the long-term I have no objections to some changes to the restrictions and bays on Cumberland Road, but I object to this scheme going ahead before additional parking space can be found to ameliorate the parking problems that will be caused.</p> <p>16) I do share concerns about fire engine access to parts of Cumberland Road, especially as this has been found to be a real problem in recent times.</p> <p>The problem is relevant to any kind of large vehicle, not just to fire engines. I often see lorries struggling to proceed past badly parked cars or past oversized vehicles, often resulting in damage. Yesterday in fact I saw an ambulance struggling to pass some parked cars. It must be extremely difficult for bin collections on a regular basis. For these reasons I would be broadly in favour of allowing parking on only one side of Cumberland Road.</p> <p>There are a number of steps that could be explored to mitigate for the loss of parking spaces. Possibilities include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. opening up the area between 96 and 106 Cumberland Road, to the east of the garages, to parking, 2. converting the area of land at the north end of Cumberland Road (next to the foot bridge) to parking spaces, 3. opening up parts of the central road in the cemetery for parking (this certainly happens informally by users of the Gurdwara so is practically possible), and/or
--------------------------------------	--

	<p>4. allowing strictly only permit holders to park in Cumberland Road, reducing the need for spaces.</p> <p>Point 3 though will result in security concerns for cars parked in the cemetery overnight, and so may require lighting and CCTV. Point 4 will be a problem for brief visitors, and to users of the Gurdwara, though.</p> <p>A positive consequence of allowing parking on only one side of the road is that the south part of Cumberland Road could presumably be opened up to two-way traffic making access out of Newtown easier than it is at present.</p>
<p>17) Resident, objection/comment</p>	<p>17) A resident without easy access to email has asked that I register some objections on her behalf.</p> <p>Firstly, that any consultation on parking in the road should not be done in August, a large number of families, and any students, are away from the area and will be unable to respond. This also means that car parking is at a low point in the year, which might give residents the false impression that there are spaces that are unused.</p> <p>Secondly, they are concerned that significantly reducing space for parking means that elderly and disabled worshippers will not be able to access the Mosque and Gurdwara, and she would like that raised as an Equalities objection.</p>
<p>18) Resident, objection</p>	<p>18) I am writing on behalf of myself and my partner, residents at [REDACTED] Cumberland Road regarding the proposed changes to parking along Cumberland Road in Reading. While it is imperative that emergency services are not impeded in their responses, by making the parking on the road single sided this will cause a massive parking issue to the residents of Newtown. We are a single car household and still at times have difficulty parking along our street and need to seek parking in adjacent roads. There is a risk that by reducing the parking along this road all that will happen is the blockage will shift to other streets. Prior to any changes being made additional parking in the area needs to be created otherwise the residents will be massively affected, as well as residents in nearby streets.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p>
<p>19) Resident, objection</p>	<p>19) I would like to object to the council's proposal to reduce parking to one side of Cumberland Road only. Whilst I appreciate that some cars are parked badly, I believe that the loss of car parking spaces will create problems in other roads in the area and will not resolve the issue there.</p> <p>A better solution might be to allow partial parking on the pavement on one side of the road, something</p>

<p>20) Resident, objection</p>	<p>that is widely practised in Cholmeley Road, for example.</p> <p>20) As a resident at [REDACTED] Cholmeley Rd I object to your proposal to remove parking bays in Cumberland Rd as there will be a detrimental effect to other areas parking. I suggest you widen the road rather.</p>
<p>21) Resident, objection/comment</p>	<p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p> <p>21) I am writing to object to the Traffic Regulation Order (ref: CMS/009816). I understand that the proposed new parking restrictions will result in the council cutting the parking provision on Cumberland Road (within parking zone 12R) by 50%, a loss of approximately 50 parking spaces. The proposed restrictions are intended to increase the width of the road available for through traffic, in particular Berkshire Fire and Rescue have raised concerns about their fire engines being unable to pass up and down the road on some occasions.</p> <p>I object on the grounds that the proposed changes cannot achieve the desired aim of improving access to Cumberland Road for emergency services vehicles without a significant detrimental effect on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local residents: a lack of planned provision for nearby alternative parking to replace the 50 spaces that would be lost on Cumberland Road (and more broadly, in the 12R parking zone) as a result of this TRO is very concerning. Many local residents rely on their vehicles to commute to their places of work, and these proposed changes will make it difficult to find any available parking space within the 12R parking zone, and consequently impact on livelihoods. Local roads in the 12R parking zone are already close to capacity with regards to available parking. • Safety: Any increase in cars parking on other roads in the 12R parking zone will make it more difficult for emergency services vehicles to access properties on these roads, and so the problem is moved, rather than solved. Personal safety is also a consideration for residents on Cumberland Road returning after dark who in future face a walk of several streets between their cars and their homes, if they can find parking provision in the parking zone 12R at all. <p>I similarly object on the grounds that I do not believe the Council have fully considered alternative arrangements that would result in a better outcome for the residents of Cumberland Road and the local community, and more broadly the residents of other similarly narrow roads across Reading. I would like the Council to consider the alternative proposals outlined below (particularly those that have been actioned and proven to work in other areas of Reading, Berkshire, and more broadly the South-East),</p>

prior to taking any further action to reduce the number of parking spaces available on Cumberland Road:

- The procurement/deployment of fire engines appropriate to the local roads they will be accessing by Berkshire Fire and Rescue. Berkshire Fire and Rescue report that there are three vehicle types that comprise their fleet of fire engines: Volvo VL8, Mercedes Atego, and Dennis Artego. The ability of these vehicles to access narrow, Victorian streets, like those in Reading (including Cumberland Road) and their availability to fire crews manning fire stations covering the Reading area should be assessed. If a vehicle that is sufficiently narrow is not currently available in the local area, a number of fire services in the South East have reported purchasing narrower vehicles for the purposes of accessing narrow streets, and Berkshire Fire and Rescue should be asked to undertake an exercise to assess the feasibility of doing the same.
- Amendments to existing parking restrictions could both better manage the types of vehicles accessing parking on Cumberland Road and the volume of traffic. There are a wide number of options, and combinations of options, that should be investigated:
 - A restriction in the types of vehicles for which residents permits are granted, for example commercial vehicles over a certain weight to be ineligible for residents permits. These vehicles are often much wider than an average family car, and longer, taking up space in more than one parking bay;
 - Removal of the parking provision for '2 hours no return within 2 hours', bringing the parking restrictions in the 12R parking zone into alignment with other residential parking zones in centralised parts of Reading. Parking on Cumberland Road is often notably busier at weekends, indicating that visitor parking is having a significant impact on the parking available for residents at these times;
 - Introduction of parking meters for visitor parking (excl. those in possession of visitor permits linked to residential addresses in the 12R parking zone), such as those in use on roads in Earley (i.e. Alexandra Road) to disincentivise visitor parking for those accessing local community centres, faith centres and commercial properties situated on and near to Cumberland Road. The Gurdwara have an established agreement with Reading College for use of the latter's car park at times when high volumes of visitors to the Gurdwara are expected. This arrangement should be exploited fully, and other faith groups encouraged to establish similar arrangements.

<p>22) Resident, objection/comment</p> <p>23) Resident, objection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marked parking bays that overlap the pavement on the west side of Cumberland Road (where the majority of the proposed parking restrictions are planned for) would increase the width of the road for through traffic. Cumberland Road would remain fully accessible to pedestrians on the east side. <p>Improved parking enforcement: There are substantial sections of Cumberland Road where parking is already restricted by the use of no waiting zones (double yellow lines). Better enforcement of vehicles parking in these zones in violation of local parking restrictions, and Penalty Charge Notices issued to vehicles not displaying a valid permit or remaining parked for longer than the permitted 2 hour period, may be sufficient to increase the accessibility of Cumberland Road. We are unaware of any publicly available evidence that indicates that vehicles parked in compliance with existing parking restrictions are preventing access to Cumberland Road for fire engines.</p> <p>Finally, we would request that should the Council insist on proceeding with the planned changes to parking restrictions on Cumberland Road, without amendment and after due consideration of the above alternatives, that this is not undertaken until plans for provision of new, alternative parking are developed and shared with residents of the 12R parking zone for review. Furthermore, these parking restrictions should not be implemented until acceptable new parking provision is actioned and work is complete. We are aware that some land presently providing a pedestrianised through-way between Cumberland Road and Amity Road has been highlighted as a potential site for further parking, and we would like assurances that this will be fully considered by the Council. However, we recognise that there is not sufficient space to replace 50 parking spaces, and further solutions will need to be found.</p> <p>We would ask the Council to carefully consider that in introducing these parking restrictions to Cumberland Road an unacceptable and unworkable precedent may be set for Reading. Many narrow streets in centralised parts of Reading are potentially difficult for Berkshire Fire and Rescue to access with their existing fleet of fire engines. However, it is not feasible to impose parking restrictions in large parts of residential Reading without adversely affecting the local economy.</p> <p>22) Living [REDACTED] Cumberland Road. I have one car. I always respect and support for fire safety but Im deeply concerned about loss of parking spaces. Our voice is raising that we want alternative parking places if you want to do one way parking. I hope council will understand about these matters.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p> <p>23) I am very concerned that the proposed removal of car park spaces on Cumberland Road will cause residents real problems with parking. I do find it staggering that the large bin lorry seems to make it</p>
---	--

<p>24) Resident, objection</p>	<p>down Cumberland Road every week with no apparent issues. Removal of the spaces on Cumberland Road will mean other roads that are equally as narrow become even more congested and impassable for the fire brigade. The roads and houses were built a long time ago and it seems unfair that all of the residents need to suffer due to poor vehicle choice of the fire brigade. There are many very narrow roadways in Reading not just Newtown so would it not be beneficial for Reading to have a smaller appliance as they used to have in Cookham to attend calls where access can be difficult?</p> <p>The proposed change solely for access for the fire service seems unfair to residents who for the last few years have had council tax increase for the fire service. Once again it seems residents will be paying the price again through loss of parking when improvements were meant to be made to the service (such as suitable vehicle) with increase in council tax.</p> <p>24) i am objecting the proposed layout as it does not give us a designated parking space for each house hold along the whole length of cumberland road. last year you proposed to put parking machines and forced us to pay for the installation of the machines now you are coming back with this idea of making us park on one side which i find it hard to believe your genuine idea of trying to free up traffic from our road. i was looking at the proposed road layout it does not cater for all the household cars along the road. are you indirectly trying to evict us as i am already considering moving to other areas as it is increasingly becoming expensive to own a car along cumberland road. i have lived at my address for seven years but the last two years i have seen that there is a drive to push us out we car owners.</p>
<p>25) Resident, objection/comment</p>	<p>If you widen up the road that means all those delivery trucks will be going thru our area. As it stands now it restrict them from going thru because it's narrow. You widen it the way you are proposing we will come back to you to reverse it back to where it was.</p> <p>25) We understand the need to make the roads accessible for Fire engines, could it not be investigated at looking for smaller engines as water carrying in the town is not essential due to fire hydrants.</p> <p>As for parking regulations in Cumberland road with the 2 hour free parking makes it impossible to park on a Sunday. As for the sheikh temple they have parking rights in the collage car park on kings road, but not everybody uses it. As for disable drivers they park on double yellow lines and on the corners making it near impossible to turn into Cumberland road.</p> <p>The increase of building houses on the old swimming pool site will mean even more cars, also the making houses into multiple occupancy will also increase difficulty parking in this area. More parking needs to be found for existing residents, the cost of the parking permit scheme will become a joke.</p> <p>My [REDACTED] is disabled so we will be able to park on double yellow lines for 3 hours, but this will</p>

<p>26) Resident, objection/comm ent</p>	<p>not help the problem of the fire engines getting down the road. At the last incident of a fire engine not being able to get down the road was caused by people parking on Cumberland road were at the warehouse at the top end of the road and have there own car park, so nobody knew who the cars belonged to.</p> <p>We suggest that the 2 hours free parking be suspended and that the parking permits have the address of holder, or the fire brigade have access to a data bank with permit no's and addresses on it.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p> <p>26) I am writing in objection to the Proposal of only allowing parking on one side of Cumberland Road.</p> <p>This will create major parking problems in the area causing other surrounding roads to be congested and will in affect stop the fire service from accessing those roads.</p> <p>An alternative must be found either by educating drivers on how to park correctly or making the paths slightly narrower.</p>
<p>27) Resident, objection/comm ent</p>	<p>27) As a car-owning resident of Cumberland Road, Reading, I am concerned with your proposal to cut the number of parking spaces in this road. I understand that this is because the Fire Service has raised concerns that, at times, they are unable to proceed easily down the road. Whilst I support fire safety in the area, I believe that losing approximately 50 parking spaces will cause problems for residents and visitors. At present we have about 130 spaces, this number, under your proposals, would be cut to about 80. I have conducted a survey in the road - 110 houses responded, and there were 86 cars in those houses, 36 did not respond, but averaging these houses car ownership to those that did respond, there could be another 28 cars at those houses, giving a total of 114 cars belonging to residents of the road. Therefore we need to have at least that many spaces just for the residents, without even considering visitors, carers, tradespeople, etc, who sometimes need to park in the road. Before you go ahead and implement this scheme, I suggest that you should look into providing alternative parking spaces to mitigate the loss that your proposed scheme will cause. My suggestions are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) About 20 parking spaces could be provided by turning the land between the telephone box on Cumberland Road and Amity Road into a car park, with access off Cumberland Road, and no entry/exit into Amity Road. In my opinion, this would be a better use for the land, under the circumstances of losing some of our parking on Cumberland Road, than what it is at present - a dumping ground for rubbish, and dogs toilet. People could still walk through if it was a car park,

<p>28) Resident, objection/comment</p>	<p>to get from one road to the other. The current garages by the telephone box would not be affected, and could stay where they are.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) About 6-10 extra spaces could be provided at the bottom of Cumberland Road/Avon Place, both sides of the approximately 6 spaces which are currently there. These spaces appear to be 'unrestricted parking' so I suggest these plus any new ones created should be 'permit holders only'. In fact, when I checked on them about 8pm last night, only one of the six cars parked there had a parking permit displayed. 3) Get rid of the '2 hours, no return within 2 hours' parking. Anyone coming to visit one of the houses in the road could use a 'visitors permit'. This might mean that it would be a good idea for each house to be issued with more than 2 free 'visitors permits' books, and for a second car in a house to be issued with some free 'visitors permit' books instead of the nil that they are entitled to at present. A lot of the people who use the '2 hours, no return within 2 hours' parking at present go off to other places, ie a quick trip into town, and park in our road so that they don't have to pay to park in the centre of town. 4) Sunday is a particularly bad time for parking in the road, because of people visiting the Sikh temple, mosque, and local church. Quite often they don't have permits because they are from outside the area, and they stay longer than 2 hours, and park on the pavement and the double yellow lines. Maybe a traffic warden should come around at that time, and issue parking tickets if appropriate? Maybe the visitors should walk or use public transport? <p>If you instigate this proposal without allocating any extra spaces, ie as I have suggested in 1 and 2 and 3 above, residents who are unable to park in Cumberland Road will park in any available spaces in neighbouring roads, and thus possibly causing the same problems in these roads.</p> <p>Incidentally, the space between the parking lines in Amity Road is 1.86 metres, less than the space between the parking lines in Cumberland Road (2.2 metres). Has a fire engine ever needed to get along Amity Road?</p> <p>28) It has currently come to my knowledge that there is currently a plan to reduce the number of parking places within Cumberland road. This unfortunately will cause a number of issues for the local residents which will hopefully be outlined below.</p> <p>We are a two-car household both cars are used for traveling to and from work. One person is employed as a teacher and has to travel to and from work. Whilst the other person is self-employed and has to travel large distances to see clients, and therefore a reduction in parking will cause an increase in stress and frustration.</p> <p>We moved to the area deliberately due to the ample parking available to the area and have currently enjoyed 4 years of local living and easy access to other areas of Berkshire.</p> <p>Hopefully below I will outline the possible issues for the local residents.</p>
--	--

<p>29) Visitor to the Mosque, objection</p> <p>30) Resident,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be loss of value to the property, on average parking adds £10,000 to the value of a property, if there is a reduction in parking this would mean that local property values would reduce by £10,000 each. Currently there are 144 houses on Cumberland road with the average value of the houses on Cumberland road of £250,000 (taken from Zoopla), meaning that on average each house will suddenly and irrevocably be reduced to £240,000 of 144 houses meaning that there will be a total loss of £1,440,000 along the entirety of Cumberland road. • If there is reduced parking this will reduce the value of property in the area leading to a possible reduction in the council tax band of each house along the road. Meaning that for the 144 houses along Cumberland road they could reduce from. For example: a council tax band of D to a council tax band of C. Meaning that each house individually will save £191.48. but this means that reading council will lose 191.48 per house hold for 144 households meaning a net loss of £27,573.12 per year. • Reduction in social economic status of local people. “There is evidence that those on low incomes, living in deprived neighbourhoods, are more adversely affected by the impacts of transport than those living in more affluent neighbourhoods. These differences include an increased risk of road traffic injury, increased concerns about personal security, and higher exposure rates to ozone and particulate matter. People without cars, those with disabilities, the elderly and school children are the most severely affected by severance (where transport schemes or high Transport and Poverty 33 Page volumes of traffic act as a barrier to movement and social interaction). This combination of problems can exacerbate poverty by reducing access to key services such as employment, education and healthcare, lead to social isolation and reduce physical and mental well-being.” Taken from Transport and Poverty ‘A review of the evidence’ 1 July 2014. If the parking restrictions go ahead then the council may be intentionally isolating people from poorer backgrounds and reducing their ability to progress within society. • Forcing properties to have one car. • Currently the local refuse lorry easily travels up and down the road with no obvious problems. • If this was to be implemented within Cumberland road then this would have to be logically implemented upon the whole of the new town area and thus other areas within reading. • Will cause over parking and crowding in other roads and possibly leading to aggressive behaviour and potentially vehicle destruction. <p>Ideas to help with the issue of parking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilise the council owned property (117) on Cumberland road as alternative parking. • Allow parking on pavements. • Increase cost of parking permits. • Utilise Tesco's overflow carpark as alternative council parking. <p>29) Parking is vital for this street. I use it daily and it becoming one side, would restrict me from doing so. I</p>
--	---

objection	attend the mosque on this road and I have to drive because I live across town and if I can't park there, it would restrict me.
31) Resident, objection/comment	30) Residents who live on and around Cumberland Road are already struggling to find parking as it is! This will be a nightmare and a huge inconvenience.
32) Resident, objection/comment	31) This will have a major impact on parking in the area causing other surrounding roads to become congested and in effect make it difficult for fire service to access those roads. Alternative measures can be carried out like narrowing the pathways or educating drivers to park close to the pavement.
33) Resident, objection/comment	32) This will have a major impact on parking in the area causing other surrounding roads to become congested and in effect make it difficult for fire service to access those roads. Alternative measures can be carried out like narrowing the pathways or educating drivers to park close to the pavement.
34) Resident, objection	33) I oppose to make Cumberland Road restricting to parking on one side of the road as will make other roads congested which will make it hazardous for fire fighters and ambulances and other emergency services to get through. Pavements should be narrow and drivers encouraged to park near to curbs.
35) Resident, objection	34) I object. It will cause a huge problem with parking in the area. People will then start parking illegally creating difficulty for emergency vehicles.
36) Resident, objection/comment	35) There are not enough parking places already and if you make single side then there will be a big problem. It will not even cover the residents. There are three holy places, gurdawara, Mosque and church.
37) Resident, objection	36) Restrictions in parking bays will put pressure on other roads within the area, causing additional residents to suffer from a lack of parking spaces. I would suggest width restrictions and maybe lowering the kerbstones to allow cars to park on the pavement. Allowing lorries to park in the bus lane on London Road for deliveries would also help. Cumberland Road has three religious places of worship. These worshippers require parking for an hour or two at different days and times of the week.
38) Resident,	37) I object to this proposal as it will create more harm than good, in my perspective. Less parking space means more congestion. This will especially be the case during Friday prayers, night prayers during Ramadan and before and after kids classes. Not only is this a danger and safety risk for these children but the congestion will also create difficulty for ambulance/fire services accessing these roads. There

objection/comment	is also the concern that people may start parking illegally which will create even more issues. I deeply believe an alternative solution should be looked in to.
39) Resident, objection/comment	<p>38) This will have a major impact on parking in the area causing other surrounding roads to become congested and in effect make it difficult for fire service to access those roads.</p> <p>Alternative measures can be carried out like narrowing the pathways or educating drivers to park close to the pavement.</p>
40) Resident, objection/comment	<p>39) This will have a major impact on parking in the area causing other surrounding roads to become congested and in effect make it difficult for fire service to access those roads.</p> <p>Alternative measures can be carried out like narrowing the pathways or educating drivers to park close to the pavement.</p>
41) Resident, objection	<p>40) I object to this as it will only create congestion on other roads.</p> <p>Alternate is to reduce path size.</p>
42) Resident, objection	<p>41) Parking restrictions on Cumberland Road will cause mayhem as surrounding areas will become congested and it will also become extremely difficult for the public who need to use the businesses and/or places of worship that are located in that area.</p> <p>So many people benefit from parking on both sides on that road especially residents so it will be foolish to restrict one side.</p>
43) Resident, objection	<p>42) I want to write against the parking restriction on Cumberland Road although I am a resident of Orts road this will have major impact on us as already lot of vehicles of Cumberland road residents are parked on Orts road. Due to the Mosque and Gurudwara on Cumberland road there are lot of visitors coming from different places.</p> <p>Its already difficult to find parking places specially on weekends if you further restrict the parking on Cumberland Road it will create lot of problems for neighbouring roads residents.</p> <p>Hence kindly request you to make alternate arrangements as reducing the parking places will create lot of other problems.</p>

<p>44) Resident, objection</p> <p>45) Resident, comment</p> <p>46) Visitor to the Mosque, objection</p> <p>47) Resident, objection/comment</p> <p>48) Resident, objection</p> <p>49) Resident, objection</p>	<p>43) I am against this proposal because of it would be too congested to park the car as big hundred of people live on the Cumberland Road and they use their own cars. Also there is Mosque for Muslim Community and they attend the Mosque five times a day. The parents of the children pick and drop them from Mosque as the children get their religious education in the Mosque. In all of the holy month of Ramadan the Muslim community spend lots of time in the Mosque. Hundred of Muslims offer their prayer on every Friday.</p> <p>Also there is a Gurdwara for Sikh community is on the Cumberland Road. The community attend religious services on the daily basis and also organise religious functions and big community attend the religious services.</p> <p>So on the above mentioned reasons, I disagree with the Council decision and request not to impose the new proposal for the best interests of the residents as well the Two Religious Communities to perform their religious functions with comfort and ease.</p> <p>It would be much appreciated if the Council do not change the status of the Cumberland Road.</p> <p>44) I would like to live it as it's now with double parking please, because I would not be happy to see people parking here getting ticket unnecessarily.</p> <p>45) It just doesn't make sense</p> <p>46) This space for parking is very important for the members who attend the mosque on Cumberland Road, where residents from the whole of Reading come from.</p> <p>47) this will have a major impact on parking in the area causing other surrounding roads to become congested and in effect make it difficult for fire service to access those roads. Alternative measures can be carried out like narrowing the pathways or educating drivers to park close to the pavement.</p> <p>48) this will have a major impact on parking in the area causing other surrounding roads to become congested and in effect make it difficult for fire service to access those roads. Alternative measures can be carried out like narrowing the pathways or educating drivers to park close to the pavement.</p>
--	---

50) Local Councillor, objection/comment	<p>49) Cumberland Road has many community facilities and restricting parking will only cause difficulties for the users and other people.</p> <p>50) I would like to object to the proposal to cut parking in half on Cumberland Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extra parking could be created at the same time as making any changes to avoid chaos - top of Cumberland Road, School Terrace school zigzags, bottom of Cholmeley Road, near to the Jolly Anglers pub, Sun Street car park, Newtown school car park - Driver education could be further explored - the bays could be narrowed to 1.9 m along the road - could the fire service get a narrower fire engine?
51) Resident, objection	<p>51) I am one of the residents of this road lives on side of the road you intended to remove parking, remaining parking space is on front of other people's house, local psychology is people's mind if we park on front of their house while there is no space around for them to park, I already getting anxiety for parking space for me.</p> <p>I hope everything will be fine.</p>
52) Resident, objection	<p>52) I am strongly opposed to the above scheme involving the reduction of up to 50 parking spaces on Cumberland Road. The loss of so many spaces would have devastating effects on the residents in this road and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Weekends used to be permit holders only and this has been changed to allow 2 hours free parking. Sundays are extremely bad due to the very large number of worshippers that attend the Temple on Cumberland Road. We can not even go out in the car Sunday mornings as when we return there is no where to park.</p> <p>We have to pay for both our vehicles and feel that the residents in this area are already being penalised for where we live.</p>
53) Resident, objection	<p>I feel that these plans should not go ahead and that this would just move the problem elsewhere in the area.</p> <p>53) How the hell do you want to take 50 spaces away from Cumberland Road, we pay £150 to try and park 2 cars on Cumberland Road. Have the time we end up searching for spaces, if you take 50 spaces away</p>

54) Resident, objection	<p>where the do you wont us to park, all the roads around here are already full congested. Why do you not just enforce the permits so there is no parking at any time, or fine people who park 30 cm away from the curb, making it hard to get by.</p> <p>54) I live in Cumberland Road, and whilst I fully understand that the fire service struggle sometimes to drive down our road, I am concerned about where the 50 or so cars will then park.</p> <p>What would the impact be on other roads in Newtown of displacing 50 cars from Cumberland Rd? Are there other roads in Newtown that the fire service struggle to drive down?</p>
55) Resident, objection	<p>is it possible for cars to park partially on the pavement on one side like they do in Amity Road and have a lower kerb on that side?</p> <p>55) I am writing to inform you that I am a against the proposed changes to cut the number of parking spaces on Cumberland Road by making it so you can only park on one side of the road. This would be absolutely ridiculous idea as the parking can be a nightmare as it is. Things have got worse now that you have changed the parking restrictions. It use to be permit holders only on weekends.</p> <p>We can't even go out in the car sunday morning's because the road is full of cars belonging to patrons on the temple at the top of Cumberland Road because they have no car park.</p> <p>We now have to pay for both cars to be able to park as it is. I for one do not want to be walking late at night from my car because I can't park close by.</p>
56) Resident, objection	<p>The problem with emergency vehicle's getting through is mainly down to people's poor parking which is usually people that don't live here.</p> <p>Yet again I feel that we are being penalised for living where we live.</p>
57) Resident, objection	<p>56) Would you please explain why you are about to reduce residents parking by about 50 places with very little notice and no plans for where the displaced residents are to park. We estimate that there are about 114 cars owned by Cumberland Road residents who need to park near their homes and that the removal of about 50 places with no alternate parking will make it impossible. We object most strongly. There has been no conduction. No alternatives have been offered.</p>

<p>58) Resident, objection</p>	<p>57) This Cumberland road (RG1 3LB) has both sides parking from quite long time and all type of vehicles can come and go easily. There are small houses and many cars so by removing one side of parking will put all residents in trouble. Please keep parking both sides of the road</p> <p>58) I'd like to log my objection to the proposed changes in parking in Cumberland Road, Newtown.</p> <p>The proposed changes will result in a significant loss of parking spaces with seemingly no consideration for replacing a majority of the lost spaces. It is already very difficult to park on the road on some days of the week due to an influx of visitors attending the various religious institutions on and around the road.</p>
<p>59) Resident, objection</p>	<p>I object to this plan going ahead until alternative parking spaces are provided to replace the ones being lost.</p> <p>59) I am writing to you to express my concerns regarding your proposal to remove 50 card parking spaces from Cumberland Road. I understand your reasoning and I agree that the emergency services need to be able to gain access to the houses etc. However, as a resident who pays for her yearly parking permits and still struggles to park at times, I am very concerned about where residents will park. Some houses have 2 or more cars and with 50 spaces removed my simple question is: where will they park? You cannot remove spaces and not provide an alternative.</p> <p>If you remove spaces without alternatives then property prices will reduce and potentially the area will as well. If this is the case then I am assuming parking permits and council tax will reduce?</p> <p>This decision appears to have been made quickly and with little consultation or thought about alternatives for residents. This issue has to be resolved in a way that allows emergency services to move down the road and residents to have adequate parking.</p>
<p>60) Resident, objection</p>	<p>With the current proposal of removal of parking spaces without an alternative parking arrangement I have to oppose this idea. I feel that you should be offering alternative solutions to residents rather than simply removing 50 spaces where suddenly residents cannot park and will potentially cause more people to get parking tickets and be unable to park where they live, which is ultimately wrong.</p> <p>60) I wish to formally object to CMS/009816. The demand for parking in this residential area already far outstrips supply with space available for less than one vehicle per household. Removal of "shared use" parking from one side of Cumberland Road will make this situation intolerable. I live on Amity Road. There is already a massive over demand for parking here and this proposal will increase that by</p>

<p>61) Resident, objection</p>	<p>probably 50%. It is getting so bad for parking here that I seriously believe that this much of a reduction will lead inevitably to acts of criminal damage and acts of violence against the person.</p> <p>The plans state that this proposal is either in response to safety issues or demand. Demand is obviously not the issue here so the council must therefore be stating that this is an accident blackspot. This is definitely not the case. There is no justifiable reason under either of these justifications for this change and I ask you to stop this totally ill judged and ill advised change.</p> <p>61) I would like please to object to the proposed changes to parking arrangements in Cumberland Road as displayed in the public notices. I agree that the 'shared use' bays should be extended as shown. However, I object to the proposal to introduce 'no waiting at any time' along the whole of the west side.</p> <p>I drive along Cumberland Road, so I am familiar with the traffic conditions there; there is room for a bin lorry or a fire engine to pass through. I agree that there should be 'no waiting at any time' for 8m to either side of each junction; adjacent to the entrance gate of the garages; and directly opposite the junction with Amity Street. If the shared use bays are extended, and the rest of the road remains otherwise the same, then it could be beneficial to introduce a passing place approximately 2 car lengths long on the west side of Cumberland Road between the junctions with Orts Road and Woodstock Street to facilitate traffic flow.</p>
<p>62) Resident, objection</p>	<p>In my view the proposed introduction of the extensive 'no waiting at any time' along the west side of Cumberland Road would cause more problems than it would solve. There would be a significant loss of what are already insufficient residents' parking spaces. More seriously, making the west side of the road a clear route will encourage speeding in a residential area with many young children, whereas the current arrangement encourages compliance with the 20mph limit.</p> <p>I urge you to please reconsider these proposals, as they would not work well as suggested.</p> <p>62) As residents who would be directly affected, We are writing to object in the strongest terms possible to the parking regulation changes that are planned for Cumberland Road.</p> <p>Our understanding is that these changes are being driven by the need for emergency vehicles to pass along the road without hindrance, and that the current parking situation interferes with this at times. We can see that this is a serious issue that needs to be addressed, but the proposed solution would cause more problems than it solves - as detailed below. There are other ways of dealing with the issue, though presumably costing somewhat more, so these plans have the appearance of just providing a quick cheap fix rather than a well-considered sustainable solution.</p>

Clearly the main problem with the changes will be a near 50% reduction in the availability of parking on Cumberland Road. The current situation seem to give roughly sufficient space for 1 car per household. Considering that the street also has a Mosque, a Sikh temple and a jewellers - none of which have dedicated parking - spaces are already in short supply. The busy 'Warehouse' community centre also often adds to the pressure on parking, as its small car park can't accommodate all the cars of those who attend the functions that it is used for.

Where will the displaced cars park if such a large proportion of the current spaces disappear? There is no mention of any dedicated facilities being created to deal with the problem. This leaves the nearby streets of Newtown as the only option - but these already have a problem with insufficient parking provision. Surely emergency vehicles also need to access the other roads in the area, so what is the benefit of opening one road a little bit by further clogging surrounding streets?

Cumberland Road, like the rest of Newtown, has a wide variety of people living in a state of generally happy harmony. Many of us actively choose to live here, in spite of the small gardens and on-street parking, because of the sense of close-knit community and the ability to access the town centre without needing to drive. A car however remains a necessity for most people, and thus the ability to park a car fairly near to one's house without regularly wasting time hunting for a space is an important aspect of the area being a realistic place to live. The loss of this convenience would be a game-changer for many, with a resulting exodus to the already sprawling suburbs in pursuit of a private drive. Much of the central area of Reading consists of narrow terraced roads with on-street parking, similar to Cumberland Road. Surely it is important for the town's wellbeing that these areas remain desirable places to live for car owners?

For the limited number of occasions when an emergency vehicle needs access, a 'solution' that causes such a constant and significant negative impact on the local residents would appear to be highly unreasonable. A more logical option would be to invest in some slimline emergency vehicles. This approach has been successfully adopted in other areas of the UK, and the large number of narrow streets in Reading would seem to lend weight to the benefit of this approach. A narrow residential street would not appear to need the functionality of a full-sized emergency vehicle.

Another alternative would be to clearly mark parking bays - e.g. using red lines - that limit the width of vehicles that are allowed to park on the street, thus giving sufficient width for emergency vehicles to pass down the street unhindered. People would then need to inform companies of the need to use smaller lorries/vans etc for deliveries, but this is not an unusual request. Obviously some enforcement would be required, especially at the start - but it's fair to say that this would be equally true of the

63) Resident, objection	<p>planned move to one-side-only parking as well. Some people will try to flout the rules regardless of what they are. There is also the possibility of widening the road.</p> <p>Having happily lived on Cumberland Road for 17 years, it would feel tragic to need to move out towards the edges of town. But life is hectic, and turning the business of parking the car into a daily time-consuming palaver would be genuinely unsustainable. The same will be true for many others who live here. Please think deeply about all that would be lost by these changes, even if they provide an easy solution to a particular problem.</p> <p>We would also like to object to the timing of this consultation. Signs only went up a couple of weeks back and that leaves little time to respond before the deadline, considering many use August for a family vacation.</p>
64) Resident, comment	<p>63) I object to proposed removal of street parking in Cumberland Road on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I live in Sun Street and pay for street parking. Residents from Cumberland Road already park in Sun Street which is a small road and often I can not park close to home. This will exacerbate that. 2. Too many times non permitted vehicles already park in Sun Street so I can not park close to home and no tickets are issued 3. RBC continues to grant permission to develop flats in the area when parking is already tight - removal of 50 spaces will make this worse for existing residents 4.
65) Resident, objection/comment	<p>64) If the resident is parking properly within the designated area the fire engine has enough space to move down the road.</p>
66) Resident, objection	<p>65) I object to this proposal as there will be less parking space. As a result people may start parking illegally creating congestion on nearby roads. This will make it difficult for emergency vehicles to get through. There is already difficulty in finding parking space in the area, so I believe this proposal will only worsen the situation.</p> <p>I suggest trying using smaller fire engines or narrow the foot paths to widen the road for bigger fire engines and educate public to park closer the kerb and I therefore strongly object to the proposals for parking on one side of the road. I hope council will review the proposals and find alternative solution to this problem.</p> <p>66) As residents who would be directly affected, We are writing to object in the strongest terms possible to the parking regulation changes that are planned for Cumberland Road.</p> <p>Our understanding is that these changes are being driven by the need for emergency vehicles to pass</p>

along the road without hindrance, and that the current parking situation interferes with this at times. We can see that this is a serious issue that needs to be addressed, but the proposed solution would cause more problems than it solves - as detailed below. There are other ways of dealing with the issue, though presumably costing somewhat more, so these plans have the appearance of just providing a quick cheap fix rather than a well-considered sustainable solution.

Clearly the main problem with the changes will be a near 50% reduction in the availability of parking on Cumberland Road. The current situation seem to give roughly sufficient space for 1 car per household. Considering that the street also has a Mosque, a Sikh temple and a jewellers - none of which have dedicated parking - spaces are already in short supply. The busy 'Warehouse' community centre also often adds to the pressure on parking, as its small car park can't accommodate all the cars of those who attend the functions that it is used for.

Where will the displaced cars park if such a large proportion of the current spaces disappear? There is no mention of any dedicated facilities being created to deal with the problem. This leaves the nearby streets of Newtown as the only option - but these already have a problem with insufficient parking provision. Surely emergency vehicles also need to access the other roads in the area, so what is the benefit of opening one road a little bit by further clogging surrounding streets?

Cumberland Road, like the rest of Newtown, has a wide variety of people living in a state of generally happy harmony. Many of us actively choose to live here, in spite of the small gardens and on-street parking, because of the sense of close-knit community and the ability to access the town centre without needing to drive. A car however remains a necessity for most people, and thus the ability to park a car fairly near to one's house without regularly wasting time hunting for a space is an important aspect of the area being a realistic place to live. The loss of this convenience would be a game-changer for many, with a resulting exodus to the already sprawling suburbs in pursuit of a private drive. Much of the central area of Reading consists of narrow terraced roads with on-street parking, similar to Cumberland Road. Surely it is important for the town's wellbeing that these areas remain desirable places to live for car owners?

For the limited number of occasions when an emergency vehicle needs access, a 'solution' that causes such a constant and significant negative impact on the local residents would appear to be highly unreasonable. A more logical option would be to invest in some slimline emergency vehicles. This approach has been successfully adopted in other areas of the UK, and the large number of narrow streets in Reading would seem to lend weight to the benefit of this approach. A narrow residential street would not appear to need the functionality of a full-sized emergency vehicle.

<p>67) Resident, comment</p>	<p>Another alternative would be to clearly mark parking bays - e.g. using red lines - that limit the width of vehicles that are allowed to park on the street, thus giving sufficient width for emergency vehicles to pass down the street unhindered. People would then need to inform companies of the need to use smaller lorries/vans etc for deliveries, but this is not an unusual request. Obviously some enforcement would be required, especially at the start - but it's fair to say that this would be equally true of the planned move to one-side-only parking as well. Some people will try to flout the rules regardless of what they are. There is also the possibility of widening the road.</p> <p>Having happily lived on Cumberland Road for 17 years, it would feel tragic to need to move out towards the edges of town. But life is hectic, and turning the business of parking the car into a daily time-consuming palaver would be genuinely unsustainable. The same will be true for many others who live here. Please think deeply about all that would be lost by these changes, even if they provide an easy solution to a particular problem.</p> <p>67) Have you thought about allowing parking partially on the pavement on both sides of the road? If the kerbs were lowered and you allowed one wheel of the car to park on the pavement on both sides of the road, then the remaining pavement is still wide enough for wheelchairs/buggies to access.</p> <p>This idea is in addition to my previous comments in which I state that I don't know where the 50 or so cars affected will be able to park if parking is stopped on one side of Cumberland Rd.</p> <p>I hope you will be able to consider my suggestion.</p>
------------------------------	--

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
<p>PE1_Galsworthy Drive</p> <p>1) Resident, objection</p>	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 7, Support - 1, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p>1) I wish to object to the proposals on safety grounds and the displacement of parking.</p> <p>While the current situation leads to restricted forward visibility there have been no recorded Personal Injuries Collisions in the past 19 years (reference: CrashMap). Removing this parking will increase vehicle speeds on the bend and encourage them to accelerate earlier on the straight section immediately after the bend, something that is already a problem. Given the shared nature on Galsworthy Drive, and the relatively high volumes of traffic, keeping traffic speeds low to minimise the conflict with pedestrians (a large percentage are children) is essential. The parking provides effective traffic calming which can be demonstrated by the lack of PICs.</p>

<p>2) Resident, objection</p>	<p>The removal 20m of available parking will result in the the displacement of vehicles to other parts of the street which is likely to just push the visibility issue elsewhere. It will certainly lead to conflict in the street with increased competition for the remaining space.</p> <p>I understand that the forward visibility on the bend does not meet current standards but there is no history of collisions or issues with emergency vehicle access and the unintended consequence of introducing restrictions would be to increase speeds, that are directly linked to the frequency and severity of PICs.</p> <p>2) I wish to object to the proposals on safety grounds and the displacement of parking.</p> <p>While the current situation leads to restricted forward visibility there have been no recorded Personal Injuries Collisions in the past 19 years (reference: CrashMap). Removing this parking will increase vehicle speeds on the bend and encourage them to accelerate earlier on the straight section immediately after the bend, something that is already a problem. Given the shared nature on Galsworthy Drive, and the relatively high volumes of traffic, keeping traffic speeds low to minimise the conflict with pedestrians (a large percentage are children) is essential. The parking provides effective traffic calming which can be demonstrated by the lack of PICs.</p> <p>The removal 20m of available parking will result in the displacement of vehicles to other parts of the street which is likely to just push the visibility issue elsewhere. It will certainly lead to conflict in the street with increased competition for the remaining space.</p> <p>I understand that the forward visibility on the bend does not meet current standards but there is no history of collisions or issues with emergency vehicle access and the unintended consequence of introducing restrictions would be to increase speeds, that are directly linked to the frequency and severity of PICs.</p>
<p>3) Resident, support</p>	<p>3) Further to the notification received this evening with regards to the proposed 'No waiting at Any Time restrictions' on Galsworthy Drive. I would like to confirm that both myself and my husband are in full support of the proposal.</p> <p>The letter refers to the pressures of parking on Galsworthy Drive, which as a resident I can fully understand and is one of the main reasons why we incurred personal cost to ensure our driveway was adequate for our family and any visitors. However, I feel it pertinent to point out there is ample parking available at the Milestone Centre car park which is a mere 3 minute walk away. I feel it should</p>

<p>4) Resident, objection</p>	<p>also be noted that whilst I appreciate the housing estate was built in the 60s with the idea of a one car per household with a small drive to accommodate said car, over the years however most families have grown to own two cars and as such a majority of houses have used the full potential of their frontage to accommodate both cars and therefore do not cause any issues. Unfortunately there is of course, always an exception to the rule ,with those families that use their frontage as storage either for scrap vehicles or caravans, which are themselves an environmental eyesore. Some larger families also have in excess of 4 cars per house and this will cause parking issues for anyone with a genuine visitor. A more recent issue with parking has arisen from the increasing number of works vans being placed on the corner which further restrict visibility and decrease access. (Images attached in an email)</p> <p>In terms of there being a lack in personal injury claims, that may be so, however I feel it would be prudent to look at the number of vehicle insurance claims as a result of parking on this corner. I myself, before our driveway was maximised, had two cars hit whilst parked due to lack of visibility. Another vehicle was hit but the culprit drive off so no claim was made. Since then there have been several near misses and a nasty accident earlier this year (Images attached in an email)</p> <p>With regards to emergency vehicle access, [REDACTED], there have been several times over the years when emergency vehicles have had to attend our address and on several occasions have struggled to place their vehicle in a safe or accessible place due to the parking. I am sure that the Ambulance Service could provide you with details of the number of times they have had to attend our address. I am also concerned with regards the ability of a larger emergency vehicle being able to gain access such as a fire engine when there are vans parked.</p> <p>I am more than happy to discuss any of the points above and am hopeful that common sense will prevail with the restrictions being implemented.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p> <p>4) It has come to my attention that you plan to introduce a no waiting at any time restriction(double yellow lines) [REDACTED]. I feel this is a mistake and will cause conflict between neighbours on an already strained road for parking, as people compete over what little park space there is.</p> <p>The introduction of these lines will result in the loss of 4 parking spots. As more and more of the properties on Galsworthy are converted into having basement apartments, the parking on our road has become a premium. In the past 5 years 3 properties around my house have done these conversion and I am sure more along my road will in the future, so the loss of four park spot will be greatly felt by multiple residents as people park further from property in place others may have parked.</p>
-------------------------------	--

<p>5) Resident, objection</p> <p>6) Resident, objection</p>	<p>I also don't see the benefit of these lines in the past 30 years I have not seen an accident on this bend and unlike other corners on the road it has no high bushes obstructing the view of on coming traffic. I have never seen an issue for access for emergency vehicles along this road.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p> <p>5) I received your consultation notification on Thursday night, as I presume all other local residents have. Not having a car myself the parking restrictions should not affect me, but I do like to have access to my driveway. Tonight 2 vehicles are parked across my drive way, leaving no access for the binmen in the morning. This is not a new issue it has been caused by the HMO house on the corner and the first 3 storey house that has been turned into 3 flats, all presumably with Council approval. This necessitates parking for 10+ vehicles needing to find spaces. In the hot weather sleeping with the windows open I was unsure if it was burglars looking for an easy target, but it was cars cruising up and down looking for a space up until 2a.m. They tend to abandon their cars sometimes up to 2 feet away from the kerb making it difficult for residents across the road to get off their drives. I suggest that these residents be told to park in the car park outside the Milestone centre to ease congestion. Tempers are already frayed in this area and I think the double yellow opposite the houses concerned will only add to the tension. No reply is necessary just airing my view as I have no car myself and know it is not illegal to park across a driveway. Just hope the binmen struggle through the cars to get my bin.</p> <p>6) It has come to my attention that you plan to introduce a no waiting at any time restriction (double yellow lines) on bend [REDACTED] on Galsworthy drive. I feel this is a mistake and will cause conflict between neighbours on an already strained road for parking, as people compete over what little park space there is.</p> <p>The introduction of these lines will result in the loss of 4 parking spots. As more and more of the properties on Galsworthy are converted into having basement apartments, the parking on our road has become a premium. In the past 5 years 3 properties around my house have done these conversion and I am sure more along my road will in the future, so the loss of four park spot will be greatly felt by multiple residents as people park further from property in place others may have parked.</p> <p>I also don't see the benefit of these lines in the past 30 years I have not seen an accident on this bend and unlike other corners on the road it has no high bushes obstructing the view of on coming traffic. I have never seen an issue for access for emergency vehicles along this road.</p> <p>I have raised [REDACTED] children in house and always felt the road outside our house is safe.</p>
---	---

<p>1) Resident, objection</p>	<p>1) Restriction park in Bede walk will Affect all Neighbourhood with cars most house hold in Bede walk has an average of 2 cars/house. It will put untold hardship on Bede walk residents who were care owners. This will also affect some of Hexham Road car owners that do part their car on Bede walk when Hexham road parking spaces are full</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal /restriction on Bede walk will affects all resident of Bede walk that are car owners. as they no longer has secured places to park their car. 2. The garages space are rented out to mostly non Bede walk residents.. Its be noted and most garages tenants are not using it to park vehicles but for storage of goods. Thus lack of enough garages for Bede Walk residence. The cars space on Hexham road 3. About 10 years ago Bede walk has lots of incidence of Vandalisation of cars. To reduce this attention of Counsellors and council was called . Street light were installed and the frequencies of thus reduced. Some of the vandals were caught and prosecuted in court. 4. Restriction of parking will reduce activities of motorists and thus will give more chance / opportunities to vandals to attack the garages again if the environment becomes quiet. Due to less movement. 5. Restriction will lead to congestion of Parking on Hexham Road as Bede walk resident will no longer has space around their residence but to also park their vehicles on nearby roads such as Hexham road. This will also cause undue hardship on Hexham Rd car owners as they will also struggle to find space to park. 6. I think the restriction is unfair on Bede walk residence as the council that suppose to help them is making life miserable and difficult. Knowing fully that Bede walk being a walk let car owners or Land Lord no chance to create a car space on their property as the Hexham Road Landlords has. Its also Unfair because The council provided parking Space for council flats house holds Parking space but there will be absolutely non permitted for Bede walk community residents. 7. This untold hardship will definitely put pressure on Bede walk resident to consider their next choice of vote for which party or counsellor if they felt let down by the current council government. 8. What I believe the solution to Bede walk Car parking Should be council to create Parking space for Bede walk residence with permit restriction for residents only with or without 1 hour limits for non resident. If the Parking space were marked. Violators will be charged parking fines. Putting yellow line on the whole area is unfair and unjustified.
<p>2) Resident, objection</p>	<p>2) I am a resident of Bede Walk, and I have done so since 2005. I moved to this area with 2 children and my family are happy in the neighbourhood. Despite some challenges, we experience I decided that this area is family friendly. I have been able to teach my children about the basic rules of life as per teaching them to cross the road, confidence in using public transport just to mention a few. I wish to express objection to the above proposals because of the followings reasons.</p>

This will not help school children that use the walk because it will be very quiet and not a lot of people will be breaking the silence.

I do not mean that in disobedience but I was a victim of theft severally on my car but if not that the environment was constantly in use, my car will have been stolen by thieves, and police contacted and the action and justice were proportionate to the crime committed.

People who have been in use of the car park have been a deterrent to vandalism of garages. Due to the frequent movement of motorist parking and moving their vehicles/ and some vandals were caught the crime rate drastically reduced.

I could remember vividly 12 years ago when there are series of vandalism as result, Police was sent to the area frequently this reduces vandalism a while but as soon as the frequency of police subsided the vandalism and breaking of garages increased. Not to mention fly tipping. What had reduces these crimes were increased street lightings and in the number of car owners who chases away intruders. People in use of the car park have deterred drug dealers away from this area. This area has become another drug dealer zone centre in Reading.

My children see a lot of people in the car park, and the smell of the drugs around them make me go out and the groups move away quickly. Many of these people are not able to do much that to call the seller, but a car park is in use severally, it has stopped or moved them on.

The fly-tipping will be more if this car park is made as above no waiting. With the present use, my garden has suffered from this a lot and I have called the council on many occasions about this and at present, it is still happening. Currently, we are struggling with mice in this area because many black bags are left around and rodents feed on the foods waste. Unsure if a new resident that has no black wheelie bin has just moved into this area. Building rubbles, household waste Xmas trees and all sorts have been fly-tipped here even when residents are actively using it. But with No waiting plan, it will aggravate this beautiful area to be a dumping ground for all sorts.

Many of the people blocking garages are not from this area. They are from other streets and I do understand the frustration of my neighbour on this.

I think people with young children will struggle with this as I am one. I think Bede Walk is been marginalized on this issues as other neighbourhoods have car park spaces allocated to them. We pay tax and this is part of my right to have a space to park my car. It will be very sad to see the car park wasted. Families move away, finding it difficult to sell the house. There is uncontrolled antisocial mayhem.

We are still battling with some of this antisocial behaviour noise of motorcycles when you are sleeping after a busy work. Children are unable to play in the area because of drug dealers around loitering. I hope with this few points I have explained the reasons for my objection.

It will be better to explore other options for sorting the problems to cause more damage to families and children.

This is my opinion and recommendation to address some of the issues I have highlighted in the above

<p>3) Resident, objection</p>	<p>paragraphs. Tickets payments of vehicles per household; Installation of cameras; Community police officers and Street controllers are some I have thought about. This may be explored for future consultation.</p> <p>3) I have been a resident of Bede Walk for more than 17 years. I'm very concerned with Hexham Road / Bede Walk area proposals to introduce double yellow no waiting at any time throughout the garage area space. I also rent a garage at the area and I don't see how these restrictions are of benefit to the residents of Bede Walk and how they will be helping me to live happier or have a better quality of life or to have a better and simple access to my own property. Bede Walk properties have restricted access to front of their houses as they face Reading Girls School and even if the owners would want to create off road parking slots it won't be possible. Our back gardens are also restricted as the council decided to build night garages to make money through rent without considering parking spaces for Bede Walk residents The restrictions will only produce and inflame hatred between Bede Walk residents and Hexham Road residents as they will start fighting with each other for a free space to park. It will impact everyone around. Racial tensions and hatred will be created as the people will be irritated and will always be angry when coming back home. In your mind, where would you propose that I should park if not at the end of the garage area between the garages and Bede Walk? All the courts like Bamburgh close and other flats around Hexham community centre have parking reserved for their residents. While I acknowledge that sometimes non residents of Bede Walk (visitors and trades people) have awkwardly parked to restrict access to garage owners, I believe that the council and residents of both Bede Walk and Hexham Road can meet and talk about how to resolve the issues of parking and blocking garages. Alternatively only introduce double yellow in front of garages area only and leave the ends as they are. I don't understand why council people like creating and thinking things on our behalf instead of empowering us to talk about things that affect our lives. Instead of pushing legislations to us, those who we have elected should bring us together to reason and we solve the problems that we encounter in life. Alternate Solution I believe some people must have complained about parking in the area concerned. Looking at simple solutions does not solve simple problems and instead they create larger problems. In this I would suggest the following alternatives: 1. Re-plan the area between the end of garages and Bede Walk. If planned properly the area could create parking for at least six cars for Bede Walk residents to reduce the demand of parking on Hexham</p>
-------------------------------	---

<p>4) Resident, objection</p>	<p>Road which has no enough spaces for those who live in the road even now.</p> <p>2. I tend to believe that the garages on the area were meant for Bede Walk residents from the beginning. (I might be wrong) However, if one side (line) of the garages should be demolished to provide parking for residents of Bede Walk as I believe the people who came with the idea of building these garages focused only on monetary matters and not the interest of the residents who would occupy the houses. They were short sighted in the area of the future increase in car ownership in the area otherwise they would have created parking spaces.</p> <p>For these reasons I would like to raise my Objections on your proposal as it will bring more harm than good towards the current goodwill of the residents of the area. I feel that the proposal if implemented as it would be hugely inconvenient, if not outright dangerous to the community as it will spoil peace and goodwill between Hexham Road and Bede Walk residents.</p> <p>4) I am writing to raise my objection towards the plan to put waiting restrictions in the area concerned especially the area bordering bede walk where I live and the garages</p> <p>As a resident, the no waiting restrictions means that at no point will I be able to park my car even when I come home from shopping or to park my car when I am unloading or loading things for my own use.</p> <p>All other buildings around Hexham community centre were equipped with car parking spaces while the parking space for Bede Walk residents was selfishly taken by Reading Borough council to try to make money out of the residents by building overnight garages for rent.</p> <p>A big question arises as a result of your proposal. Where will Bede Walk residents who park at the top between bede walk and the garages park their vehicles? Hexham Road is currently not enough and even people living on Hexham Road at times park on garage area in question.</p> <p>The proposal will just create more problems between the residents of Hexham Road and Bede Walk as they will be fighting for few parking spaces on Hexham Road.</p> <p>I believe the people renting the garages are the ones complaining as at times they are blocked by either visitors for bede walk and Hexham road residents or trades people who work in the area. The council would rather allow those complaining or supporting the proposal to meet with Bede Walk residents and discuss the best way to make the area more friendly for everybody even if it means giving permits to those of us who live on Bede Walk.</p> <p>This proposal is victimising us as permanent residents who would have even liked to create off road parking in the front of our houses and have better access to our homes but the infrastructure does not allow us.</p>
-------------------------------	--

5) Resident, objection	<p>This proposal should be given a little bit of more thought by calling a meeting between the planners and the residents to discuss the way forward.</p> <p>5) I would like to object. The putting of double red/yellow lines is unfeasible here.</p> <p>There are two many residents, this is a residential area as well. There aren't many shops nearby and not many people park here. By putting yellow/red lines you will just be increasing the amount of cars which will park on surrounding roads such as Northumberland Avenue (a main road), hexham road north, the flats carpark is already full. There's no reason why this area should have parking restrictions. All the garages are in use so we can't even park in there. There really is no reason for this.</p> <p>Who even asked for them to be put in there? It's also a waste of resources for traffic wardens having to come so far from town or whitely street where parking restrictions actually matter as they are business/shopping areas. The fact that bede walk garages ad hexham road south are purely residential areas means that these parking restrictions will cause more hassle to the surrounding areas.</p>
------------------------	--

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
TH2 - The Mount	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 1, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p>1) Resident, support</p> <p>1) Of the drawings listed on the notice, Drawing WRR2018A/TH2 concerns an extension of the “no waiting at any time” close to the sharp left bend turning out of Albert Road, which seems to be a sensible plan.</p>

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
TH4 - Dovedale Close/The Mount	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 2, Support - 0, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p>1) Resident, objection/comment</p> <p>1) The new double yellow lines shown on Drawing WRR2018A/TH4 are much more extensive. I am concerned particularly about the proposed continuous double yellow line from the junction of Albert Road along the North side of The Mount and 12 metres into Dovedale thereby removing the opportunity for a small number of parking places mainly in The Mount. If lines must be painted, why not restrict them to corner of the junctions of the Albert Road junction? (Please see attached sketch).</p> <p>At the planning stage many local people have raised concerns about the very limited number of parking places (13) for residents of the new flats being built at 1 Albert Road. Dovedale is, and will remain in</p>

<p>2) Resident, objection/comment</p>	<p>the foreseeable future, a quiet close with no significant vehicle movements as also is The Mount. The proposed Order would create unnecessarily a bigger problem both for future residents and for carers, visitors and service workers needing somewhere to park to access the new flats. It would unnecessarily result in a reduction of a small number of parking spaces and place even greater pressure for car parking in Clifton Park Road, the Eastern part of The Mount, in Albert Road and beyond.</p> <p>Local residents have seen that, over many weeks, contractors' vehicles have been parked daily in Dovedale and into the Mount up to the junction with Albert Road. This, I believe, contravenes a requirement of the planning consent for 1 Albert Road - that they should NOT be parked on local roads nearby. No doubt that been the cause of some very local concern which should have been dealt with, e.g. by placing police "no parking" cones close to the Albert Road junction or by the enforcement officers of the Planning Department taking action. This is a temporary problem is likely to disappear as soon as the construction work is completed in a few weeks' time. It does not justify the proposed Order to run continuously the yellow lines from Albert Road to 12 metres into Dovedale to deal with it right now.</p> <p>Approval of this Order would unnecessarily reduce the parking places that will be badly needed by future residents of Beechwood Grove (1 Albert Road). This part of the order is not necessary and should NOT be approved.</p> <p>At the very least it should be postponed until the extent of future parking problems has been ascertained and the views of the new residents of the Beechwood Grove flats have been taken into account.</p> <p>2) I understand the validity of placing double yellow lines on the stretch of road where Albert Road and The Mount meet. This would make it easier and safer for buses, waste collection lorries and the bulk of the through traffic to travel. I do not understand why it is thought necessary to put double yellow lines along the western end of The Mount, through into Dovedale Close. There is no through traffic in this area and distances are so short, no driver would be able to drive at a dangerous speed.</p> <p>The new Beechwood Grove got planning permission with people who need assisted living in mind. These people will need carers to visit them, often several times a day. There are 28 flats to be sold and 14 rented flats, the tenants of which to be nominated by the RBC. I attended the meeting when planning permission for this was passed. At the time, it was agreed that the parking allowance was on the tight side. There is no way that Beechwood Grove will be able to provide enough on site parking for carers or other visitors. If carers have to find somewhere to park a long distance from their clients</p>
---------------------------------------	---

	they will not find working in Beechwood Grove viable and carer turnover will be a nightmare. It therefor makes sense to leave Dovedale Close and the short part of The Mount which runs into it as unrestricted parking.
--	--

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
<p>TH6 - St Peter's Avenue/Wychcotes</p> <p>1) Resident, support/comment</p> <p>2) Resident, comment</p>	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 0, Support - 1, Comment - 1, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p>1) Good effort and welcome the proposed restrictions.</p> <p>Please can you extend the proposed restrictions until 40, St Peters Avenue or atleast put in place time based restrictions.</p> <p>I have a [REDACTED] and uses a wheelchair adopted van to get around. I am unable to get the van out of my driveway as the road is used from the wychotes junction until 40, St Peters as park and ride and the vehicles are parked for days and weeks by non-residents. Also, the bin lorries are finding difficult to navigate with hap-hazard parking by non-residents.</p> <p>Alternatively, if you could ear-mark a disabled space in front of [REDACTED], St Peters Avenue that will help us immensely.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p> <p>2) Since there are no parking restrictions in St. Peters Avenue, the on street parking space is completely used by non-residents who park on the road. The issue is not about non-residents parking on the road, but it is about the way the cars are parked in majority of the instances blocking the way or causes inconvenience for residents, bin collection trucks and any delivery vehicles that come along the road. This has been an ongoing issue for quite a few years now. I have a [REDACTED] and use WAV (Wheelchair accessible van) for his transportation and I have so little space to maneuver my vehicle. When we politely request the car drivers who park their vehicle not to block our access, we are being harshly challenged always. Given parking restrictions are applied for the space near Wychotes, can it also be considered to extend the parking restrictions up until 40 St. Peters Avenue. Alternatively, is it possible to allot a disabled parking on street space close to [REDACTED] St. Peters Avenue.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p>

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
<p data-bbox="176 217 443 284">T14 - Thicket Road Bramble Crescent</p> <p data-bbox="226 328 416 395">1) Resident, objection</p> <p data-bbox="226 1150 416 1217">2) Resident, objection</p>	<p data-bbox="551 217 1480 284">Summary of responses: Objections - 7, Support - 0, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p data-bbox="600 328 2089 395">1) I wish to object to the proposed changes to the junction of Bramble crescent and thicket Road I live [REDACTED] if these changes were to take place it will cause major problems with parking.</p> <p data-bbox="647 440 2130 544">I look out on this junction constantly and can quite categorically say it is really rare for people to park anywhere near the corner of the junction. As most people park slightly back from the junction because we are all aware that it is illegal to park on a corner.</p> <p data-bbox="647 588 2130 772">By putting the double yellow in place we could end up causing a more dangerous situation one because of the restricted parking but also as it stands at the moment if a car comes around the corner they can see that there is a car parked there. This means they generally slow down as it is a completely blind corner you will find that people would no longer be cautious they will end up driving much faster meaning the danger to children playing in the road will increase significantly</p> <p data-bbox="647 817 2101 884">I have talked to all the residents close to my house and we are all in agreement that we do not want double yellow lines on this junction.</p> <p data-bbox="647 928 2101 1032">I believe it is only one lady who does not even live in Bramble crescent and lives at the end of thicket Road who has put this proposal forward for the second time. This proposal would not affected her in any way, but she is trying to put her wishes on the residents that it will affect on a daily basis.</p> <p data-bbox="647 1077 2141 1110">We are a quiet little crescent no one has asked for this no one has consulted us we do not want this!!!!</p> <p data-bbox="600 1155 2056 1222">2) I am writing to object to the planned works in putting in double yellow lines in a little cul-de- sac where i live in Bramble Crescent and a side road of Thicket Road.</p> <p data-bbox="647 1267 2119 1370">Basically the notice is notifying the residents that RBC are looking to put in double yellow lines on the corner of Bramble Crescent and Thicket Road. The area is a quiet one which doesnt have that many cars and this will severely impact residents in both roads.</p> <p data-bbox="647 1415 2101 1519">Many residents do not have off road parking and it will become ten times worse because some residents do not have off road parking and if they cannot park where they currently do then this will mean they park all the way down Thicket Road and Bramble Crescent which will ,in effect, make it a</p>

<p>3) Resident, objection</p>	<p>one lane road and this will cause people to have to reverse back down Thicket Road causing even more aggravation.</p> <p>I am quite fortunate in that i already have a drop kerb but other local residents do not and they wont be able to afford the £2k plus to get a drop kerb installed so they have no choice but to park on the road.</p> <p>There is no issue at the moment but i feel installing double yellows will create a problem that doesn't currently exist.</p> <p>3) I wish to object to the proposed changes to the junction of Bramble crescent and thicket Road I live [REDACTED] if these changes were to take place it will cause major problems with parking.</p> <p>I look out on this junction constantly and can quite categorically say it is really rare for people to park anywhere near the corner of the junction. As most people park slightly back from the junction because we are all aware that it is illegal to park on a corner.</p> <p>By putting the double yellow in place we could end up causing a more dangerous situation one because of the restricted parking but also as it stands at the moment if a car comes around the corner they can see that there is a car parked there. This means they generally slow down as it is a completely blind corner you will find that people would no longer be cautious they will end up driving much faster meaning the danger to children playing in the road will increase significantly</p> <p>I have talked to all the residents close to my house and we are all in agreement that we do not want double yellow lines on this junction.</p> <p>I believe it is only one lady who does not even live in Bramble crescent and lives at the end of thicket Road who has put this proposal forward for the second time. This proposal would not affected her in any way, but she is trying to put her wishes on the residents that it will affect on a daily basis.</p> <p>We are a quiet little crescent no one has asked for this no one has consulted us we do not want this!!!!</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p>
<p>4) Resident, objection</p>	<p>4) I am writing to oppose the proposed parking restrictions at the entry to Thickett Road on Bramble Crescent. We live in [REDACTED]. We are not fortunate to have a driveway due to the expense and we currently park outside of our house and along the side of our house (on Thickett Road). This parking is</p>

<p>5) Resident, objection</p>	<p>also used by many of the residents on Bramble Crescent and Thickett Road for second cars and visitors on a regular basis.</p> <p>There are many reasons why we would discourage any parking restrictions from a personal perspective;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is where we park our cars as we don't have a driveway • This is where all friends and family park when visiting for many residents • If we must park elsewhere I would worry about upsetting other neighbours by parking outside their houses <p>Our biggest concern though is for the safety of the residents of both Bramble Crescent and Thickett Road. On various occasions a resident or friend of someone who lives in Thickett Road has sped down the road which appears to be at a speed that is above the limit. This causes a massive concern that if restrictions are in place they will not need to consider slowing down to manoeuvre around the corner. Both roads are full of families that have young children and animals, and this causes massive concerns that if a driver is not being forced to slow down they could potential harm an unexpected child or animal.</p> <p>There does not appear to be many restrictions within residential areas and I do not see why we should start seeing restrictions now. Parking a car alongside the side of my house is not going to cause problems for residents as there is plenty of room to manoeuvre and drive down the road in a safe manor if anything they will just need to slow down and take time to drive more sensibly.</p> <p>In summary, this will take any parking away from us near our home; we can't afford a dropped curb and then a driveway. Drivers will have to slow down on that corner and the cars currently parked act as a deterrent to drivers driving recklessly. We have spoken to many neighbours on Bramble Crescent and Thickett Road and its of our understanding that one neighbour has asked for this and its not for the benefit of the whole community.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p> <p>5) I'm writing to object to the proposal to adding "no waiting at any time" to the junction as Bramble Crescent meets Thicket Road.</p> <p>I feel this will result in more cars bumping up on front of people's driveways and cause more a obstruction.</p> <p>Family and friends visiting rely on using the side road and spaces to the front of Bramble Crescent, by</p>
-------------------------------	---

<p>6) Resident, objection</p>	<p>adding the restrictions it will then push traffic outside properties forcing they bump up onto the kerbs.</p> <p>It's not a very busy road, I see no need for the restrictions.</p> <p>Many residents have more than one vehicle so have no choice than to use road parking, for additional vehicles/guests. By applying the restrictions they will be forced to park at the end of Bramble or further away in Gratwicke Road, which already is a busy road with cars speeding along as a cut through.</p> <p>6) I'm writing to object to the proposal to adding "no waiting at any time" to the junction as Bramble Crescent meets Thicket Road.</p> <p>I feel this will result in more cars bumping up on front of people's driveways and cause more a obstruction.</p> <p>Family and friends visiting rely on using the side road and spaces to the front of Bramble Crescent for visitor parking, by adding the restrictions it will then push traffic outside properties forcing they bump up onto the kerbs. This is already a nuisance when neighbours family/friends bump up outside blocking our own driveways. If they have nowhere else to park they will be forced to park outside houses which will impact our own private driveway access as we have two vehicles, one of which a large van.</p> <p>It's not a very busy road, I see no need for the restrictions.</p> <p>Many residents have more than one vehicle so have no choice than to use road parking, for additional vehicles/guests. By applying the restrictions they will be forced to park at the end of Bramble or further away in Gratwicke Road, which already is a busy road with cars speeding along as a cut through.</p>
<p>7) Resident, objection</p>	<p>7) This email is to oppose the planning for double yellow lines along Bramble Crescent and Thicket Road. CMS/009816 Drawing Number WRR2018A/T14</p> <p>My reasons are: Only a handful of the houses have drop kerbs so any family we have come to visit have to park along these roads. If there were to be yellow lines then this would push all residents who do not have drop kerbs or visitors to park on the already busy Gratwick Road, this road in itself has many residents parking on the road and is full of pot holes which would only cause more damage to the road. If more cars were to park on Gratwick Road then this will also cause more problems during School pickups and drop offs to the nearby Nursery Blargrave and Park Lane Primary Infants site.</p>

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
<p>T16 - Dunsfold Road</p> <p>1) Resident, objection</p>	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 4, Support - 0, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p>1) I would like to formally register my objection to any changes to the current situation; in other words, I think we should continue to have double yellow lines on both sides of our street, prohibiting parking/waiting at any time, but allowing loading/unloading. The main reasons for my objection are summarised below:-</p> <p>WHO WILL PARK THERE?</p> <p>*The reality is that residents themselves will have little chance of unloading shopping/children etc. outside their homes, let alone parking there (unless they wait all day for a space, park up, and then never move their car again, which sort of defeats the object!)</p> <p>*On weekdays, the staff from the Avenue School and the Thames Valley School will use the length of our street for free all day parking. My understanding is that the proposal has emanated from an officer at one of these two schools. Both would appear to have significant areas of outdoor play area with low levels of usage, which may perhaps provide an in house solution to any parking issues they may have. Alternatively they could join with RBC in encouraging their staff to walk, cycle, car share or use public transport. Failing this, I would have thought the Meadway Sports Centre would be amenable to some sort of sharing agreement, as their car park is largely empty during the working day.</p> <p>*In the evenings, the sports centre users, who continue to enjoy pedestrian access from our street, will use it as a free alternative to the sports centres amply sized, but pay and display, car park, as most would “sell their granny” to avoid paying even a minimal parking fee.</p> <p>*At weekends, the many visitors to the children’s parties hosted at the sports centre will do likewise.</p> <p>CONSEQUENCES</p> <p>*Both these last two groups, once the dozen or so kerbside places are full, will look for alternative free places to abandon their vehicles, even more so now that they would have to exit Dunsfold Road and go down Conwy Close to access the pay and display car park. Experience tells us that they have no qualms about trespassing in our own 4 residents visitors parking spots, the slipway to our garage block, or even blocking residents in/out of their own garages by parking outside them. All these alternatives are on our own private property, but that seems to make no difference once they have set their hearts on avoiding the pay and display charge.</p> <p>*Both of these last two groups also result in reduced revenue for RBC, by avoiding payments to the pay and display scheme. With all the soundbites we hear about the council being strapped for cash, surely</p>

<p>2) Resident, objection</p>	<p>this makes absolutely no sense in these austere times?</p> <p>*In all of the above scenarios, in the event of an emergency we will have no idea who the cars/vans belong to, how long before they return to their vehicle, or how to contact them in the meantime.</p> <p>*As the east side pavement is segregated from the highway by 24 concrete bollards along its length, to help make it safe for the many children (and adults) walking to and from the sports centre, the Avenue School and Church End Primary School, there is no guarantee that a fire engine would be able to service our homes or garage block should the need arise, because the other side of the road will be full, nose to tail, with vehicles with no size limitation and absent, anonymous owners.</p> <p>*Emergency fire service access to the Thames Valley School would also be compromised, as would vehicular access by their groundsmen and other maintenance services.</p> <p>*Access would also be a weekly issue for RBC's refuse and recycling wagons, which could not squeeze past even a parked Transit style van in our street, let alone anything larger.</p> <p>*There are 3 houses (out of 12 in total) who have visits most days from relatives who are Blue Badge holders, and any changes to the current situation would significantly disadvantage them, whereas at present they have special dispensation to park right outside. In my particular case, both my elderly parents, who also live in Reading, are wheelchair reliant.</p> <p>*Luckily, the other residents do not need on-street parking, as each household has its own garage, with 2 houses additionally having off-road parking via dropped kerbs. To my knowledge, there are only 2 two driver/two car households in our street.</p> <p>AND FINALLY</p> <p>*As a point of procedure, we, the residents, and yourselves went through this proposal/objection/review/non-implementation process in 2016. It seems a waste of RBC's (and our) time, effort, resources and funds to have to jump through the same hoops every couple of years just to preserve the status quo. Please advise what (if any) systems are (or can be put) in place to stop this becoming a recurring nightmare and a drain on the public purse.</p> <p>2) I wish to register most strongly my objection to your proposal, to do away with the double yellow lines down both side of the road, and have parking with no waiting restrictions in there place. We have been all through this before only a couple years ago, and as there is a Nursery and Thames Valley School with double gates in Dunsfold Road what happens if any Emergency services need to access either of them, it will be very difficult for them to swing round to get through the gates, if there are cars parked down one side of the road, and also for that matter what happens if they are needed for the houses, can't see them waiting while the resident runs round trying to owner of the car. It makes me wonder if this idea is anything to do with all the new flats and houses being built in Conwy Close were are all there cars going to park. As I said before I have seen what happens when they were allowed to park down the road, they park half on the pavement so close we could hardly get out of the gates. Also its very</p>
-------------------------------	---

<p>3) Resident, objection</p>	<p>dangerous for the nursery children and all the other young children that come down the road as a short cut to the other primary schools and bigger schools. Residents have enough trouble getting out of this road as it is, trying to turn right and getting across the road, as its not just Dunsfold Road residents but also Routh Lane also who have to negotiate getting out of the road, without the added stress of cars parked down one side of the road. while cars are also turning into the road to go into the Nursery. So that is my objections to this whole scheme, not enough thought has gone into this plan, just oh there's a road quite handy to the schools for some of our cars to park in. We also can do without the abuse we get when they are asked to move their cars.</p> <p>3) I am writing in regarding to your notice, which is display on a lamppost in my road. It looks as if you intend to remove the double yellow lines on the west side of the road, this will be very awkward for my [REDACTED] who is a blue badge holder, and visits us most days. If he parks on the east side, it will block the road completely as the west side will be full with sports centre and school staff cars.</p> <p>Also it could be very awkward for fire engines, and ambulances wanting access to the road.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p>
<p>4) Resident, objection</p>	<p>4) I would like to formally register my objection to any changes to the current situation in Dunsfold Road parking; in other words, I think we should continue to have double yellow lines on both sides of our street, prohibiting parking/waiting at any time, but allowing loading/unloading. The main reasons for my objection are summarised below:-</p> <p>WHO WILL PARK THERE?</p> <p>*The reality is that residents themselves will have little chance of unloading shopping/children etc. outside their homes, let alone parking there (unless they wait all day for a space, park up, and then never move their car again, which sort of defeats the object!)</p> <p>*On weekdays, the staff from the Avenue School and the Thames Valley School will use the length of our street for free all day parking. My understanding is that the proposal has emanated from an officer at one of these two schools. Both would appear to have significant areas of outdoor play area with low levels of usage, which may perhaps provide an in house solution to any parking issues they may have. Alternatively they could join with RBC in encouraging their staff to walk, cycle, car share or use public transport. Failing this, I would have thought the Meadway Sports Centre would be amenable to some sort of sharing agreement, as their car park is largely empty during the working day.</p> <p>*In the evenings, the sports centre users, who continue to enjoy pedestrian access from our street, will use it as a free alternative to the sports centres amply sized, but pay and display, car park, as most would “sell their granny” to avoid paying even a minimal parking fee.</p>

*At weekends, the many visitors to the children's parties hosted at the sports centre will do likewise.

CONSEQUENCES

*Both these last two groups, once the dozen or so kerbside places are full, will look for alternative free places to abandon their vehicles, even more so now that they would have to exit Dunsfold Road and go down Conwy Close to access the pay and display car park. Experience tells us that they have no qualms about trespassing in our own 4 residents visitors parking spots, the slipway to our garage block, or even blocking residents in/out of their own garages by parking outside them. All these alternatives are on our own private property, but that seems to make no difference once they have set their hearts on avoiding the pay and display charge.

*Both of these last two groups also result in reduced revenue for RBC, by avoiding payments to the pay and display scheme. With all the soundbites we hear about the council being strapped for cash, surely this makes absolutely no sense in these austere times?

*In all of the above scenarios, in the event of an emergency we will have no idea who the cars/vans belong to, how long before they return to their vehicle, or how to contact them in the meantime.

*As the east side pavement is segregated from the highway by 24 concrete bollards along its length, to help make it safe for the many children (and adults) walking to and from the sports centre, the Avenue School and Church End Primary School, there is no guarantee that a fire engine would be able to service our homes or garage block should the need arise, because the other side of the road will be full, nose to tail, with vehicles with no size limitation and absent, anonymous owners.

*Emergency fire service access to the Thames Valley School would also be compromised, as would vehicular access by their groundsmen and other maintenance services.

*Access would also be a weekly issue for RBC's refuse and recycling wagons, which could not squeeze past even a parked Transit style van in our street, let alone anything larger.

*There are 3 houses (out of 12 in total) who have visits most days from relatives who are Blue Badge holders, and any changes to the current situation would significantly disadvantage them, whereas at present they have special dispensation to park right outside. In my particular case, both my elderly parents, who also live in Reading, are wheelchair reliant.

*Luckily, the other residents do not need on-street parking, as each household has its own garage, with 2 houses additionally having off-road parking via dropped kerbs. To my knowledge, there are only 2 two

	<p>driver/two car households in our street.</p> <p>* It would make it very difficult for delivery lorries to deliver things to our household as reversing will become totally impossible.</p> <p>AND FINALLY</p> <p>*As a point of procedure, we, the residents, and yourselves went through this proposal/objection/review/non-implementation process in 2016. It seems a waste of RBC's (and our) time, effort, resources and funds to have to jump through the same hoops every couple of years just to preserve the status quo. Please advise what (if any) systems are (or can be put) in place to stop this becoming a recurring nightmare and a drain on the public purse.</p>
--	---

Scheme	Objections/support/comments received.
<p>T18 - Bromley Walk Elvaston Way</p> <p>1) Resident, objection</p> <p>2) Resident, objection</p>	<p>Summary of responses: Objections - 3, Support - 0, Comment - 0, Mixed Response - 0.</p> <p>1) I would like to raise my objection to the above proposed traffic restriction. I have lived at [REDACTED] since [REDACTED] and we have always parked one of our cars outside our garage in the service road where you propose to introduce a traffic restriction. No one has complained about my car being parked there in all that time.</p> <p>I'd like to suggest a leaflet drop to all of the houses affected by the proposals (to ensure that those who are unlikely to read the notifications are aware) - this would inform the taxi driver who parks several cars all over the far end of the service road, blocking in cars from regularly used garages.</p> <p>There are no parking issues at my end of the service road and it is unfair that mine and my neighbours ability to park outside of our properties should be affected by one resident who parks selfishly.</p> <p>The actions of one should not disproportionately affect the rest of us..</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p> <p>2) With reference to the proposed painting of yellow lines and making the service road at the rear of my property a 'NO WAITING' area. I strongly object to this happening. We have lived in this house for over 40 years, and in all that time, NOT ONCE, has the council made any upkeep to the surface of the</p>

<p>3) Resident, objection</p>	<p>service road, made any attempt to fit the extra lighting requested, or cleaned the surface water drains.</p> <p>Now all of a sudden you feel the need to stop me parking outside my own home!!! This is totally unacceptable. It will achieve nothing, with the exception of upsetting everyone affected. It also threatens to lower the value of the properties, as no prospective buyer would want to buy a house where they unable to park by their own garage and back gate. Having spoken with the majority of residents who access garages in the service road in Elvaston Way, we all feel the same way.</p> <p>3) We have lived here since 1997. We are a family of [REDACTED] with two cars. We have NEVER experienced any problems with parking or gaining access to our property via the service road in which you propose to place double yellow lines.</p> <p>We feel that by not allowing us to continue to part at the rear of our property will firstly devalue our property, significantly.</p> <p>My [REDACTED] who is registered disabled and does drive but is unable to access our property from the front due to steps HAS to park her vehicle at the back of our property.</p> <p>The most important objection is the fact that the majority of the three storey houses close by are now or are being converted into THREE individual flats with driveways only capable of accommodating ONE car. Therefore the remaining the cars (which is a minimum of three cars per "house") are having to park on the road.</p> <p>We feel that parking is already at a premium in Elvaston Way as a result of the conversions of the three storey houses along with inconsiderate parking by other residents (and also non residents) of Elvaston Way.</p> <p>OFFICER COMMENTS: Some personal information has been removed.</p>
-------------------------------	---