

PROPOSED RESIDENT PERMIT SCHEME, LOWER CAVERSHAM - OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER
APPENDIX 1 - Summary of letters of support and objections received to Traffic Regulation Order

Street/Summary	Objections/support/comments received.
	Summary of responses: Objections - 50, Support - 11, Comment - 11.
1) Resident, Support	Totally 100% support these proposals.
Area: Montague Street	I do however have a concern that false and objections may be made as there is no way on this objection form does it ask to provide evidence of address and name i.e. entitled to have an objection, please can you confirm what the process is for making sure there aren't suspect objections??
2) Business, Comment	We are a [REDACTED] business operating out of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Vehicles belonging to our customers are always on 1 of our 2 sites. Our staffs do park on the road, as a business how many parking permits can I apply for.?
3) Road user, Comment	This is the gradual erosion of any form of on street parking. Not everybody is lucky enough to be able to afford the (extortionate) station car park charges nor afford or able to get spaces in the other less expensive car parks. Some people have no choice but to park and then walk into Reading. It also requires a cost to the residents but they are still not guaranteed a space either. If, as with Patrick Road and others, which have had permit parking introduced, there are frequently empty spaces. All it does is push cars into the non-permit areas, thereby compounding the problem. It seems to me to be the wrong approach in general. Make cheaper parking more widely available so there is plenty available for all rather than this restrictive approach. I feel time/ money would be better spent on dealing with the pavement parking on Westfield Road which regular stops traffic getting through and restricts pedestrian access, particularly for the disabled (for wheelchair access) and for prams/ buggies - which would otherwise be able to get through.
Area: General	I do want to be contacted about this but cannot add any response to question 2 but would put in Yes if the form would let me. Also the signpost re the consultation shows the link www.consult.reading.gov.uk but if you try this it doesn't work so you cannot get to this consultation. Is this deliberate to restrict comments on the consultation?
4) Unknown, Objection	Briants Avenue east side. You plan on making these areas that you cannot park during the day to permit area. If this happens briants avenue will become a permanent traffic jam from 7am to 10 and 4pm to after 6pm every day. Currently if one car parks there now. It's down to single lane and you cannot move. This area

Area: Briants Avenue	should remain as is with the east side and the rest of the proposed acceptable.
5) Road user, Objection	I'm opposed to the resident permit. As I have to leave my car and walk in for work from here. I don't block anyone in I'm gone before it effects anyone. It's to expensive to park in reading everyday. Please don't make it permit holder area.
Area: General	
6) Resident, comments	Although the principal seems useful, our concern is that as a resident in [REDACTED], may suffer further as a result.
Area: Montague Street	We currently suffer with people visiting the school using our resident parking. I understand that this scheme will not affect resident parking - As per telecon today, we will firstly see the result of the proposal for the scheme, then see what and how it affect us once the scheme is introduced. I am not sure if the Monday to Friday scheme will have the desired affect, we regularly get commercial vehicle parking in the narrow Montague Street, which give us problems exiting resident parking. Maybe a full week scheme might be better. There is no need for contact further , however we would like to be kept up to date on the progress
7) Resident, Support	I am happy to hear that it will be permit holders only but are you guys going to charge ridiculous prices for more than one permit? please could you send over more details if you can or let me know where i can find them please, thank you.
Area: Mill Road	
8) Resident, Support	I strongly support the proposed measures.
Area: Heron Island	The incidences of nuisance parking have increased to an intolerable level recent years. Whilst the volume of non resident parking makes access very challenging, it is the inconsiderate, bordering on illegal parking which impacts life in this area. At times access along Mill Road is barely passable. Service vehicles, particularly RBC waste services cannot access side roads because of vehicles blocking junctions. Police time has been wasted trying to contact drivers of vehicles left blocking roads. This action by RBC is welcomed and will make a significant difference in the Heron Island area.
9) Resident, Objection	As someone who lives just outside the proposed scheme [REDACTED], if such a scheme were to be implemented I am concerned there may be some displacement of non-resident parking from the proposed scheme area to areas just outside the scheme area.
Area: Surrounding	I already have difficulty manoeuvring along [REDACTED], due to street parking associated with the properties in the street. These difficulties would only be increased by potential parking by commuters cars after the possible implementation of a nearby permit scheme. If implementation of the proposed scheme goes ahead and my street suffers from non-resident parking,

	would the council consider extending the scheme to include my road?
10) Resident, Objection Area: Washington Road	<p>1- there is currently no problem with parking in Washington Road or the surrounding roads. I have lived there for [REDACTED] years and NEVER not been able to park on my road.</p> <p>2- the current scheme suggests that marked bays will be placed across driveways which means that people can block access to my drive or the public highway.</p> <p>3- I have a standby commitment with work whereby I can be called in at any time day or night and so need to be able to get off my drive. Difficult if someone is parked on it.</p> <p>4- marked bays across the driveways will CREATE a parking problem because residents will park on the road just to prevent them from being blocked in. This will reduce the amount of parking available to non residents.</p> <p>5- this is just another money making scheme. We currently see none of the money we currently spent to be road users. The roads have horrendous pot holes, flood when there is too much rain and are very rarely cleaned. What's to say this will improve with residents paying to park!</p>
11) Resident, Objection Area: General	<p>There is no problem with parking in lower Caversham this scheme is a waste of money. I am also extremely concerned about this resulting in access to my driveway being restricted or prevented by people with permits parking over my driveway - effectively blocking my in or preventing my driving back into my driveway. My husband and I work irregular hours including night shifts and on call work. We cannot have access to our drive blocked due to unfair parking schemes such as this.</p>
12) Resident, Objection Area: Washington Road	<p>I am a resident of Washington Road. We have lived here for [REDACTED] years, and have [REDACTED] vehicles. We both work shifts and have never had any issue with parking our vehicles on the street. There is always space be that day or night, I would argue that it's harder to park of an evening once the residents are all home rather than in the day time but regardless we always manage to get parked. As such the proposals made, albeit the best of a bad bunch, will not improve parking on the street of an evening when it is harder to park. All that will happen is during the day the street will be empty and at night the same issues will apply. Furthermore we have a dropped kerb driveway at the front of our house, as such if we struggle to park we use the space at the front of our house to park our 2nd vehicle, keeping other spaces free for other residents. My understanding is that the bays will go across our drive and if we are not parked on the drive anyone will be able to park there either with a permit or for the 2 hours without one. Potentially putting more cars on the street as I won't be able to use my drive. I also have a young child and rely on being able to park on my driveway- a drive I paid to have completed & paid to have the kerb dropped for, if I am then not able to use it freely like I currently do this will be of significant hinderance to me and make parking more difficult. We know we are not the only residents in objection to these plans and ask that further consultation be made and for our voices to be heard.</p>
13) Resident, Objection	<p>We live on Westfield Road and South View Avenue is the closest place we can park our car. As we're on the east side of Westfield Road we don't qualify for a permit or visitors permits, but have nowhere else to park.</p>

Area: General	<p>If South View Avenue is made permit only, would we qualify for a permit? If not we would strongly object to this proposal.</p> <p>Having children and not being able to park outside your property is hard enough. Not being able to have visitors parking makes us rather unsociable at home. This proposal would have a hugely negative impact on our lifestyle.</p>
14) Resident, Objection Area: South View Avenue	<p>I feel very strongly that a parking permit scheme is not necessary for South View Avenue, which is where I live. While it is extremely annoying to have my drive blocked in on occasions, usually by churchgoers or parents collecting children from school, I prefer that to a permit scheme. We frequently have visitors to the house, friends and family, and them not being able to park freely would be a real shame, it would restrict our visitors and other people's visitors. Also anyone else coming to the house - workmen, window cleaners etc, would be seriously inconvenienced.</p> <p>Please add my vote to the number of people who do not want this scheme.</p>
15) Unknown, Objection Area: General	<p>I object to the proposed plans to implement permit parking areas in the lower Caversham area. The permit method Reading council uses is designed to both allow shoppers to park for free for 2 hours and walk to town. But also penalises residents guests parking in the evening thus making it costly for residents and of no benefit. This scheme DOES NOT SERVE RESIDENTS only the council finances. MOREOVER the proposed scheme seems to be a response to residents annoyance at school and church parking overflows. These are necessary things. Not only does this appear to be a money spinning scheme that penalises residents it stops parking for users of local services. This therefore serves no benefit and I object to its implementation.</p>
16) Resident, Objection Area: Washington Road	<p>We are residents on Washington Road, we have lived here for [REDACTED]. We currently have [REDACTED] car parked on the drive and [REDACTED] parked across the drive way. We object to the parking restrictions for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have never had issues with parking since living here, the system being proposed will create issues for all residents. We could come back from work to find we are unable to park outside our homes. 2. Where I currently park for free outside my home, I will then have to pay for a permit. This is outrageous, that I should have to pay to park in front of my own house. 3. As there will be bays across current driveways, whilst the white lines will remain, people will be encouraged to park there because they may understand the marked bay as overriding the white line. This will increase the risk of us getting home from work or just popping out to the shops for 10 mins to find we can no longer access our own drive. This becomes more of a problem when working outside of working hours. 4. Currently there is a good unofficial parking policy between residents. The likelihood with this new scheme is that people will be fearful of using/leaving their drives which will encourage more people to park on the street. This will reduce the number of parking spaces available for guests and could potentially cause frustrations between residents.

	<p>5. This is a scheme designed only to benefit the council through increased parking fines and not the residents who live in this area.</p> <p>6. We have not even been officially informed by the council of this proposal; the first we knew of it was when we were informed by our neighbour that this consultation was ongoing. This is completely unacceptable.</p>
<p>17) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: Washington Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The area does not need controlled parking bays - The council has not justified why they are required with actual evidence - The council should spend the time and money fixing the unsafe road surfaces in the area - If tax income from council tax is not sufficient you should increase it instead of introducing a stealth tax <p>Grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no issue with excessive parking of cars (I live on Washington Road and I have not seen any issues on surrounding areas) 2. The proposal to paint parking bays across dropped pavement areas will mean that access to my drive will be prevented, causing me to have no alternative than to pay for a permit as I will potentially be unable to park my car on my property; effectively disenfranchising me under duress. 3. The council has not justified why they are required with actual evidence
<p>18) Resident, Comments</p> <p>Area: Washington Road</p>	<p>PARKING IS BAD IN WASHINGTON RD BUT WORSE IN SOUTHVIEW AVE WHEN TRAFFIC CANNOT PASS TWO WAYS BECAUSE VEHICLE S PARKED BOTH SIDES. I LIVE IN WASHINGTON RD AND HAVE A DROPPED KERB AND WHITE LINES WHICH PAID THE COUNCIL A LOT OF MONEY FOR. I HOPE THIS WILL NOT BE ALTERED IN ANY WAY BY THIS SCHEME ALL THE WHITE LINES I HOPE WILL BE HONOURED AS THEY ARE NOW !</p>
<p>19) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: South View Avenue</p>	<p>I am a resident of South View Ave. I have lived in the property for [REDACTED] years and have NEVER had a problem with parking,</p> <p>I have [REDACTED] who have personal assistants. and [REDACTED] going out at the same time with their 1:1 carer. This will cause me a problem when they leave their cars when on shift - they would leave their car here for 4, 5 and sometimes 6 hrs. Local councillors have informed me issue of carers pass is discretionary - no guarantees - a problem. All my relatives live at a distance to me and need to park when they visit. Given that there have never been problems I believe permits are totally unnecessary. Moreover there are absolutely no guarantees that residents will be able to secure a parking spot near their home. It is my view that the council should be focussing their energies and time on other issues. People are having to agree eg on Briants Ave because they currently use side streets and those people may be saying yes to creation of a zone. Ultimately this policy is very divisive in the community. Issues with Ardler Road and their hire vehicles - [REDACTED] -</p>

	should be dealt with by the council in another way.
20) Resident, Objection	This will result in me not having guaranteed access to my drive for parking on my own property and will devalue my house.
21) Resident, Objection Area: General	<p>I object to certain elements of these proposals on the grounds that extending the 02R permit zone would result in residents who live in the current parking zone area having to compete for parking with residents who live outside the current zone.</p> <p>Queens Road, Kings Road and Coldicutt Street already suffer from a lack of availability of parking spaces. By extending the 02R parking permit zone, it seems likely that residents that live in the surrounding areas would park on these streets - for example, when traffic issues in Lower Caversham make it difficult for them to reach their own streets in a timely manner, or for other reasons relating to the convenient access to Queens Road, Kings Road and Coldicutt Street.</p> <p>Furthermore, residents who would be given the ability to park in the 02R zone may be tempted to purchase additional temporary permits and sell them to non-residents during major events (e.g. Reading Festival, Reading Beer Festival) in order to profit from the increased demand for parking. These permits might be used to park on the above roads - again, owing to their convenient location - at the expense of the residents who live on those roads.</p> <p>I would urge Reading Borough Council to create a new parking zone instead of extending the 02R zone. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p>
22) Unknown, Objection Area: General	<p>Parking in lower caversham prevents a huge amount of additional traffic crossing the bridges each morning into central Reading. Parking has never been an issue during the day in lower caversham and by bringing in changes will increase and force additional pollution into the town, increase standstill traffic and force already full car parks in kings meadow / hills meadow to become battle grounds for workers. It is unreasonable to think that increasing traffic over the bridges in caversham to find day time parking is reasonable. Perhaps if a park and ride was offered on the Caversham side of the bridge people would get public transport or by allowing parking to continue as is which is favourable, If anything it should continue to encourage people walking into the town not discourage it. Most houses in lower caversham have off-street parking and forcing permits will increase the cost to households & visitors. I strongly object</p>
23) Road user, Objection Area: General	<p>I object due to lack of general parking in reading. No park and ride. Pollution for additional traffic driving into town to park. Wear and tear on bridge. No parking to use the bus.</p>
24) Resident, Objection	<p>I think that this scheme is not designed around the resident and might increase frustration between residents. I would agree to this system if no bays were introduced across driveways. Usually my partner park the car on</p>

Area: Washington Road	<p>the driveway and I park the car across my driveway blocking her car. With the implementation of the new system I might get a parking ticket for parking in front of my own driveway. I work close to [REDACTED] and drive [REDACTED] to get home at 7pm and my partner usually come back home after 6pm. The last thing we want to find is that someone is parked across my driveway preventing me and my partner to park our cars. Furthermore, even if my partner parked on the driveway, I would need to park my car on a free bay reducing the number of parking spaces available for other residents.</p> <p>In our street, Washington road, the majority of parking frustrations are outside the working hours, and so I believe there is no need to implement this new system as it is.</p> <p>In conclusion, If there is the need to introduce a parking permit, I would suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no bays across driveways - to extend the parking regulation to evening hours
25) Resident, Objection Area: General	<p>I am concerned about the proposal as I am a Blue Badge holder and I rely heavily on my car as I struggle with walking. Also my working hours are not 9-5.</p> <p>I am concerned that I may not be able to access my driveway when I need to and may be unable to park near enough to my house to enable me to walk comfortably to my home, particularly if I have shopping.</p> <p>Whilst a disabled bay could be introduced this will simply allow other disabled people to obstruct my access. I am also a [REDACTED] with limited financial resources and [REDACTED] and I simply haven't 'budgeted' for parking charges in my [REDACTED] and would struggle to afford the cost.</p>
26) Resident, Objection Area: Washington Road	<p>I object to this proposed parking scheme on Washington road. Currently we have no issues parking when we come to visit our son and daughter in law. With the proposed plans, there will be a reduced chance of finding a parking space and when we are there we will have no longer than two hours. This is only during the day too. Outside of these hours we would not be able to park for free. The idea of permits that they can give us just doesn't work because sometimes we have to visit whilst they are not there. With bays being put across the driveways, we may not even be able to use their drive as it may well be blocked by someone parked across it in a bay.</p>
27) Road User, Objection Area: Washington Road	<p>I object to the parking permit system proposed in Washington road. It will make visiting our friends there all the more difficult due to the 2 hour restriction and we may not be able to even use their drive as someone may have parked across it in a new bay! Utterly ridiculous and purely a money making scheme</p>
28) Resident, Objection Area: General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Peoples' driveways, for which they have already paid you thousands of pounds, will be blocked, almost certainly, by strangers which will eventually lead to personal and vehicle attacks making the problems we already have that much worse. 2. If you ensure that only the residents of each street in the scheme can park in the inhabited areas of their

	<p>street then the areas against walls or fences could be used for the overflow from the other streets, such as Gosbrook Rd, therefore forcing the people, who are currently coming from outside the area to use us as a free car park, to use your car parks instead and supply you with revenue.</p> <p>3. The above scheme would cost you less as you would only need signs at each end of the road saying, "Residents Only Parking Beyond This Point" and identifying letters on the permits in the vehicle windows ie W for Washington Road, A for Ardler Road etc. This would help with residents identifying rogue parking and requiring less Traffic Wardens.</p> <p>4. Guest temporary parking permit books would then be welcomed at any price.</p>
<p>29) Resident, Comments</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>This is not an objection in itself but feedback and questions re Lower Caversham main scheme including area covering Briants Avenue.</p> <p>1. I seek reassurance that all the roads included in the scheme will have equal access to all the zone covered i.e. will it be one complete zone giving all resident parking permit holders access to parking across the whole area?</p> <p>2. Can visitors using resident visitor passes park in any space?</p> <p>3. To what extent will the needs of the wider community of residents be considered in relation to further requests for dropped kerbs/creation of new additional driveways? I have noticed a recent increase in these (no doubt due to proposed creation of RPZ). I am aware this generates income and the Council has an income-generation agenda, but the concern is this reduces the amount of roadside parking as each driveway requires "lead in" space each side so often the creation of one driveway for one car can remove 3 roadside parking spaces which greatly exacerbates the parking problem.</p> <p>4. Given increase in other chargeable services to generate income beyond the cost of the service provision (e.g. garden waste) what guarantee can you give regarding the retention of the current annual fee for resident parking permit and visitor passes?</p>
<p>30) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>I object to the proposals for a residents parking scheme in Lower Caversham. This will cause an inconvenience to local residents who have visitors wishing to park for longer than 2hrs. Quite a few properties have off road parking and throughout the day there are numerous places to park, which aren't taken up by commuters. There should not be a residents parking scheme in this area</p>
<p>31) Road user, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>I think it is ridiculous to put permit parking on the streets of lower Caversham. It is not an issue and won't be. Think of those drivers who have to work in town and cannot afford expensive car parking! Leave the roads as they are.</p>
<p>32) Resident, Objection</p>	<p>I would like to make an objection to the proposed residents parking scheme in Lower Caversham. I am concerned that the parking bays, as shown on the drawing extend the whole length of the roads, and do not stop across driveways. I have looked at other Residents Parking schemes in Reading and they have a break</p>

Area: Washington Road	in the bay across driveways. Anyone who has been out on site, to Washington Road in particular, would see that a majority of the road has driveways, and therefore white lines across the driveways.
33) Resident, Support Area: General	Why do you only allow objections to the scheme? I am totally in favour of this long overdue scheme. The sooner it is introduced the better. Parking during the day is a nightmare due to drivers from outside the area using it to park and then commute to London.
34) Resident, Objection Area: Washington Road	This is not required in Washington Road. the only time there is problems parking is when parents drop their children off at school or in the evenings, when permits will not be required. If bays are marked across driveways it will only add to the problem as people will think they can park there, so residents will be unable to get on their own driveways. this appears to be just a money making scheme. Its bad enough that a traffic warden patrols on a bank holiday and issues tickets to people parked outside the school.
35) Resident, Support Area: General	I don't wish to object I think it is a great plan. Why should we have half of Oxfordshire parking in our street for free while the go to work.
36) Unknown, Comments Area: General	The situation will improve once The Heights school moves to its permanent location so I think it is better to wait for that than make a change to push the current non-residents' cars further up into Caversham. There are also no new car park facilities being made available when a substantial amount of on-road parking is being taken away.
37) Resident, Comments Area: Surrounding	I believe that putting parking permits will impact other residential areas of caversham which are not covered by the permit area. The introduction of the parking permit will therefore push the parking problem to other areas.
38) Resident, Support Area: Heron Island	As a local resident (Heron Island), I support the introduction of a resident permit scheme in lower Caversham. Cars frequently impede access to our development (which has prevented deliveries on a number of occasions) and there is already a lack of car parking available for residents, even without non-residents parking up to walk into town and to the station.
39) Resident, Objection Area:	I object to the proposals on the grounds that we have a driveway, a lowered curb with a white line outside. This works very well at the moment and I feel certain that with the proposed shared use boxes being put outside our houses this will cause problems i.e. people thinking that they can park here. I am a shift worker and finish work at ridiculous times and I am sure that I will come home to find people parked across my drive. Our road is worse than most as we have a school, a school hall, and a church to contend with and parking has never been as busy as it is now. The main problem that we suffer with in this road is trying to park in the

	<p>evenings/weekends. Other people from other roads park their cars and work vans here at night and we have evening activities at the school hall most nights. At weekends we have parties in the hall and children's activities - these parents just park anywhere with no thought about whose drive they may be blocking. We also constantly have selfish parents parking outside our houses to drop off/pick up/visit the school even though the school actively encourages their parents to use the church car park. We have people parking here whenever there is a football event over Christchurch meadows, parking all weekend when the rock festival is on etc. Evening and weekend parking in this road is getting ridiculous.</p> <p>Permit holders only parking (full-time) is the way forward to alleviate the problems that we have in this road but NOT with the allowed 2 hour non permit parking - if you go ahead with the proposed parking bays this will only make matters worse for this road!</p>
<p>40) Resident, Comments</p> <p>Area: South View Avenue</p>	<p>I live on Hampden Road and occasionally have to use South View Avenue for parking in order to access the rear of my property, which backs onto the passageway leading to South View Avenue.</p> <p>Under the current proposals, it appears that South View Avenue will be assigned to a different parking permit zone (01R) to Hampden Road (02R), meaning I will be unable to park there myself, or assign visitor permits to tradespeople, thus denying me required access to the rear of my property.</p> <p>I would suggest that the east end of South View Avenue be assigned a split permit zone (01R/02R) in order that this issue is avoided.</p>
<p>41) Resident, Support</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>supportive of the proposal</p>
<p>42) Resident, Comments</p> <p>Area: Surrounding</p>	<p>I understand the need for a review of the parking in the area that is being considered. However, I am concerned that the people living in & around the Kings Road, Queens Road & Caldicott Street area do sometimes have a need to park in the roads under review as the number of cars in this area far out number the spaces available, especially at night.</p> <p>I am worried that coming home later in the evening there will be no where available to park once any new restrictions are put in place. Being a single woman living alone obviously I am concerned about the safety aspect.</p> <p>I am therefore hoping that you are considering extending the zone 02R to include the new streets, which I think will resolve this issue.</p>
<p>43) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: Briants Avenue</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed new parking bays on Briant's Avenue.</p> <p>The removal of the no waiting restrictions on the northbound side of the road will cause terrible congestion, particularly at rush hour.</p> <p>I live [REDACTED] on Chiltern Road, and use Briant's Avenue a lot. At the weekend it is a challenging road to</p>

	<p>drive up as you can only get one vehicle comfortably through between cars parked on both sides of the road. During the rush hour, traffic queues down the southbound side of the road. In that scenario we would be in a position where traffic attempting to travel north would not be able to pass. In my opinion, this would make a very busy and slow road even busier and slower.</p> <p>Traffic I would presume would then start using other routes, all of which involve residential streets in the surrounding area.</p>
<p>44) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: Briants Avenue</p>	<p>Objection to proposed parking bays on Briants Ave which will effectively make it a one way street. How will buses cope with that? Its already very congested during peak times.</p>
<p>45) Resident, Support/Comments</p> <p>Area: Heron Island</p>	<p>We are writing to support the proposed parking scheme as we are residents of Heron island and we have to constantly battle with outside area office workers that use our streets to park in during the day. The only concern that we have is with the 'resident parking only past this point'. Will the people see the sign at the beginning of Mill Road, it will there be a few signs stating this? Also, will there be regular traffic wardens checking that people are not still parking along here.</p> <p>At the same juncture, I would like to raise the fact that you made parking for Heron island residents after working hours more difficult by painting double yellow lines on the bridge going on to Heron island, instead of single yellow lines, which I understand was the initial intention. Is it possible to change these so that residents and visitors can park after business hours?</p>
<p>46) Church, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>I am a member of Caversham Methodist Church which has its entrance in Ardler Road. Under the proposals there will be double yellow lines completely surrounding the church so how are weddings, funerals and church services to be held? Our car park is not big enough. Also, will people attending Sunday Service be issued with fines if they park nearby for a church service?</p>
<p>47) Resident, Support/Comments</p> <p>Area: Heron Island</p>	<p>I support the proposals in principle, but there are some details in relation to the implementation on Heron Island about which I have contacted Councillor.</p>
<p>48) Resident, Objection/Comments</p> <p>Area: Washington Road</p>	<p>Objections as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The parking restrictions on Washington Road do not go far enough. We have a big problem with people blocking residents drives and the ability to park for 2 hours will not prevent this. - The restrictions will not prevent a high number of commercial vehicles parking on the road (the majority of which do not belong to residents living on Washington Road) on an evening and weekends. These vehicles often park dangerously on the corner of Washington Road near the shop which is a hazard. We also have commercial vehicles parked on drives on Washington Road which block the pavement entirely.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have a big problem with litter that non-residents parking creates on Washington Road. - We have an issue on weekends when non-residents park on Washington Road for the football games on Christchurch Meadows or activities at St Anne's School. <p>I am in favour of parking restrictions in the area but do not feel that the restrictions go far enough for the above reasons, and feel the current proposal will cost me money for limited benefit.</p>
<p>49) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: Send Road</p>	<p>I do not support the consultation for introducing permit parking for the Lower Caversham Area as outlined on Notice of Intention number 1097855.</p> <p>There is already not enough parking for all residents in the area, making off areas for 2 hours will reduce resident parking. My road, Send Road has a section for this 2 hour parking Monday - Sunday. A previous consultation proposed a sign at the junction of Send Road and Gosbrook Road indicating Send Road was a Resident Parking Area and permits were required, this is not the case from Notice of Intention number 1097855. There are flats on Send Road and some residents have multiple cars resulting in there have never been enough parking spaces on Send Road and surround roads are used, this impacts the residents on those roads.</p> <p>Introducing permit parking will move the parking issue to other parts of Caversham and Reading. I feel this is also another income generating scheme, once this is introduced it will exist till eternity.</p>
<p>50) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>These plans are unnecessary because I have never had difficulty finding a parking space in either Ardler Road or South View Avenue. I live on Gosbrook Road and we have a single off street parking space. If these changes go ahead they will effectively prevent us from receiving visitors and family at weekends. The plans will also remove any alternative parking in the vicinity for us making it impossible to have essential maintenance carried out to our property as tradesman will be unable to park in our drive since there will be no alternative parking for our car anywhere nearby.</p>
<p>51) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>I object to the proposals on the basis that I am a local resident of Westfield Road who is excluded from the residents' parking permit zone (zone 01R) and therefore unable to park a car or obtain visitors' permits for use in the area around my home. At present, if I have visitors on a Saturday or during the week they have to park on South View Avenue or around and walk to our home from there. While this is already inconvenient (particularly as I and most of my friends have small children), it would be far worse if the proposals go ahead, preventing parking in the surrounding area.</p> <p>While I understand that the consultation does not cover our area, I submit that the needs of the residents in the surrounding area should be considered. If parking zone 01R were to be extended so that both sides of Westfield road are covered I would have no objection to the plans. As it stands, however, the imposition of further parking restrictions will effectively prevent the residents like me who are excluded from the residents' parking zone within which they reside, from owning more than one car or having visitors.</p>

	<p>We currently have access to one parking space as we have created a driveway on our own land to the rear of our home. As above, however, we cannot park on the roads around our home. I note that many of the residents included in the proposed new controlled area also have driveways yet will presumably be entitled to residents' parking permits and visitors' permits entitling them to have visitors and to own more than one car. I submit that all residents should have equal access to parking in the area around their home and that as such Westfield Road residents' needs should be taken into account as part of the current consultation.</p> <p>It would have been useful if we had made aware that the consultation was taking place more directly and at an earlier stage. I found out about the formal stage of the consultation through signs placed on South View Avenue. I do not recall seeing any similar signs in relation to the earlier less formal consultation stage and certainly have not received any notification directly through our door, which I would have expected considering the potential impact of the proposals on our ability to park near our residence. If I had been aware of the consultation at an earlier stage I would have submitted my objections earlier and asked that Westfield Road be included for consideration.</p>
<p>52) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>I object to the extension of the 01R parking zone in lower Caversham.</p> <p>Currently residents of Westfield Road (east side) are excluded from 01R, presumably on the basis that they have a service road, albeit one with no parking. The service road allows for possibility of residents converting the rear portion of their gardens into drive ways.</p> <p>The exclusion from 01R has forced most residents of Westfield Road (east side) to convert their gardens into driveways; however, if a resident wishes to make use of their garden, the closest place they can park is currently Southview Avenue. The CMS/11474 proposal would force the any resident wishing to use their original garden to park over half a mile from their home. This is manifestly unfair and cannot be allowed to happen.</p> <p>Further, any visitors to properties on Westfield Road (east side) do not have access to visitors' permits. The extension of zone 01R would mean that visitors would have to park even further away that at present I would withdraw my objection to CMS/11474 is Westfield Road (east side) was included in the 01R zone.</p> <p>In support of my solution (inclusion of Westfield Road (east side) in the 01R zone, I would draw the decision-makers' attention to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Cromwell Road (west side) backs on to the same service road; however, it is included in zone 01R, allowing: residents to either convert their gardens into drive ways or park in 01R; access to visitor parking in 01R; and, to park a second car 2) The properties on Southview Avenue have access to driveways, which do require an incursion into their gardens; however, they are going to afforded the benefit of residents parking on their street. There is no justification for extending such benefits to Southview Avenue, whilst continuing to penalise the residents of Westfield Road

	The current effect of parking zones on the residents of Westfield Road (east side) is unfair, irrational and unjustifiable. The extension of zone 01R under CMS/11474 exacerbates the impact.
53) Road user, Objection Area: South View Avenue	<p>I currently park on South View Avenue during the afternoons when I collect my grandson from nursery. I am not able to park closer to his house on Westfield Road as he lives in one of the odd numbered properties that are forbidden parking permits or visitor permits.</p> <p>The on-road parking in Zone 01R does not allow visitors to stay past 5.30 p.m. and I see traffic wardens at 5.30 waiting to ticket vehicles.</p> <p>I need to be able to stay until 6.30 to 7.00 pm, when his parents get home from work.</p> <p>The implementation of these plans would make an already arbitrarily unfair situation even worse.</p>
54) Resident, Objection Area: Surrounding	<p>My fiancée and I live on the east side of Westfield Road. We are unable to obtain a parking permit because despite being within the area covered by the 01R zone our house and the other houses on this side of the road (odd numbers) are not included in the zone. The reason that we have been given by the council is that we have garages behind our houses so don't need a permit, this seems strange because the residents of Cromwell Road also have garages but are entitled to permits.</p> <p>Getting a modern family car into and out of our garage is almost impossible due to the width of the lane and the size of the garage door, and the risk of damage to both the garage and the car is high. Our insurance company charge higher premiums for parking in the garage as they consider the risk of damage greater than if the car is parked on the street.</p> <p>As we are not eligible for parking permits we are also not eligible to receive visitor permits. When we have family visiting from outside of Reading the only place that they can park (Monday to Saturday) within a reasonable distance of our house is Southview Avenue.</p> <p>We understand the frustration of the residents of Southview Avenue and we would rather not park on their street, we would rather that our house and our neighbours houses were brought into the permit scheme so that we can enjoy the same privileges as the residents of the west side of Westfield road and the residents of Cromwell Road.</p>
55) Resident, Objection Area: Briants Avenue	<p>We object to the proposal on on the below accounts;</p> <p>1. We do not believe proposal to permit the West side of Briants Avenue leaving a number of waiting areas for cars has considered the impacts on traffic of making the road, essentially a one lane road. This is in reference to the back up of traffic that will occur as a result of allowing permitted cars to park in various locations on the West side of Briants Avenue. We have concerns queuing traffic will build up along Briants Avenue and Donkin Hill causing it to back up onto Henley road - adding to the traffic chaos that occurs every</p>

	<p>morning and evening in rush hour. We have concerns queuing traffic will mean will not be able to get out of the side Road, Nelson, Montague and South View Avenue if traffic queues in front of the entrances to these roads. We have not seen any traffic modelling on the effect on traffic in Lower Caversham as a result of allowing permitted parking on both sides of Briants Avenue. Until we have seen traffic modelling which assures us that the proposal will not cause queuing of traffic to back up and further traffic chaos in Caversham particularly up Donkin Hill and out on to Henley road, we cannot be assured the proposal will not worsen the flow of traffic in Caversham by trying to resolve parking issues. We ask you to look at the traffic on St Annes Road in Caversham particularly in rush hour to see the effect of permitted parking on both sides of the road. It is dangerous to try and get out onto St Annes Road from Priest Hill - we have on numerous occasions been blocked in by queuing cars down St Annes Road unable to see through these cars - we have concerns Briants Avenue will experience the same traffic issues making it dangerous for residents to get out on the side roads .</p> <p>2. The impact on air quality of idle cars waiting to pass in the passing points and ass the cars queue up Donkin Hill and onto Henley Road has not been considered. We have seen no information that demonstrates you have considered the impact of the proposal on air quality and noise. Until we have seen evidence that the proposal will not cause deterioration in air quality in Lower Caversham from more idle cars waiting in queues we object.</p> <p>3. The impact of noise of idle cars waiting to pass in the passing points of Briants Avenue and queuing has not been considered. This is of particular concern for us living on Briants Avenue. When cars queue down Briants Avenue (which we are experiencing at the moment as a result of the SSE works in central Reading) there is added noticeable noise which we can hear inside our house of cars queuing with their engines on. There is also added frustration of drivers in queues causing them to use their horns and accelerate quickly when they can. We anticipate the same will occur as a result of the permitted parking you plan to impose on Briants Avenue. Additional noise will be a nuisance for residents on Briants Avenue, causing additional stress and preventing us being able to enjoy time in our houses peacefully. Until we see evidence you have considered the impact of the parking proposal on traffic and noise on Briants Avenue we object.</p> <p>We welcome your consideration of these issues and the further information to address our objections. We hope this additional information will give us assurance you have considered additional impacts of the proposal besides just parking in Lower Caversham.</p>
<p>56) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: Surrounding</p>	<p>My daughter lives in one of the odd numbered properties on Westfield Road. They have on parking space at the back of their property. When visiting I currently park in South View Avenue and walk through to Westfield Road. As they are not eligible for visitor parking permits I have very limited options. I note that residents with even numbers are allowed to have visitor permits and can therefore park more than one car, clearly an unfair situation.</p> <p>Further extending the restricted parking appears unnecessary since most residents on South View Avenue have</p>

	<p>driveways. On this basis will you be refusing to allow them visitor permits in line with your decision on Westfield Road.</p> <p>When visiting with my son I can park on the single yellow line for up to 3 hours because he has a blue badge. Bringing my daughter who has autism or delivering/collecting my grandson would be almost impossible with implementation of the proposals.</p>
<p>57) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: Junctions</p>	<p>We object to the amount of parking space lost at the junctions of South View Avenue, with Washington Road, Ardler Road and St John's Road plus outside nos 1 to 3 South View Avenue now proposed to be no waiting zones as this will be a reduction in the amount of parking space available.</p> <p>Currently these spaces are usually in use, I've used them myself, and losing these spaces could make the parking situation worse.</p>
<p>58) Road user, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>I currently park in this area from 8.45- 3.15 on days when I work in town. There are spaces as by this time as residents have gone off in their cars for work.</p> <p>I do this because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hills Meadow car park is busy, there can be no spaces. It's expensive. If it's full where do you go? 2. Traffic volume from bottom of Donkin hill to Hills meadow can cause long delays to get to the car park 3. Bus fares are too expensive for occasional users. Plus traffic makes the journey v slow in a bus. 4. I have no parking at work. 5. I need to keep my car somewhere reasonably local so that I can meet my son from school and work the max hours that I can. 6. There is no park and ride or any where to park in north Reading. I would rather park north of Reading centre so that my car is not adding to the traffic jams the nearer you get to Caversham bridge. <p>There must be somewhere in this area that you could provide some non resident parking, for more then 2 hrs - allowing up to 6 hrs- even if it was metered.</p>
<p>59) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: South View Avenue</p>	<p>First and foremost I object to the proposed residents permit scheme. My reason is that parking is not a problem where I live on South View Avenue.</p> <p>As I stated in my feedback to the original consultation in September 2018, I object to the following aspects of the design proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The main map shows proposed no waiting at any time zones on Washington, Ardler and St John's Road junctions onto South View Avenue. Whilst I could appreciate this is in place for vehicles turning out of the three roads onto South View Avenue, vehicles do not currently have problems without a residents permit scheme. Also Ardler Road is a one-way road heading south, so extra turning space (if required) would be needed on the bends heading south and not on the straight on the northern side of the junction.

	<p>2. The proposed no waiting at any time zone at the western end of South View Avenue opposite St Anne's church looks excessively large. With the zone shown on the southern side of the road, vehicles would easily be able to turn east into South View Avenue from the church car park without the need for a no waiting at any time zone on the northern side of the road. This, and to some extent for point 1 above, would reduce parking capacity on the road unnecessarily.</p> <p>3. At the northern end of St John's Road, more needs to be done on preventing residents blocking the pavements outside numbers 70-80 and Formak/Chiltern Houses at the present time. The vehicles do not park on the roadside here, but fully on the pavement on the eastern side of St John's Road and bumped up on the pavement on the western side. If a permits zone was introduced on the western side opposite these houses, the parking on the pavement issue on the eastern side issue would only get worse.</p>
<p>60) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>I bought my house having researched this area quite widely and specifically chose to buy in this area because it does not have a residents' parking permit scheme. I wanted a house where visitors were able to park easily without the need for scratch cards and fear that a parking inspector would impose fines for being a few minutes over the limit. I went as far as to conduct a parking survey in different streets - I still have that data and the parking situation has not in [REDACTED] years got any worse. My visitors continue to easily find parking spaces and living here is exactly as I had intended. Where is the data from the council's own surveys to demonstrate the problem and thus the need for this solution? I suspect none has been conducted and this is simply driven by a few people who have recently moved into the area without fully understanding the parking situation. Do we understand the business of the drivers who park in this area? Is it commuters parking for the whole day to work in either Reading or travel by train to London or is it shoppers parking for a few hours? Without this data, and if we must proceed with some scheme, would it not make far more sense to have a staged build up to such a scheme ie one that firstly tackles the whole day parking first by being in operation from say 9am-12pm. If this fails to address the issue then it could be extended to longer hours to address the shopping parking issue. The current proposal is akin to using a sledge hammer to crack a walnut. This is a money-making scheme designed to extract further funds from residents - many households will need not just one permit but two, significantly increasing their annual contribution to the council's coffers. Secondly this will force more drivers to park in the, quite frankly already extortionately expensive, car parks in the town centre. This whole scheme is driven by a shortage in council funding from the central government not because the calls for such a scheme have got any louder. Whilst I recognise the awkward situation the council must be in with the funding cuts, it cannot be an acceptable solution for a council to invent a scheme imposing stealth taxes on its own residents under the auspices of an unnecessary parking permit scheme. Reducing the town centre's parking prices would solve this problem without any need for the scheme.</p>

	<p>Similarly, this concern could also be addressed if the costs and profits of the scheme were annually reviewed with any profits given to community projects in the area as voted by residents.</p> <p>A lack of clear information - is this area to be one permit zone where anyone resident in this area can park anywhere or will it be subdivided? - I suggest this has massive implications to whether this scheme would have support. Will there be a limit on the number of permits issued? I suggest the areas where the parking issues have been most intense will continue to be so. What if the scheme does not address the parking issues - will it be removed? When will it be reviewed? How will residents be involved in this review? How will the increased costs to businesses with parking in this area be addressed? To protect their parking spaces they will presumably have to employ private parking enforcement companies and pass on these costs to their customers. Has there been traffic and environmental modelling on the proposed effective width restriction to Briants Avenue? - when cars park here on a Sunday, as they are currently entitled, the road becomes effectively single lane for substantive sections - on a busier day this is likely to lead to significant traffic build up in the area with increased pollution through engine idling and potential queues. I can also see potential benefit here of reduced traffic noise and vehicles having to proceed at lower speeds but am concerned about the traffic and pollution implications. I am also concerned this is simply a rouse included to attract residents on this street but will later be dropped following this consultation. As an ambulance route - is this even allowed?</p> <p>This consultation process has been undemocratic in favouring younger, wealthier residents who have internet access to follow the web links on the yellow signs, have sufficient web expertise to read the documents and complete the consultation or who can read the miniscule writing on the laminated white posters. Many of the residents are not in these categories and have been unfairly excluded from this process. If the intention was to genuinely capture the views of the community - those proposing this scheme would have had sufficient belief in its virtues to test it by means of a local referendum. The ward has two elections over the coming month, one local and one European over the next month and could have easily run such a poll on one of these occasions to reduce the cost. The feedback from this consultation will be held behind closed doors rather than an independently verified and published voting outcome.</p>
61) Resident, Support Area: General	<p>I live on Ardler road in lower Caversham and I support permit parkings 100%, I have enough of the fact that everyone parks on the road and there is not enough room for people to live on the road. I can't wait for the permits to be introduced! If there was anything that can be done about Caversham vehicle hire it would be great!!!</p>
62) Road user, Objection	<p>I live in Caversham Park Village. I run a car but cannot afford to buy a weekly bus pass as well so I park in St Johns Road/Southview Avenue area and walk to work, i.e. the Royal Berkshire Hospital which takes about 25</p>

<p>Area: General</p>	<p>minutes walk from there. If I cannot park in Lower Caversham anymore, it means I have to walk all the way which would be one hour in each direction. The proposals mean that I wouldn't be able to park all day. There must be many residents from places such as Caversham Park/Sonning Common/Emmer Green who do the same.</p> <p>If the parking restrictions are passed, the roads around Lower Caversham will be virtually empty all day - for what reason?!! There is no point in having 2 hour parking - I can't think of why anyone would want 2 hour parking in that area. It would be better to have some restrictions but not so that no all day parking is allowed. A lot of houses have off street parking in that area anyway. I don't see that the proposals will benefit anyone apart from allow the odd resident from parking right outside their house.</p> <p>If you stop commuters from parking in this area (which is not that close to town) it means the roads and traffic on the North side of Reading will be even worse than it currently is as it will mean a lot of people will drive all the way to work.</p> <p>Please can the proposals be looked at again and not be so extensive.</p>
<p>63) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>Further to my email below requesting information on an impact analysis on the area surrounding the proposed parking restrictions, please see below my concerns that I would like taken into consideration for the consultation.</p> <p>I live on a street (Lower Henley Road) which is just outside the boundary of the proposed restrictions. We are already fighting for parking spaces with commuters on a daily basis, and I know that one of my elderly neighbours regularly see cars parked over her driveway and has had to confront commuters in the past.</p> <p>The cut through between Lower Henley Road and Donkin Hill regularly has cars parked on both sides, making it very difficult to pass through, and would make emergency service access difficult.</p> <p>Lower Henley Road has no traffic calming measures and is also already a speedway with cars regularly speeding and not paying attention to the roundabout at the bottom by the Co-op. I regularly see cars speeding and driving the wrong way down the very narrow one way street Star Road, coming off that same roundabout.</p> <p>My concern is that given the new restrictions, there would be a massive increase in pressure by commuters to find space on the roads immediately surrounding the proposed area, especially during the time kids are walking to school. This would increase the difficulty for residents to park, and given the lack of traffic calming measures and that many drivers already pay little attention to the roads rules at the best of times, they would be even more distracted whilst fighting for limited space during the times my kids are walking to</p>

	<p>school, thus placing them in additional danger. I also believe that this will also result in the potential for more confrontation between residents and commuters.</p> <p>Therefore, it's my concern that this is a clear Health and Safety issue and the proposals will increase the risk to local residents.</p> <p>Outside of the consultation area, if you are seriously proposing to make parking by commuters less prevalent, please consider widening the area covered by the restrictions so that this practice becomes non-viable. I would welcome similar restrictions on Lower Henley Road and further afield.</p>
<p>64) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: Washington Road</p>	<p>I am a home owner and long-term resident of Washington Road, having lived here since [REDACTED]. My objection to the proposed parking permit scheme is that no account is taken of the fact that residents without cars are far more reliant on car-owning visitors than people who have cars of their own. The fact that applicants for permits have to prove ownership of a vehicle means that there are households located in the parking permit area that are being denied the basic right to a parking space, something which should be available to every household.</p> <p>My own personal situation means that I will be severely disadvantaged if this scheme comes into effect, despite my [REDACTED] years of residence in this street. I am [REDACTED] years old, do not drive, do not have a driving licence and consequently do not own a car. However, I have a long-term partner who has his own home, but is a very frequent visitor to my home and has been for more than [REDACTED] years. Since my retirement he usually spends two to three days every week with me, and I rely very heavily on being able to use his car. This is the car that I have access to and he is the driver I can call on any time I need to drive anywhere.</p> <p>I have calculated that, if I were to rely on visitors' permits for his car, I would pay £110 a year for the maximum number allowable. Given the amount of time we have got used to spending together, the permits would cover us for only around 6 months of the year, and even then only on condition that I have no other visitors whatsoever. Meanwhile, my neighbours will be paying only £30 for a full year, simply because they are the owners of the cars they are registering.</p> <p>I object to the scheme in general because there is no recognition of the needs of people, particularly older people, who rely on cars other than their own, and who therefore have more 'visitors' than the permit scheme realistically allows for. I object to the Lower Caversham scheme in particular because it is all-encompassing, covering as it does every single street in the area. Consequently it will become impossible for anyone without a permit to park anywhere in the vicinity. This will include my partner, once we have used up all the visitor permits, and there will be a huge negative impact on me, my lifestyle and my access to</p>

	<p>transport. I do not believe that a scheme supposedly designed for the benefit of residents should penalise any residents at all, but this scheme has the potential to severely penalise me and any other people who might be in a similar position.</p>
<p>65) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>I am writing to you in response to the consultation notice for the new proposed permit scheme in Lower Caversham to highlight my concerns and objections of the current plan.</p> <p>I am a resident/owner of an odd numbered house on Westfield Road which itself sits within the existing permit scheme 01/R.</p> <p>Odd-numbered houses in Westfield Road are not entitled to permits within this scheme for reasons that no one has ever been able to explain to me, however I do know that it is oversubscribed which combined with the until now availability of nearby unrestricted parking has made discretionary permit applications futile. As a result of this residents, on the odd numbered side Westfield Road are forced to use the rest of Lower Caversham's currently unrestricted parking zones for all visitor and tradesperson parking, and second cars. This has never been an ideal situation and in addition to being a safety concern causes the residents difficulty with being able to find local traders.</p> <p>However, it is one that we have accepted over our [REDACTED] years living on the street.</p> <p>Although I agree with the need to control the use of the areas parking by station commuters, implementing the scheme in the current form will remove our access to this parking and put the residents on the odd numbered side of Westfield Road in an unsustainable and unique position within Lower Caversham.</p> <p>My suggestion as an alternative to the current plan is to move Westfield and Cromwell Road from the current 01/R permit zone into the new 02/R zone therefore moving Westfield Road into a less subscribed zone and grant equal access to permits for all residents.</p> <p>This would maintain the permit controls and allow them to maintain a workable parking situation within the area.</p> <p>The impact of the current proposal going ahead will have a significant impact on my own family as well as many others on the street, so much so that we may be forced to consider moving from the area.</p> <p>Many thanks for your consideration.</p>
<p>66) Resident, Objection</p> <p>Area: General</p>	<p>I am, writing concerning the proposed plans for south view ave ,I strongly disagree with the proposal all we need down this road is a two hour block out in the day to stop the commuters which I know works in other areas, I feel that the resident at being treated unfairly as we will have to use so many permits for our visitors, why is it permit at night and weekends as well it is just pure commuter parking in the day, our road is a mixture of ages from old people having relatives in to help them etc, grandparents who help look after there grandchildren who are dropped off, so will be forever looking to see if a warden is coming, I have lived on this road for over [REDACTED] years and feel very strongly on this ,I really do think just one 2 hour block out every day would work so please look into this, also another problem we will have is less car parking the road will</p>

	<p>return to being a rat run and this road is used for 3 schools children walking, st Anne's ,the heights and thameside.</p> <p>Looking forward to hearing from you in this very important matter</p>
<p>67) Resident, Comments</p> <p>Area: Gosbrook Road</p>	<p>I wonder if you could help me. I live at No [REDACTED] Gosbrook Road. I noticed that there are some parking restrictions coming into force around the area. Firstly, I wonder if this will affect me as currently I am able to park outside my house. This is infrequent as often I am unable to.</p> <p>I am a [REDACTED] and am required to be on call for 24 hours. I am also required to be available for work at short notice. Before I apply for a parking permit, I wondered if you could tell me of the roads in Lower Caversham that will be affected. Thank you for your time.</p>
<p>68) Resident, Support</p> <p>Area: Ardler Road</p>	<p>I live on Ardler road in lower Caversham and I support permit parkings 100%, I have enough of the fact that everyone parks on the road and there is not enough room for people to live on the road. I can't wait for the permits to be introduced ! If there was anything that can be done about Caversham vehicle hire it would be great !!!</p>
<p>69) Resident, Objection/Comments</p> <p>Area: Star Road</p>	<p>I am writing to raise a concern about the proposed alterations to parking restrictions detailed under reference CMS/11474.</p> <p>We live at [REDACTED] Star Road. Parking on our road is already very busy, with most of the road reduced to a single lane due to the number of cars parked. By not extending the proposed alterations to Star Road, we anticipate this problem will worsen as drivers are pushed further out of town, particularly due to the regular bus services (27, 29) and easy walking access to the town centre along public footpaths running near the Thames. We would therefore like to see consultation on extension of the plans to include Star Road, at least the southern part.</p> <p>We have a further issue at our address, with a wide pavement outside our property (see attached photo), which tempts some drivers to attempt to park their entire vehicle on the pavement. Previously, when cars have parked here, it has hindered access to our driveway. I am concerned that the proposed changes will lead to an increase in drivers parking on this pavement. If the proposed parking changes are put in place and not extended to Star Road, we would request the council put bollards on the pavement to prevent drivers parking here.</p> <p>I am glad that the council has recognised the parking issues faced in Lower Caversham and hope that these points will be taken into consideration. I look forward to hearing your response.</p>

<p>70) Resident, Objection/Comments Area: Star Road</p>	<p>My wife and I live at [REDACTED] Gosbrook Road, Caversham, and have seen the proposal for a new parking scheme in our area.</p> <p>We would both whole-heartedly welcome the parking scheme's introduction. We have found it increasingly difficult to park outside our home over the past few years. We notice that the stretch directly outside our property and the surrounding roads get used by local businesses and commuters as areas of free parking. I have witnessed many people parking here and walking into Reading for business (local or commuting) or to avoid paying for parking in the town centre. On occasion vehicles have been left overnight or for several days at a time.</p> <p>Hopefully the introduction of a residents parking scheme would help to alleviate this issue and allow local residents to park closer to their homes.</p>
<p>71) Resident, Objection Area: South View Avenue</p>	<p>I am writing in relation to your proposal to introduce parking permits on South View Avenue. I live at number [REDACTED] South View Avenue along with my partner, [REDACTED]. We are owner occupiers and we are both opposed to your proposal. We have experienced no problems with parking along the road and do not see any justification for your introducing such a scheme. Friends and family can always find somewhere nearby to park when they come to visit. By introducing such a scheme, you would be restricting our ability to have friends and family come to visit freely at the weekend and to park along the street. This is to the detriment of us as residents of the street.</p> <p>By far the greatest parking issue in this area is the problem generated by parents dropping off children at St Anne's School on Washington Road, who frequently park across people's driveways where there are white lines, often refusing to move their cars and sometimes locking them up and walking off, leaving homeowners on Washington Road and the part of South View Avenue near the school unable to access or leave their properties by car. I speak from experience, having previously been a home-owner on Washington Road, living there from [REDACTED]. On 2 occasions I had recourse to call the police over this, once when a driver insisted he had the right to wait on the white line outside my house for 20 minutes and refused to move his car when I told him I needed to leave my property in my car. You would be far better advised to direct resources towards sending someone to curb that anti-social behaviour. Perhaps arranging for a staggered start time for the school so that the church car park, which has been made available for school drop-off and pick-up times in the past (I'm not sure whether that arrangement is still in practice) can be used to accommodate the cars. I was previously advised by the school that the church car park was not big enough for all of their parents cars, hence the suggestion of staggered start times for different year groups.</p> <p>If you genuinely want to improve the experience of people who live in this area, you would address that</p>

	<p>problem instead of introducing a scheme for which there is no need. Luckily, we now live far enough from the school for this issue not to impact us, but just the other day I passed a poor lady outside her house on the part of South View Avenue towards the church asking a parent to move a car and it reminded me how much of an issue this is for that area.</p>
<p>72) Resident, Comments</p> <p>Area: Heron Island</p>	<p>Please find attached the highway map for Heron Island, one of the roads being included in the proposed new parking scheme.</p> <p>When Heron Island was developed in the late 1980s the driveways were shorter than would be currently accepted under the Council's standards for design of parking spaces. As a result when cars are parked on driveways they may overhang slightly (although their wheels will be on the areas designated for parking which may be partly private land and partly highway strip).</p> <p>The roads on Heron Island are narrow and do not have footpaths. It would be unacceptable if residents parking their cars in their driveways would be subject to parking enforcement if their vehicles overhang the highway, as that is how the Island was designed in 1987.</p> <p>The consultation map does not include the highway strips in the hatched areas. I have explained that these strips are not delineated from front driveways or gardens. Please can the Committee obtain a binding assurance from Highways and the Council's Legal Department that the only areas on Heron Island which will require a parking permit are those shown hatched on the consultation plan and therefore that the scheme does not affect highway strips.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt please can the Committee dealing with this matter confirm with the Highways Department that parking can take place on highway strips which adjoin driveways and front gardens without the requirement to have a parking permit, otherwise the unintended consequence of the scheme would be to reduce residents parking as residents would not be able to park on their own driveways.</p>