

**APPENDIX A
NIGHTINGALE ROAD, WOODLEY PROHIBITION OF WAITING ORDER 2016**

	Letter/ Email from		Supports / Objects / Comment	Comment/Objection	Officer Comment
1.	Cllr Beth Rowland	Local Member	Objects and comments	All well except BOTH sides of N-W turning road - I would be happy with one side. Both sides mean that the displaced cars are once again put on to my residents' roads where there are houses. Using one side of the NW end would reduce this a little.	These proposals were initially requested by local residents through another local ward member. The turning head is no wider than the rest of the road and this is why parking might need to be restricted on both sides to enable delivery vehicles etc to turn around.
				If this goes ahead as planned residents will be more affected and even more cross than they already are by station parking.	The proposals have been kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary displacement of parking into nearby residential areas. The objective is to keep the turning head clear and maintain access to the electrical substation.
				There is a fairly wide verge up at that top end of Nightingale Road - could that be taken away and parking installed - that off road parking would make considerable improvements for residents - the verge is already highway but there would be a cost.	The cost of converting verges into parking laybys is considerable, particularly as it would probably involve the cost of protecting public utility apparatus. The council does not have sufficient funding to install parking laybys from its

					limited highway improvement budget which is focused on road safety and congestion issues ahead of improvements in local parking facilities.
2.	Traffic Management Officer	Thames Valley Police	Objects and comments	<p>I think this needs some discussion before going ahead.</p> <p>This road is used by commuters using Earley Train Station. If you reduce the number of parking spaces available the problem will move to the residential streets in the surrounding area generating even more complaints.</p> <p>The turning head as mentioned in the statement of reasons has always been used as a parking area for at least the last ten years to my knowledge without any incidents. I would agree to DYL around the sub-station to maintain access.</p>	It is recognized that future TRO projects will have to allow more time for informal consultation with the police and other stakeholders. The proposals have been kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary displacement of parking into nearby residential areas. The proposals represent a minimum requirement to keep the turning head clear and maintain access to the electrical substation.
3.	Committee Officer	Woodley Town Council	No objection	<p>At a meeting on 23 August 2016 the Woodley Town Council Planning Committee considered the proposal to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions (double yellow lines) on Nightingale Road, on both sides of its north-western turning head, and no waiting at any time restrictions on the south-west side of Nightingale Road, adjacent to the electricity sub-station.</p> <p>The Committee had no objections to the proposals.</p>	Noted

4.		Local Resident	Objects	<p>I strongly object to this Prohibition of Waiting Order and urge the Council to withdraw the order. My reasons are as follows: Of course this length of cul-de-sac is used for parking by rail commuters, that is exactly what the public and the Council should want to happen. We all want to reduce traffic and pollution on the roads by encouraging the use of public transport. How are people to use public transport if they can't park somewhere nearby? If you implement these parking restrictions less people will use the trains from Earley station. That adversely affects most of us, not just the local residents.</p>	<p>The proposals do not prevent all the parking in the cul-de-sac so this would still be available for commuters or any other member of the public parking in the vicinity. The council does encourage greater use of public transport but any "Park and Ride" means of travel should take place in the appropriate locations.</p>
				<p>You say in your Statement of Reasons that, "The turning head should remain clear at all times in order to maintain access" Access to what? This is a cul-de-sac with no houses on it. Pedestrians have the access they need and cars can't access anything at present and still won't be able to access anything if the Prohibition of Waiting Order is carried out. This reason does not make sense to me, and I would like to know its explanation.</p>	<p>The proposals have been kept to a minimum to keep the turning head clear and maintain access to the electrical substation. Occasionally works vehicles may need access to Earley station footbridge or for other maintenance works.</p>
				<p>You say in your Statement of Reasons that, "The parking also takes place near an electrical substation making access difficult." This doesn't require all the lengths of double yellow lines that you propose; a short length across the substation entrance would be quite sufficient.</p>	<p>The turning head is no wider than the rest of the road and this is why parking would need to be restricted on both sides to enable delivery vehicles etc. to turn around.</p>

				<p>If you implement these parking restrictions, most of the people who at present park there will just park on the nearby roads such as Bideford Close, Hazel Drive and Sycamore Close. The local residents will then have cars parked outside their front gardens, rather than where the cars park now, which is out of sight from the local houses.</p>	<p>The proposals have been kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary displacement of parking into nearby residential areas. The proposals represent a minimum requirement to keep the turning head clear and maintain access to the electrical substation.</p>
				<p>My objection is because the whole proposal seems against common sense; it is not an example of NIMBY. I never park in the area involved and I very rarely use the trains from Earley. I hope you will give my reasons for objection serious consideration.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
5.		Local Resident of Bideford Close	Comments	<p>We reside on Bideford Close and thus our back garden is directly adjacent to the portion of road being proposed for no waiting restrictions. I have reviewed the information on the borough website -- thank you for the ability to access the relevant information.</p> <p>I read and understand the reasons for the proposed restrictions, especially the access to the turning head and to the sub-station. We have lived here for just over three years and have not necessarily noticed an increase in parking along this part of Nightingale but fully agree it is steadily used. When we purchased the property, we were told by the previous tenants that there would be a</p>	<p>The proposals have been kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary displacement of parking into nearby residential areas. The proposals represent a minimum requirement to keep the turning head clear and maintain access to the electrical substation.</p>

				<p>lot of parked cars but they had never had any problems, and to date this has held true for our family as well. I do agree with the local residents that filed the request that this part of the road is used for access to Earley Station.</p> <p>In the context of road safety on this particular section of Nightingale, I don't have any objections.</p> <p>I do have some concerns about what will happen if/when there is a loss of parking spots (I've not counted, but perhaps 5-6 spots?) The worry of course is that rail commuters will park in other nearby areas of the neighbourhood, exacerbating what is already an increasing "home-grown" problem regarding street parking.</p> <p>I understand this area was developed 40 years ago and more people have more cars than they did in the past. However, parking along curves and at intersections already poses a safety concern regarding visibility and safe access to intersections (e.g., the SE intersection of the Hazel Drive loop, where Hazel meets itself, just north of where Hazel intersects with Nightingale.) That is, there is already an issue with local residents parking too close to intersections. I have some sympathy due to the density of the neighbourhood, but this does pose a hazard.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				In short, I'm worried that the overflow from the turning head on Nightingale will spill over into adjacent streets, exacerbating existing congestion and competition for parking. It's easy to envision a scenario in which Nightingale is made incrementally safer, but safety is diminished on nearby streets. I accept these are difficult decisions for which to weigh the risks and benefits.	
6.		Local resident of Nightingale Road	Objects	<p>I'm writing regarding my opposition to the proposed works on Nightingale Road.</p> <p>My opposition to the 'No Stopping Zone' Monday to Friday between 9 and 5 is based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no major problem to fix. They are just parked cars. - The use of that part of the road when accessing the station as a local resident is often a life line. - Putting restrictions in place will only serve to push the parked cars from a safe, useful zone into the residential areas further back up Nightingale Road. This will create a significant problem when there wasn't one in the first place. - During the week the parked cars help to dramatically slow down traffic. On the weekends 	<p>The proposals are for 'no waiting at any time (rather than a daytime only restriction). The proposals have been kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary displacement of parking into nearby residential areas. The proposals represent a minimum requirement to keep the turning head clear and maintain access to the electrical substation.</p> <p>The proposal does not cover the through section of Nightingale Road; there is not a speeding issue in the cul-de-sac section.</p>

				<p>when it is clearer, cars go excessively over the speed limit down that section of Nightingale Road.</p> <p>Without empirical evidence that these restrictions won't serve to worsen congestion in areas this space currently relieves and I am highly opposed.</p>	
7.		Unknown address	Objects	<p>I am writing in regard to the proposed waiting restrictions – Nightingale Road, currently under consultation after reviewing Drawing no. 5049-2156.</p> <p>The cars parked in this dead end road are always parked neatly and whilst I agree that the electrical sub-station access should be marked with double yellows, 20m is quite extreme.</p> <p>In addition, the 'turning zone' at the end of the road is also unrequired. The road is not of substantial length and with a shorter area for the electrical sub-station access being double yellowed and perhaps the opposite side of the road being marked at the same, this would be more than adequate for turning vehicles and would also mean more spaces for vehicles also.</p> <p>It may also be worth reviewing the overgrown bushes in this area, opposite the sub-station which have grown out in to the road forcing some cars to park away from the kerb.</p>	<p>The proposals have been kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary displacement of parking into nearby residential areas.</p> <p>Parking opposite the entrance to the substation does not obstruct it (as it is quite wide), as long as vehicles aren't parked to the right of the entrance as vehicles emerge.</p> <p>The cleaner and greener team has previously arranged some cut backs of this vegetation. However this comment is noted and we will request they revisit the area.</p>

				<p>I hope that you consider these thoughts, by shortening the marking on the side of the sub-station, adding the same opposite and not proceeding with the turning zone marking at the end I think that it will be a win all round, access granted, turning possible and this will prevent the cars moving to park elsewhere which would just shift the problem down the road to busier sections.</p> <p>Thank you for your time</p>	
8.		Unknown address	Objects	<p>Objection to notice.</p> <p>I would like to object and ask/state the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what is the main reason for introducing this? - how many objections do you need to stop progressing? - how many objections do you have recorded so far? - there is no blockage to residents - the road actually helps residents, as people will not park on their cul de sacs etc. - there is not enough parking at Station car park - some spaces have been taken by the bikes - many spaces are always taken by construction vehicles it network rail units. Further reducing parking spaces for station users. <p>There is just no other solution so I'd quite look forward to understanding the presumably strong</p>	<p>These proposals were initially requested by local residents through another local ward member. The proposals have been kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary displacement of parking into nearby residential areas. The objective is to keep the turning head clear and maintain access to the electrical substation.</p>

				<p>reasoning for blocking the use of that road.</p> <p>I also encourage you to make this known at the main station entrance- as limiting parking at Nightingale road will affect everybody.</p>	
9.		Local resident of Hazel Drive	Objects	<p>I am writing to express my serious concern at the proposed parking restrictions for the service road at the end of Nightingale Road in Woodley, drawing no. 5049-2156.</p> <p>We already have an increasing number of cars parked opposite our house and in our road by users of Earley station. This situation has got worse since the introduction of double yellow lines further up Nightingale Road (at the junction with Bodmin Road). With less space to park in the service road, even more drivers will continue into Hazel Drive to park.</p> <p>People who are parking here to use Earley station already often do not park as tidily as they should – I have seen people all but ‘abandon’ their cars as they run off towards the station bridge, obviously concerned that they will miss their train. As well as being inconsiderate to local residents, this is also potentially dangerous. The new restrictions will increase the danger that is already posed to the many children living in our road, including my daughter, in crossing the road safely and learning to do so independently.</p>	<p>These proposals were initially requested by local residents through another local ward member. The proposals have been kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary displacement of parking into nearby residential areas.</p>

				<p>The increased number of parked cars in Hazel Drive will make cycling around our road (I do not drive) even more difficult as the road is not wide and I already have to manoeuvre around parked cars onto the other side of the road towards oncoming traffic. Since Hazel Drive is a long road and has several closes off it, there is a surprisingly large volume of access traffic at all times of day that also has to negotiate parked vehicles.</p> <p>I would be interested to know how many of the drivers parking on Nightingale Road live within walking distance. Surely measures to encourage people not to drive in these circumstances would be beneficial to both the local residents and to the health of the drivers themselves? This would be better than the proposed changes to road markings.</p> <p>I urge you to please reconsider your plans. I and my husband are very concerned about the negative impact this will have on us, our daughter and the other residents of Hazel Drive. The current situation is far from ideal, but we believe this proposal will make things much worse.</p>	
10.		Unknown address	Objects	<p>The cars parked in the places, where you want to restrict parking, are not affecting any residents as the road here is purely a dead-end and there are no front driveways along the various lines you indicate. If you stop this parking.....drivers will</p>	<p>These proposals were initially requested by local residents through another local ward member. The proposals have been kept to a minimum to</p>

				<p>obviously then find other residential roads in South Lake to park in all day long, thus unnecessarily upsetting these residents. It's very good news that commuters are using rail travel more and more - but with this comes the problem, "where can I park in order to use the railways on a daily basis?" As a nation, we build more homes and more homes, which adds to the prosperity of the Council's coffers (with increased Council Taxes etc) and then we wonder how to deal with the extra problems it all brings to the local communities, such as car parking prior to rail travel. There are verges alongside both sides of this cu-de-sac, including loads of unsightly brambles which could be cleared away to provide some adequate lay-bys - and possibly made into metered parking bays to give the council some revenue. Whatever is decided, you must keep the access to the electricity company's compound clear at all times. At the extreme far end of Nightingale Road - that area also needs to be kept clear for any works vehicles requiring access to the pedestrian footbridge over the A 3290 and the railway. Am I just being cynical, or have you chosen the deadline date for comments to be slap bang in the middle of the holiday season, when there are so many of the regular commuters away from their daily working life/routine, and they may not yet be aware of WBC's proposal?</p>	<p>avoid unnecessary displacement of parking into nearby residential areas.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

11.		Unknown address	Comments	<p>I have just seen the notice which seems a good idea for safety but I am a resident in Bodmin Road and am a bit worried where the cars will start parking if they won't be parking where they are now. We have had some double yellow lines put on our junction but it is still trouble seeing cars further down coming up towards Hazel Drive as there is a bend and if cars start parking further down there it will make it harder. So please would you think and keep an eye on the effect it will have. My son has already had an accident on that bend by a car going too fast and didn't stop!</p>	<p>The proposals have been kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary displacement of parking into nearby residential areas.</p>
12.		A local resident	Objects and comments	<p>I agree that yellow lines are needed at the entrance to Electricity Sub-station and suggest that yellow lines are also needed on the north-west side of the road (26m from the junction) where there is a footpath into Bideford Close. Cars sometimes park here causing an obstruction for people with pushchairs, wheelchairs, on bicycles and on foot. Parking restrictions at the turning head will exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>If there are yellow lines at the entrance to the Electricity sub-station, would it not be possible for cars to use this entrance for turning rather than preventing parking at the end of the cull-de sac? I have lived here for 33 years and cars have always parked in the road. I am not aware that it has caused a problem apart from the occasional car blocking the sub-station.</p>	<p>The proposals have been kept to a minimum to keep the turning head clear and maintain access to the electrical substation.</p> <p>Occasionally works vehicles may need access to Earley station footbridge or for other maintenance works.</p>