

APPENDIX A

**Map-based TROs formal consultation – summary of responses received
report to Council Executive 29 June 2017**

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|----|---|----------------------|---|---|---|
| 1. | On-line | Anonymous contact | Makes other comments | Map is unbelievably hard to understand and use? | The on-line map viewer is only a guide to the actual parking restriction maps that form part of the legal TRO documents – and these are in a more recognized IT format of ‘pdf’ files. However, officers will continue to look at ways of making the on-line viewer easier to understand and use. |
| 2. | On-line | Resident | Makes other comments | Feel some need extending | The extent of parking restrictions has not changed, other than the minor amendments listed in the report. Requests for changes to parking restrictions will continue to be considered after CPE has been implemented and reviewed. |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|----|---|-------------|---|--|--|
| 3. | On-line | Resident | Makes other comments | Adding vehicle registration mark to the permit, disallows any visitors to use the parking during the week (assuming the primary car is not present; eg, when the driver is at work). The restriction of one permit per household still applies. Why further restrict it to just one car? | <p>The intention of changing the rules to require a vehicle registration number (VRN) to be displayed is threefold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To harmonise the residents permit systems across all schemes in the Borough. 2. To assist the management of the limited supply of on-street parking spaces to ensure that bona fide residents' parking needs are prioritised above others. 3. To align with best enforcement practice under CPE and help prevent any abuse of permits. <p>The further restriction (in some zones) to limit the number of permits per property, reflects the Council's current residents parking policy.</p> |
| 4. | On-line | Resident | Objects | I don't find it appropriate that [ADDRESS REDACTED] is eligible for a residents parking permit as it is the only property in the row of eligible houses with a drop-curb and driveway. All other have no alternative option for parking other than the designated area where there are already fewer spaces than eligible houses. I therefore propose that number [ADDRESS REDACTED] be excluded from the eligible list in the interests of fairness to the other residents that do not have an off-road parking option at their property. | <p>The address does not have a dropped kerb access; however a neighbouring property does, which is why that property is excluded from eligibility.</p> <p>The address has always been eligible for a permit under previous TRO arrangements and so there is no change proposed in that regard.</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|----|---|-------------|---|--|---|
| 5. | On-line | Resident | Objects | Station road in Twyford is already massively restrictive even when paying for a parking permit it does not stop the issue. It seems you are adding permits from Waltham road and disregarding the already overcrowded parking issue putting it under shared use!!! Clearly not a step forward but rather a giant step backwards. What are we actually really paying for??? You need to address spaces on station road and terrace by making it one way and putting parking on a slant so more spaces can be created. We need solutions not ridiculous proposals! | There are no changes to the current arrangements for eligibility of permits in Station Road. There is a proposal to alter Waltham Road (Union Street), but this is to return eligibility arrangements to what they were previously. The parking layout in Station Road can be considered in the future however a one way street would only bring a small increase in the number of spaces and would have some disadvantages in terms of concentrating vehicle movements on only one junction rather than 2. |
| 6. | On-line | Resident | Objects | Possibility of issuing parking permits to the residents of Silk Court, Rose Street. Who currently have to pay to park in a council car park a fair distance from our property, reducing the visits of our elderly relatives visiting us. | Silk Court constitutes part of the Peach Place redevelopment project and that scheme necessitates the replacement of lost off-street parking, at those existing properties that had it previously, by allowing them to be eligible for on-street permits instead. |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|----|---|------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| 7. | On-line | Councilor Prue Bray | Makes other comments | Residents parking permit schemes: harmonisation is slight improvement but you haven't tackled the main problem, which is: issuing more permits than there are spaces. So people pay for a space but are not guaranteed they will get one. That doesn't seem fair. | It is not legally possible to guarantee a parking space on the public highway. The underlying principle of resident parking schemes is to improve the priority for residents' parking needs above other users. It is sometimes necessary to issue more permits than there are spaces available otherwise a waiting list system would have to operate whereby some properties would be disadvantaged merely due to a 'first come first served' arrangement. The Council's current residents parking policy aims to control some of this issue by limiting the number of permits available to each property (1 or 2) and taking into account any off-street parking available, where there are identified pressures on parking space capacity. |
| 8. | On-line | Resident | Makes other comments | The map has too many base colours, road outlines and house outlines should be black and basic, the only colour should be where there are restrictions. | The on-line map viewer uses a different base- map to the actual parking restriction maps that form part of the legal TRO documents – and these use the traditional black outlines referred to. However, officers will continue to look at ways of making the on-line viewer easier to understand and use. |
| 9. | On-line | Councillor Pauline Jorgensen | Supports | No specific comments made. | Noted. |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| 10. | On-line | Wokingham Town Council | Supports | The Town Council supports the introduction of interactive online TROs. | Noted. |
| 11. | On-line | Resident | Makes other comments | on the website page, make the actual TRO map far more visible, not half way down a list, it should be the first on the list, or it makes no sense | Noted. Officers will continue to look at ways of making the on-line viewer easier to understand and use, including its significance on the council's website. |
| 12. | On-line | Resident | Makes other comments | The colours on the maps are too similar. E.g. Loading, School, Taxi and crossing are all black; No Loading, No Loading at Any Time, No Waiting and Bus Stop all look very red. Can you come up with a better way to represent the different restrictions? | The 'line-styles' and colours contained in the legend to the maps in the actual legal TRO documents are in a widely-used format at many other authorities. However, officers will continue to look at ways of making the maps easier to understand and use. |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 13. | Email | Resident | Objects | <p>We are the owners of [ADDRESS REDACTED] and we purchased the house with the understanding that we would be entitled to a resident parking permit but when we applied we were told that there was not one for [ADDRESS REDACTED]. Our house was converted from a commercial premise back to a residential property in 2013 and we purchased it in October 2015 but the history is that numbers [ADDRESS REDACTED] were all part of the same property back in 2003 when they were split into three with only [ADDRESS REDACTED] being retained as an office, so historically we feel that they should all be entitled to a permit.</p> <p>We find it hard to understand why our two neighbours are eligible for a parking permit and we are not. We are paying more than £2,000 per year Council Tax and we don't even have the right to park somewhere nearby.</p> <p>Can you please reconsider and allow us to have a resident parking permit for Milton Road.</p> | <p>Historically, in previous TROs, the property concerned has not been eligible for a permit. When the conversion of the property from commercial to residential took place, the planning officer's comments at that time were that 'no additional parking provision would be required'.</p> <p>This reflects the fact that there was no agreement at the planning permission stage to alter eligibility for permits.</p> <p>There are pressures upon the limited number of spaces in Milton Road, and so it is considered inappropriate to increase eligibility for more permits in this instance.</p> |
| 14. | Email | Cllr Imogen Shepherd-DuBey | Makes other comments | I think that the TR Maps are great and you can see properly what is going on in each of the respective roads. | Noted |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|---|-------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>I would like to make the following comments: Lilly Court - I do feel that one permit should be available to each flat in Lilly Court. It is an extremely contentious location as the flats were built with very little parking. The residents cars are overflowing into other streets in the neighbourhood and all of them ask for help with parking, when I speak to them.</p> <p>(note: Lilly Court is located on the corner of Havelock Road and Oxford Road, in Wokingham.)</p> | <p>Lily Court was converted from a commercial garage to a residential property and the planning permission at that time considered the development as a retirement property, in a central location with easy access to the rail station and bus services, and so the provision of off-street parking spaces in the new development was reduced. No agreement was made for properties to be eligible for on-street parking permits. The availability of on-street parking spaces in Havelock Road is under pressure and officers consider it inappropriate to increase eligibility for permits.</p> |
| | | | | <p>The parking restriction in Ormonde Road needs to be extended to later in the day. It only lasts till 10AM which means that they still get lots of people parking on this street for work in the town or the train station.</p> | <p>This can be considered after CPE has been implemented and reviewed.</p> |
| 15. | Email | Resident | Makes other comments | <p>Please don't add any addition cars to the road, I am currently a permit holder of for the reasons that many of the permit holders of this road are unable to find spaces for their cars due to drivers who park here illegally without a permit</p> | <p>The proposal is to allow a further 6 properties (Almshouse on London Road) to be eligible for 1 permit each in The Grove. Illegal parking by non-permit holders beyond the 30-minute maximum stay will be subject to improved enforcement</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>for more than 30 minutes, inconsiderate drivers parking across a space that could fit 3 cars but can't because of their parking position and drivers with out of date permits. If you're going to add the additional permit holders please can you send regular traffic wardens for inspections of legitimacy.</p> | <p>under CPE. Similarly, the misuse of outdated permits will be monitored more under CPE.</p> |
| | | | | <p>I believe, along with the traffic wardens that painting in individual car bays in the original parking areas, would help eliminate the inconsiderate drivers. It shouldn't have to come to what I am suggesting, but unfortunately some drivers in this area do park their vehicles in such a selfish way that permit holders are forced to park illegally, so that their car is close to their homes. This of course is unacceptable. I've been in my residents for almost a year now and I've never seen a traffic warden in my road. This lack of traffic warden presence has allowed drivers to do all the things I've said in this email (and the previous email). I hope you take what I am saying into consideration because as of this moment, I have no idea why I am paying thirty pounds for my permit to the council for the privilege of park in The Grove in Twyford, when the council is failing in its duties to enforce the</p> | <p>In shorter parking bays, a single vehicle can be parked inconsiderately and take up more than one space. However, in longer bays, the general guidance is not to mark individual single-spaces as this would reduce the number of vehicles that motorists tend to be able to arrange themselves. Otherwise, the spaces would have to be marked at approximately 5.5m intervals to cater for the longest vehicle anticipated, and avoid any enforcement difficulties.</p> <p>CPE will transfer responsibility for on-street parking enforcement from the police to the Council and is expected to bring a more efficient approach to on-street parking management.</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | parking in my area. Right now to me it just seems like a complete waste of my money. | |
| 16. | Email | Resident | Makes other comments | <p>We agree with the new policy of car specific permits; however implementing parking zone and permit restrictions are a complete waste of time and council tax money as they are not policed!</p> <p>We live on [ADDRESS REDACTED], where non residents park day and night in resident bays, unchecked and therefore for free!</p> <p>Residents with parking permits have to adhere to the parking restrictions in the one hour bays as well, but again, as with non residents, cars are parked there all day without penalty.</p> <p>There is absolutely no point in implementing a permit system that goes unchecked.</p> | CPE will transfer responsibility for enforcement from the police to the Council and is expected to bring a more efficient approach to on-street parking management. |
| 17. | Email | Rose Street Residents Society | Objects | In response to your letter addressed to all Rose Street residents dated 29th March 2017, the Rose Street Residents Society has the following observations and comments. These comments | The intention of changing the rules to require a vehicle registration number (VRN) to be displayed is threefold: 1. To harmonise the residents permit systems across all schemes in the Borough. |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>have been discussed with Cllr Richards in a meeting in Rose Street on 13th April 2017.</p> <p><u>Necessary Changes Required:-</u> Rose Street is the oldest and only residential street in the centre of Wokingham. As such it has special needs which are not met by the “one-size-fits-all” proposed changes to our existing permit system. This system has operated successfully for nearly 40 years and we do not see any reason to change. You are proposing that all permits include the vehicle registration number. Why? Your draft regulation 30 paragraph does not make this mandatory. Your proposed regulation states: A Permit shall be in writing and shall include the following particulars- (a) the registration number of the vehicle in respect of which the Permit has been issued or an identification code provided by the Council Our current permits have such an identifying code. If the current system was to remain then the need for visitors permits, as discussed in the next paragraph, would not be necessary for Rose Street. However, this will still be a requirement for other areas.</p> | <p>2. To assist the management of the limited supply of on-street parking spaces to ensure that bona fide residents’ parking needs are prioritised above others.</p> <p>3. To align with best enforcement practice under CPE and help prevent any abuse of permits.</p> <p>The Council will be reviewing some of these operational aspects in the light of the anticipated change in parking behaviour with regular enforcement under CPE. However, there is a specific ‘exemption’ clause in the TRO articles that permits parking in connection with building operations, and this would be a matter for the Civil Parking Enforcement contractor to consider as they deem appropriate. Similarly, there is an established facility for carers permits under the Council’s residents parking policy that would deal with elderly people in need of care. Other visitors will be no different to other resident permit zones where they may be able to make use of any short-stay parking spaces (if provided on-street), or would need to make alternative arrangements.</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Provision must be made for visitors and tradespeople. This is an essential and fundamental requirement of any permit system. Bracknell, Reading, West Berkshire and Basingstoke offer books of single use visitor permits for residents which are purchased from the Council. This facility, which could be used for visitors or tradespeople, is self-evident and must be offered by Wokingham Borough Council. Any property and especially those with Grade II status need to be maintained. With the free spaces on the street limited to 30 minutes this is insufficient time for any maintenance to be carried out. Additionally, it is vital that those residents who are elderly have visitors. Elderly people can become isolated and the lack of visitor permits would exacerbate this loneliness.</p> <p>The proposers of these changes must ask themselves how they would function without the access to permits for visitors and tradespeople.</p> <p>Other Observations and Comments</p> | <p>Silk Court constitutes part of the Peach Place redevelopment project and that scheme necessitate the replacement of lost off-street parking at existing properties by allowing them to be eligible for on-street permits instead.</p> <p>There are different options that can be considered once we have reviewed the changes in parking behaviour in the light of CPE, including reviewing existing restrictions on where permit holders can or can't park.</p> <p>Carer's permits will not require the VRN to be displayed on the permit.</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>Your Schedule 3 Column 1 identifier W7 allows 2 permits per household which we support as it is what we currently have but Schedule 5, Column 1 identifier W7 includes Silk Court and presumably the four new houses to be built as part of the regeneration as Rose Street properties. This adds a potential 20 permits and places an unacceptable burden on the existing 17 spaces.</p> <p>We would commend the Council to consider a park anywhere option for residents with valid permits if no extra residents' spaces to be provided. The Council would, through its civil enforcement officers, the ability to assess whether this was being abused and could if necessary withdraw the privilege.</p> <p>Carers permits These must not be vehicle dependent as experience shows that different carers may visit depending on time of day and holidays. Having to obtain a vehicle dependant permit for any potential carer that may visit would be impossible, as well as placing an unnecessary financial burden on a resident.</p> | |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18. | Email | Traffic Management Officer Hampshire & Thames Valley Joint Operations Roads Policing | Supports | TVP Traffic Management has no objection to the above scheme | Noted. |
| 19. | Email | Finchampstead Parish Council | Supports | I can confirm that this Council supports the proposal to revoke the existing orders governing parking through the Borough and to replace them with a single order with restrictions shown on maps. The maps appear clear and easy to interpret. | Noted. |
| 20. | Email | Resident | Makes other comments | In response to a letter dated 29 March 2017, I have questions on how the proposal that "The form of Permits will be changed so as to include the requirement for the vehicle registration mark to be shown on Residents Permit" will | Article 33 of the advertised TRO specifies that a resident can apply to the Council to alter the vehicle details on the permit. There is no charge for this facility. |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>operate in practice for a company car driver such as myself. I have no objection to the proposal in principle although would like to understand how matters would work in practice for a company car driver. I did not find anything in FAQ on company cars.</p> <p>I live on [ADDRESS REDACTED] and have one car and permit [REDACTED] I drive a Ford Motor Company Limited car which is replaced 2-3 times a year - this is typical of automotive industry car schemes as each replacement generates a sale for the Company. Under the present system you issue me a permit with my name and address on.</p> <p>I am aware that the permit is linked to the car registration and when I replace a car I obtain a copy of the new car registration document and letter from Ford Motor Company Limited and send a copy of this by post to the below address and request that the Council's records be updated for the new registration.</p> <p>1) How would matters work in practice under the proposal for my company car situation? 2) Would it be permissible to continue with a name/address issued permit and me informing</p> | |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|---|-------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>you of replacement registrations as now? (This would seem to be the administratively simplest approach for all although I appreciate this is not in line with the proposal.)</p> <p>3) And if it is not possible to continue as now, how would I seek a new permit for each new car? For example, could I write to you as soon as I have the new car registration (at the point I am notified by Ford that the new car is ready for collection from its site at Dagenham, typically 1-2 before my collection appointment), with the registration document/Company letter to follow as soon as received (typically 2-3 weeks after collection)?</p> <p>4) Would you require the old permit to be surrendered before or after the new permit is issued?</p> <p>5) Would there be a charge for updating for a new car/change in car registration?</p> | |
| 21. | Email | Resident | Objects | <p>Rose Street is the oldest and only residential street in the centre of Wokingham. As such it has special needs which are not met by the “one-size-fits-all” proposed changes to our existing permit system. This system has operated successfully for nearly 40 years and we do not see any reason to change. You are</p> | <p>This objection is identical to the one detailed at no. 17 above, and so the officer comments provided there are equally applicable to this objection.</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>proposing that all permits include the vehicle registration number. Why? Your draft regulation 30 paragraph does not make this mandatory. Your proposed regulation states: -</p> <p>A Permit shall be in writing and shall include the following particulars-</p> <p>(a) the registration number of the vehicle in respect of which the Permit has been issued or an identification code provided by the Council</p> <p>Our current permits have such an identifying code. If the current system was to remain then the need for visitors permits, as discussed in the next paragraph, would not be necessary for Rose Street. However, this will still be a requirement for other areas.</p> <p>Provision must be made for visitors and tradespeople. This is an essential and fundamental requirement of any permit system. Bracknell, Reading, West Berkshire and Basingstoke offer books of single use visitor permits for residents which are purchased from the Council. This facility, which could be used for visitors or tradespeople, is self-evident and</p> | |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|---|-------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | <p>must be offered by Wokingham Borough Council. Any property and especially those with Grade II status need to be maintained. With the free spaces on the street limited to 30 minutes this is insufficient time for any maintenance to be carried out. Additionally, it is vital that those residents who are elderly have visitors. Elderly people can become isolated and the lack of visitor permits would exacerbate this loneliness.</p> <p>You must ask yourselves how you would function without the access to permits for visitors and tradespeople.</p> | |
| 22. | Email | Resident | Objects | <p>In response to your letter addressed to all Rose Street residents, dated 29th March 2017, we wish to endorse but also add to the observations and comments made by Rose Street Residents' Association.</p> <p>My husband is over 100 years and, although extremely fit for his age, is not as mobile as he once was. The change to the parking permit</p> | <p>There is an established facility for carers permits under the Council's residents parking policy that would deal with elderly people in need of care.</p> <p>Carer's permits will not require the VRN to be displayed on the permit.</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>which is to include the registration number of the car, will make life more difficult for us. We keep our car in a garage, but do occasionally have need to use one of the parking bays. However, having the permit with an identification code provided by the Council without the registration number has enabled us to allow necessary callers to use our permit. The podiatrist comes with several heavy bags and usually needs more than 30 minutes for the treatment. We do not have any family close by so in order to visit they need use of a permit. You may gather that visiting their father of 100 years indicates they are not young themselves.</p> <p>All this is covered by the comments made in the Rose Street Residents' Association letter, but we are very worried by this proposed ruling, unless provision is to be made for visitors, carers and tradespeople to be able to park in Rose Street for necessary reasons.</p> <p>Please remember that the increased traffic within this town, using existing roads, is not of our making but caused by decisions made by the Council to hugely increase housing without much change to the road system.</p> | |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|---|-------------|---|---|--|
| 23. | Email | Resident | Objects | <p>Please retain the current system of using an identity code on the residents permits. With a vehicle registration this means it is not flexible in its use, should it be necessary to provide a space for repairs/service work to be carried out on residents properties in Rose Street. There is NO provision for visitors or carers.</p> <p>The current system of 17 designated residents spaces (originated in 1970's) is now totally inadequate for the number of permits now issued and consideration should be given to allow 'park anywhere' in the road for valid permit holders.</p> | <p>The intention of changing the rules to require a vehicle registration number (VRN) to be displayed is threefold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To harmonise the residents permit systems across all schemes in the Borough. 2. To assist the management of the limited supply of on-street parking spaces to ensure that bona fide residents' parking needs are prioritised above others. 3. To align with best enforcement practice under CPE and help prevent any abuse of permits. <p>The Council will be reviewing some of these operational aspects in the light of the anticipated change in parking behaviour with regular enforcement under CPE. However, there is a specific 'exemption' clause in the TRO articles that permits parking in connection with building operations, and this would be a matter for the Civil Parking Enforcement contractor to consider as they deem appropriate. Similarly, there is an established facility for carers permits under the Council's residents parking policy that would deal with elderly people in need of care. Carer's permits will not require the VRN to be displayed on the permit. Other visitors will be no different to other resident permit zones where they may</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | be able to make use of any short-stay parking spaces (if provided on-street), or would need to make alternative arrangements. |
| 24. | Email | Resident of Brunel Drive | Objects (and makes other comments) | <p>1. When the original T.O. was proposed we were left out of the consultation and never received any correspondence allowing us to put our opinions forward.</p> <p>2. We have lived in Brunel Drive for over thirty years, and in that time there has never been any issues that would warrant double lines in the position as proposed on the current T.O. map.</p> <p>3. The houses opposite the school on Duffield Road are only subjected to a partial restriction during the working week and non at the</p> | <p>Officers have checked historical information for this TRO which dates back initially to 2002.</p> <p>Whilst no records can be found of any formal agreement to the shortening of the yellow lines, officers have reconsidered the need for them to be so long and agree that this location does not merit that.</p> <p>It is therefore agreed that this minor amendment to the mapped restrictions can be included in the final made order.</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>weekend. We find this puzzling and feel that we are being treated unfairly in not being able to park outside our house at the weekend or in the evenings when we have friends and family visiting. They have to park away from our property, decant small children and then cross a relatively busy road.</p> <p>4. Two other roads both which are in close proximity to the school have shorter double lines which are abbreviated before the properties on those roads. These being Uppingham Drive and Sandford Drive. Both roads share the same function as Brunel Drive in so much that they feed cul-de-sac road systems. Brunel Drive along with Walmer Road feed Willowside and Bingley Grove which are effectively close loop road systems. Unlike Duffield Road which is a through road to Church Road and Pound Lane and the A4 major road at Sonning roundabout.</p> <p>5. The double yellows on Brunel Drive are longer than the recommended length proposed in the highway code for corner control, taken from the information we have been given.</p> <p>6. The Wokingham Highways Department removed the lines on our objection and photographic proof of this can be inspected on</p> | |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>satellite camera systems and by photos we have taken which show the grey bitumen paint that was used with our agreement to keep costs to a minimum. Over time this paint has understandably worn and has not been maintained.</p> <p>7. We can produce proof that the removal of the double yellow lines outside [ADDRESS REDACTED] did involve, the Woodley mayor and the elected Conservative councillor at that time and the engineers of the Highways department as e-mails were exchanged. They can be recovered from our e-mail files if you wish to see them ?</p> <p>8. I do not believe that Wokingham Council would act illegally on this issue so there must have been a T.O. issued for the operatives to effect the removal of the lines.</p> <p>9. Copies of our reply to your consultation will be sent to interested parties</p> | |
| 25. | Email | Woodley Town Council | Supports and makes other comments | <p>The Woodley Town Council Planning Committee considered the proposed changes to Traffic Regulation Orders affecting resident parking zones at a meeting on 25 April 2017.</p> <p>It was the Committee's view that the introduction of mapped traffic restrictions</p> | <p>The on-line map viewer is only a guide to the actual parking restriction maps that form part of the legal TRO documents – and these are in a more recognized IT format of 'pdf' files. However, officers will continue to look at ways of making the on-line viewer easier to understand and use.</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|---|-------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>appeared to be a good idea, but Members commented that the maps available for consultation were totally inadequate and did not provide the required information.</p> <p>The Committee had no comments to make on the proposed changes within the resident parking zones.</p> | <p>Officers would be happy to communicate with the Parish Council further to help explain the maps more fully.</p> |
| 26. | Letter | Resident | Objects | <p>I write with regard to the new proposals for parking in “Rose Street”.</p> <p>During the time I have lived in Rose Street the volume of heavy traffic has increased greatly. Not least the many buses that go through virtually every 8-10 minutes and along with much increased heavy traffic together with a good deal of motor traffic driving well over 30mph makes it a challenge to cross the road on many occasions – let alone avoiding the many pot holes at the same time.</p> <p>I am 80 years old and there are many people of a similar age living in this area, and also many in</p> | <p>The provision of pedestrian crossing facilities is not part of this TRO consultation exercise. There are different options that can be considered once we have reviewed the changes in parking behaviour in the light of CPE, including reviewing existing restrictions on where permit holders can or can't park</p> |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|--|--------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | <p>mobility vehicles struggling to move along a narrow stretch of pavement here.</p> <p>I therefore write at this point to ask whether a Pedestrian crossing could be installed at some point in Rose Street. It would be a great help to us older residents and should act as a traffic calming influence too.</p> <p>Please, could a few more 'residents' parking spaces be added – there are clearly way too few (and I realise there has to be a balance here!) Currently there are no residents spaces at the Bracknell end of the street on the south side and visitors to the Health Centre put huge pressure on this side of Rose Street now.</p> <p>It would seem unnecessary for so many 'public' spaces to be at the Bracknell end south side. Cars are left there for very long periods too!</p> <p>The whole of this area of the street is residential and a few extra spaces – maybe 3 or 4 – would make such a difference and also with the addition of a pedestrian crossing it would make it a little less necessary to cross the road to get things out of the car parked on the other side of the street at all times, in the existing spaces.</p> <p>I know there will never be enough spaces, and your job is hard enough, but with all the</p> | |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|--------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | regeneration and building going on it really does seem less important to supply masses of parking spaces at this end for visitors who are, after all, a long way from shops and offices at this end of the street, to consider a 30 minute maximum stay, and should go to the many car parks available to them. | |
| 27. | Letter | Resident | Objects | We are residents of Rose Street, living in a Grade II listed property at the Church End of the street. The possible change of registration of parking permits to apply to owners car registration only is alarming to us as my wife has heart failure and is visited by a cardiac nurse who currently uses our permit to park near our house. We also have a home help who comes once a week and see also needs to use a permit. With the loss of so many parking places due to the development of Peach Place parking near our house is at a premium. We look forward to receiving your comments | There is an established facility for carers permits under the Council's residents parking policy that would support people in need of care. Carer's permits will not require the VRN to be displayed on the permit. |

| | On-line / Email / Letter | from | Supports / Objects / Comment | Comment/Objection | Officer Comment |
|-----|---|-------------|---|---|--|
| 28. | Letter | Resident | Makes other comments | I live in Twyford, at [ADDRESS REDACTED]. I have a parking permit for a space at the bottom of Waltham Road. Parking opposite in Springfield Road is available for up to one hour. This does not help when I have visitors. I thought that you may make Springfield Park permits only. As there is nowhere to park it is impossible when my family visit. | Requests for changes to parking restrictions will continue to be considered after CPE has been implemented and reviewed. |