

Amendment 2

ROAD NAME	COMMENT	SUPPORT OR OBJECTION	Officers Comments
Bathurst Road/Arbor Lane	In reply to your letter in May, I would like to comment regarding double yellow lines in Arbor Lane at the junction of Bathurst Road. Am overjoyed at this recommendation. The parking along this road is totally dangerous, for traffic coming from Bathurst to join Arbor Lane and vice versa. All I ask is that could the double yellow lines be extended beyond that corner. At present you are only extending a few metres. The lines need to go beyond that corner and further up almost to 2a Bathurst Road. If this is not done I am sure cars will continue to park there but in a more dangerous position on the bend.	SUPPORT	It is not possible to increase the length or severity of a restriction once this has been publicised. As with all traffic orders, if implemented the surrounding areas are monitored for displacement and considered for further restrictions.
Bramshill Close/ Whitehall Drive	Whilst I realise the deadline to respond has passed I just wanted to confirm that the Parish Council has no objections or concerns regarding the revocation of double yellow lines on Bramshill Close and Whitehall Drive.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal from the Parish Council
Corfield Green	I am in favour of the proposal for the following reasons: (1) vehicles park on the grass, causing a detriment to the visual amenity of what is otherwise a very pleasant part of Emmbrook in a central position at a junction and opposite the Village Hall (2) in wet weather, parking causes heavy rutting which further worsens the visual amenity at a time when creation of flower beds and planting by the local community is trying to add colour and amenity (3) the grassed area is a meeting place after school for young children and the presence of vehicles and their movement on and off the grass causes an obvious health & safety hazard to the children (4) other options for discouraging parking have been explored by the Council and found to be impractical for one reason or another, so it is important that this option is used for the reasons given above. I would add one further thing. Should this be approved and take place, I would ask that adequate warning is given to residents so that they can tell visitors who might otherwise park on the grass, and that miscreants are dealt with on a "next time we will issue a ticket" basis if possible.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	I am a resident on Emmbrook Road and walk my child to/from school past Corfield Green. I absolutely support the addition of double yellow lines around the green, to stop cars parking on it. I have witnessed several cars driving over the green to park on it, when there are lots of children around going to/from school. This should be a safe place for children to play, without fear of cars.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.

	<p>I would fully support the implementation of yellow lines around corfield green. Young children use this area as well as the community as a whole and I have witnessed people drive there cars into the green whilst children have been on it. I must say it is usually the same offenders most days.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>I support the scheme to put yellow lines around Corfield Green would suggest two small signs pointing out that crossing the yellow lines and parking on the grass can lead to a fine</p>	SUPPORT	<p>This in support of the proposal. There are no signs available to use to inform motorists of the contravention. However they should be aware of this from the information in the Highway Code.</p>
	<p>I am emailing in support of the proposal to put double yellow lines around Corfield Green in Emmbrook. I wish to preserve our visual amenity, prevent damage to the grassed area and preserve the planting effort there.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>Is it possible to have "Residents Parking" painted on the bays in Corefield Green as the signs on the 2 posts are small and difficult to see. With double yellow lines being painted on the road we can see non residents using our bays, which already happens at school drop off and pick up times.</p>	QUESTION – response sent	<p>This in support of the proposal. The request has been responded to that it is not possible to install text onto the carriageway due to the narrowness of the road.</p>
	<p>We fully support this initiative and hope it stops the current problem with cars parking on the grass.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>I fully support the imposition of the parking restrictions to stop people parking on the grass in Corfield Green.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>We support the proposed measures to protect Corfield Green which WBC intends to implement.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.

	I am in favour of the proposed parking restrictions for Corfield Green, Emmbrook. It is a village green space and was never intended for vehicles to be parked on it. The damage to the green is unsightly and those responsible should be made to pay for the repair of the damaged already caused to the grassed area. Should the restriction be approved, which I sincerely hope it is, ticketing should definitely take place to deter people from using it as a car park in future	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	We write to support the proposal to completely encircle Corfield Green with double yellow lines. We think parking on the grass should not be allowed because it ruins the grass and destroys the visual amenity. Can we also ask you to use the narrow double yellow lines like those used recently on the Reading Road and Station Approach etc? They are neater than the wider lines and just as visible.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal. Narrow markings are only suitable for conservation areas and those installed will be in keeping with the rest of the surrounding area.
	As a resident of Emmbrook and also a member of the ERA, I wish to add my support to the consultation process currently ongoing in regard to cars parking around the Corfield Green area.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	WE SUPPORT THE DOUBLE YELLOW LINES ROUND CORFIELD GREEN ,EMMBROOK	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	I agreed wholeheartedly with the proposal by Wokingham Borough Council to add double yellow lines around the perimeter of Corfield Green in Emmbrook	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	In relation to the attached consultation, I would like to note my support for this proposal.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	I agree with the proposal to put double yellow lines around Corfield Green to prevent parking on the grass.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	We had parking bays marked in our road many years ago, to protect us from school traffic. These have turned out to be disadvantageous for us as you are restricting us from having our family/carers from parking. You are proposing to put double yellow lines around the green, which we were told, by the traffic enforcement officers, to park on the green and they could not ticket them. If you propose to carry out inserting double yellow lines around the green opposite the parking bays then you are infringing our right to have family/carers to help us with our daily activities, as all in this road are elderly and disabled. We	OBJECTION	This comment is not relating to the safety or congestion of the road if vehicles were parked opposite the parking bay, but a complaint about the lack of visitor permits for properties. The green space area is not and has never been intended for the use of parking vehicles upon and should therefore not be utilised by resident's visitors. It is not a duty of the council

	are a small community of ten bungalows. We feel we are being targeted yet in Commons Road there is an area of ten houses with a green in front with continuous parking on the green, motor mechanics done on the green, industrial vehicles parked. Some of these ten properties have driveways yet park on the road and green. We now want visitors permits, as they have in Reading. These were promised to be looked at last year but as yet nothing has happened.		to provide parking places for residents, however, Corfield Green residents have a dedicated parking scheme, giving them continual parking places above any other motorist. The parking restrictions are to ensure that a non-permit holder does not park opposite a parking place thus causing an obstruction to any other vehicle requiring access through the street. There are no proposals for Commons Road as we are not protecting the green, we are preventing vehicles parking next to a designated parking place, of which there are none in Commons Road.
Earley area in general	Please note that the meeting of Earley Town Council Planning Committee held on Tuesday 11th June, discussed the measures affecting Earley sent through in the attached email and resolved to support the measures proposed.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposals.
Falstaff Avenue/Harcourt Drive	I would like it to be noted we wholeheartedly approve of these plans. These measures will be hugely helpful to us as one of the households directly impacted by the current unbearable parking situation during the week. These changes are vital to the safety of our road for both drivers and pedestrians. We are very grateful for your efforts to make our road safe. Please go ahead with these plans.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	You are consulting on possible "no waiting at any time" as a solution to problems in a relatively short section of Harcourt Drive/Falstaff Avenue. This will just drive the problem a little further away. The local residents in this immediate area should not be penalised by such restrictions including on their visitors, family and friends, especially outside "core"/peak working hours. How about a no parking between certain named hours which should deter "all day" or several hours parking especially by those using the University who should be providing more parking on site for lecturers, other staff, and students? You should also consider the direct impact of non-resident parking in Copperdale Close which is far worse than in the other two roads. Copperdale Close needs help just as much if not more than Harcourt and Falstaff	COMMENT – MORE RESTRICTIONS NEEDED	Residents have made clear that not only does this section of Falstaff Avenue & Harcourt Drive need some restrictions, but other surrounding roads are also suffering the same issues with parking in un-safe locations. It is proposed that these restrictions are installed as advertised and then further investigation is carried out on the surround area as part of the next amendment to on-street parking restrictions. As per the Highway Code, parking at or near a junction is not permitted at any time, so we

			<p>would not be able to introduce peak time restrictions only, as this would be in contravention of the Highway Code.</p>
	<p>Re the above consultation: simply making the Pepper Lane end of Harcourt Drive and the junction with Falstaff Avenue "no waiting at any time" clearly won't solve the current parking problem. It will just move it further up both roads. I live at number XX Harcourt Drive and this proposal will impact more on me and my neighbours, making this problem even worse than it is now as there already a large number of resident's cars parked higher up Harcourt Drive. Any parking restrictions will have to include the whole of both roads, if you are serious about helping to solve this problem. The majority of 'extra' cars parked in the road and causing the current parking problem appear to be students at the university and building workers employed on the current building work on the university grounds. Since Reading Borough Council made previously free parking spaces on Pepper Lane pay to park, students, in particular, have been forced to use other nearby residential roads to park. This was an obvious outcome to these parking alterations which Reading Borough simply decided to ignore. It is these vehicles that you have to find a real solution for if you are seriously trying to alleviate the problem. Introducing a "no waiting at any time" section into the road will not be a solution.</p> <p>A reasonable proposal appears to be making both roads residents only from 20.00 to 08.00 inclusive and two hour limited parking, with no return within two hours, at all other times. There are other residential roads in Reading that have these kinds of restrictions, so there is a precedent. This would affect the student and building contractor vehicles without affecting residents. Let me reiterate - if you simply go ahead with proposals as outlined in this consultation plan you will not solve this parking problem but simply make it worse.</p>	<p>COMMENT – MORE RESTRICTIONS NEEDED</p>	<p>Residents have made clear that not only does this section of Falstaff Avenue & Harcourt Drive need some restrictions, but other surrounding roads are also suffering the same issues with parking in un-safe locations.</p> <p>It is proposed that these restrictions are installed as advertised and then further investigation is carried out on the surround area as part of the next amendment to on-street parking restrictions.</p> <p>Residents and restricted parking is not an option for this area as the majority of properties have access to off—street parking facilities, such as driveway or garage and therefore they would not meet the criteria for such. The locations of the driveways would preclude most of the area from parking bays to introduce limited waiting bays also. But this will be considered as part of the next amendment to on-street parking restrictions.</p>
	<p>I definitely agree with the proposed new double yellow lines to be installed at the junction of Harcourt Drive and Falstaff Avenue. It would be advantageous for drivers turning right at the junction of Harcourt Drive and Pepper Lane to extend the yellow lines on BOTHs ides of Harcourt Drive to that junction. I am a driver and it is impossible to see traffic approaching from the left along Pepper Lane due to the cars parked in the official parking area on Pepper Lane itself, as cars are allowed to park right up to that junction. If there were double yellow lines there at least we would then be able to see any traffic approaching from the right.</p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>	<p>Residents have made clear that not only does this section of Falstaff Avenue & Harcourt Drive need some restrictions, but other surrounding roads are also suffering the same issues with parking in un-safe locations.</p> <p>It is proposed that these restrictions are installed as advertised and then further investigation is carried out on the surround area as part of the</p>

	<p>I would also prefer the double yellow lines to extend further along Falstaff Avenue which is a narrow road, as it is impossible to exit my garage drive without having to use the grass verge with the unrestricted parking that occurs at present.</p>		<p>next amendment to on-street parking restrictions.</p>
	<p>Putting Double Yellow lines at Falstaff Ave/Harcourt Drive would defeat the object and push the cars to park further into the estate. We already have problems in getting into and out of our driveways due to parked cars. May I suggest to having access signs only at Elm Road, Rowland Way and Pepper lane end of Harcourt Drive, this would prevent car entering or using it as a rat run. This system was applied at Ramsbury Drive/Aldbourn Avenue off Wilderness Road and has been a success in stopping cars using it as a rat run or parking.</p>	<p>COMMENT – MORE RESTRICTIONS NEEDED</p>	<p>Residents have made clear that not only does this section of Falstaff Avenue & Harcourt Drive need some restrictions, but other surrounding roads are also suffering the same issues with parking in un-safe locations. It is proposed that these restrictions are installed as advertised and then further investigation is carried out on the surround area as part of the next amendment to on-street parking restrictions. Access only restrictions are enforced only by the local police, and due to staffing resources, these type of restrictions are no longer supported by Thames Valley Police, as they do not have the resources to enforce them.</p>
	<p>The double yellow lines proposed for Harcourt Drive and the junction with Falstaff Avenue are welcome. They will go some way to alleviate the dangers caused by parked cars. I have witnessed a number of near misses at both junctions and urge you to paint the lines on the roads with urgency. Further along both roads there is still the issue of the difficulty of getting safely out of ones drive with poor vision between the parked cars. We are dependent on passing vehicles and cyclists seeing that we are slowly easing the car out of the drive as we cannot always see them. The roads are too narrow to have parking on both sides of the road and I doubt if it is now possible for emergency vehicles to access all the houses. Please continue to look at solutions to the problem caused by too many parked cars on these roads.</p>	<p>SUPPORT</p>	<p>This is in support of the proposals. Residents have made clear that not only does this section of Falstaff Avenue & Harcourt Drive need some restrictions, but other surrounding roads are also suffering the same issues with parking in un-safe locations. It is proposed that these restrictions are installed as advertised and then further investigation is carried out on the surround area as part of the next amendment to on-street parking restrictions.</p>

	<p>RE the proposed restrictions on parking around the junction of Falstaff Avenue and Harcourt Drive:</p> <p>1. Some restriction of the sort proposed will increase safety at this junction 2. The junction is very busy during the rush hours because Rowland Way-Falstaff Avenue-Harcourt Drive is used as a short cut from Elm Road to Pepper Lane; consideration could be given to an "Access Only" restriction</p> <p>3. Much of the present problem is caused by contractors working at the University parking here rather than on site 4. Whatever restrictions are imposed at this junction will have the effect of pushing the parking problem further into Harcourt Drive and Falstaff Avenue. 5. When cars are parked at the end of Harcourt Drive on the South-east side (which is not subject to the proposed restrictions) and cars are driving down Harcourt Drive towards Pepper Lane, those turning left into Harcourt Drive from Pepper Lane are not able to complete the manoeuvre and potentially create a hazard with their rear ends stuck in Pepper Lane. A parking restriction covering the end of Harcourt Drive on the South-east side should be considered. 6. We heard about these proposals and the consultation by chance. Should there not have been arrangements to ensure that residents of Harcourt Drive and Falstaff Avenue were properly informed?</p>	<p>SUPPORT – with further comments</p>	<p>Residents have made clear that not only does this section of Falstaff Avenue & Harcourt Drive need some restrictions, but other surrounding roads are also suffering the same issues with parking in un-safe locations.</p> <p>It is proposed that these restrictions are installed as advertised and then further investigation is carried out on the surround area as part of the next amendment to on-street parking restrictions.</p> <p>Access only restrictions are enforced only by the local police, and due to staffing resources, these type of restrictions are no longer supported by Thames Valley Police, as they do not have the resources to enforce them.</p> <p>Residents directly affected by the proposals, i.e. those fronting the restrictions were written via mail, there have been notices on street as well as in the local media. Unfortunately we are unable to capture every resident who may be affected by a knock-on effect of the restrictions.</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>I am pleased to see that there is a proposal to implement double yellow lines at the junction between Harcourt Drive and Falstaff Avenue. Hopefully this will address the issue of thoughtless parking in this immediate area which causes restriction to traffic movement, and on occasion prevents access to larger vehicles. This is an issue to delivery vehicles, skip lorries, bin lorries etc, but is also of significant concern regarding access for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>However, it is reasonable to forecast that this action will mostly serve to ‘move’ the parking problem further up Harcourt Drive and Falstaff Ave. It is reasonable to observe that the issues of traffic volume passing down Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue are directly associated with ‘rush hour’ traffic as motorists, who evidently don’t live on Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue, seek to bypass the queues which form in the morning and evening at the mini Roundabout at the junction of Pepper Lane and Wilderness Road / Elm Lane. I.e. Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue are used as a motoring ‘rat run’.</p> <p>It is also reasonable to observe that the issue of non-resident parking on Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue area; which also extends to Copperdale Close and Felstead Close; is directly associated with the action taken by Reading Borough Council to install parking meters on Pepper lane near the University, an area which was previously free parking. It is clear by the nature of the people now parking on Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue that they are visiting the University, either as Students, staff or most recently Contractors working on worksites within the campus. The Yellow lines will not serve to address the SOURCE of the issues therefore. The issue of excessive and unreasonable levels of traffic using Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue as a ‘rat run’ during ‘rush hours’ will only be addressed if this route ceases to be available to, or ceases being beneficial to, commuting motorists.</p> <p>This leaves the following options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Speed humps. This may conceivably make this route less attractive to the commuter, but most modern cars can manage speed humps without issue, particularly the large SUV and 4x4 vehicles now so popular. Speed humps can also cause issues of increased noise in the immediate vicinity as vehicles break and accelerate for the speed humps where they otherwise would not. 2) Accept for Access signs. The installation of ‘Accept for Access’ signs, as installed at the entrances to nearby Aldbourne Ave and Ramsbury Drive for the very same reasons, I.e. deterring motorist from utilising this route through a residential area to bypass the traffic lights at the junction of the Wokingham Road 	<p>SUPPORT – with further suggestions</p>	<p>Residents have made clear that not only does this section of Falstaff Avenue & Harcourt Drive need some restrictions, but other surrounding roads are also suffering the same issues with parking in un-safe locations.</p> <p>It is proposed that these restrictions are installed as advertised and then further investigation is carried out on the surround area as part of the next amendment to on-street parking restrictions.</p> <p>Access only restrictions are enforced only by the local police, and due to staffing resources, these type of restrictions are no longer supported by Thames Valley Police, as they do not have the resources to enforce them.</p> <p>Speed humps can only be enforced where there is a history of speed related injuries occurring in an area, and are also very expensive and unpopular with residents. WBC do not have the funds to do these type of works in areas with a good accident record.</p> <p>Residents and restricted parking is not an option for this area as the majority of properties have access to off—street parking facilities, such as driveway or garage and therefore they would not meet the criteria for such. The locations of the driveways would preclude most of the area from parking bays to introduce limited waiting bays also. But this will be considered as part of the next amendment to on-street parking restrictions.</p> <p>We are unfortunately unable to comment on the costs, or works carried out by other councils and we have no control over their new proposals or charges.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>and the Wilderness Road. To be fully effective, these signs would need to be initially enforced until the local traffic became aware and conscious of the restriction. The issue of parking on Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue by non-residents during working hours will only be addressed if parking in this area becomes less favourable than parking alternatives, or unavailable to commuting motorists.</p> <p>1) Pepper lane Parking Charges. Much of the parking problem on Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue during working hours would be relieved if Reading BC were to reverse their decision to impose parking charges on Pepper Lane. This is a cynical revenue driven exercise after all. If Reading BC wished to prevent parking in this area it would have installed double yellow lines instead. However, it is not likely that Wokingham BC will have sufficient political influence on Reading BC to effect this change.</p> <p>2) University Parking provision. The University has extensive parking provision. Either it is not sufficient to deal with all the visitors on a daily basis, or the Parking Charges as such that visitors are deterred from parking on Campus and actively seek free parking off campus. Either way, it is not likely that Wokingham BC will have sufficient political influence on Reading University to effect any change on the Parking management within the Campus.</p> <p>3) Resident Parking permits. A residents Parking Permit Scheme for Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue would deny these roads as Parking options for the visitors to the University. It would also address the lesser issue of visitors to Reading Town Centre who park on Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue and catch the bus from Harcourt Drive bus stop on Pepper Lane. Such a Scheme would need to be initially enforced until the local traffic became aware and conscious of the restriction. Such a Scheme would only need to be observed during the hours of 8.00am-5.00pm such that is would impact on Commuter parking rather than local Residents parking needs outside of that time. I don't profess to have all the answers. As the Parking meters on Pepper lane demonstrate addressing one issue often leads to the creation of another, but the issue of non-residents / commuters using Harcourt Drive and Felstead Avenue for work hours parking and as a 'rat run' during rush hours are becoming increasingly challenging to Residents and it can be forecast that there will be an incident created in which an impasse to traffic movement, either by volume of traffic or thoughtless parking, will lead to a motoring conflict or will impede the access of an emergency vehicle.</p>		
--	---	--	--

I support the proposed extension of yellow lines to cover the junction. This will help to alleviate the safety issues associated with the current extensive parking at this junction which make it is extremely difficult to see what is coming when you drive from one road onto the other. Extending the yellow lines will bring about an improvement at the junction but will simply push the parking further down Harcourt and Falstaff so on it's own will not be sufficient to alleviate the nuisance caused to residents. Since Reading Borough introduced a £10 a day charge for parking in Pepper Lane more people are parking in the Harcourt/Falstaff estate. It would be helpful if Reading Borough reduced the charges for parking to a level such that their parking bays were fully utilised. I have requested that they do so but not yet had a reply. This would greatly reduce the number of vehicles parking in Harcourt/Falstaff. Perhaps the University could build a larger car park to accommodate those working and studying there. As the University expands the problem will get worse unless action is taken. If these measures are not enough, it may be necessary to consider a residents parking permit scheme or other restriction that favour residents.

Support with further comment

Residents have made clear that not only does this section of Falstaff Avenue & Harcourt Drive need some restrictions, but other surrounding roads are also suffering the same issues with parking in un-safe locations. It is proposed that these restrictions are installed as advertised and then further investigation is carried out on the surround area as part of the next amendment to on-street parking restrictions.

	<p>For the reference to "in the town of Earley", I wish to support strongly the proposal to protect with double yellow lines the Falstaff Avenue and Harcourt Drive junctions, on the grounds of safety, as it is impossible to see round vehicles when driving along the road. BOTH faces of that junction therefore need to be protected in this way. Furthermore, a few metres further up Harcourt Drive where the road bends, it is equally impossible to see round vehicles, as they insist on parking on the INSIDE of that bend. If double yellow lines were placed on this inside bend, thereby forcing those who insist on parking in Harcourt Drive, to park on the other (outer) side of the road, a danger would be considerably lessened. Finally, pedestrians trying to cross Pepper Lane face great danger from cars. Support for a pedestrian crossing, or at least a central refuge, has been requested from various parties (RBC, Reading University, Leighton Park School) for a number of years. This represents another danger spot that needs resolution urgently.</p>	<p>SUPPORT – along with further suggestions</p>	<p>Residents have made clear that not only does this section of Falstaff Avenue & Harcourt Drive need some restrictions, but other surrounding roads are also suffering the same issues with parking in un-safe locations.</p> <p>It is proposed that these restrictions are installed as advertised and then further investigation is carried out on the surround area as part of the next amendment to on-street parking restrictions.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>Hunters Way/Basingstoke Road</p>	<p>I object to the proposed use of double yellow lines on both sides of the street. I am a pre-reg childminder and my house XXXXXX will be adversely effected by this measure. I need to be able to park outside my house while escorting young children and toddlers to and from my car (& my own 1 year old). The proposed double yellow line in my opinion goes to far past my front door. I also consider double yellow lines too severe as once the chemist is shut after 6pm all the traffic disappears. The issue for parking is the chemist so I agree painting double yellows on both corners as people do park directly on the junction blocking the dropped curb and then maybe extend double yellows down the side of Hunters Way with the chemist/Walford house on it but what I do not want is single or double yellow outside my front door. I park considerably but I do notice that whole junction is often full which is dangerous and people don't seem to have the sense that the shouldn't park on the junction blocking the dropped curb and the view when turning in and out of Hunters Way.</p>	<p>OBJECTION</p>	<p>Guidance in the Highway Code states that you must not park within 10 metres of a junction. Unfortunately, the house entrance is within this distance and parking at this location does restrict visibility on an already tight bend into Hunter's Way.</p> <p>Whilst we understand that some of the parking does relate to the shop nearby, parking on a junction is not considered safe at any time of day and therefore parking after 6pm should not be allowed.</p> <p>Parking on the highway outside of any property is not a right and all roads are subject to the rules of the Highway Code and associated Acts and Legislation.</p> <p>Vehicles are allowed to load and unload on double yellow lines, so long as the activity is continual; this also includes loading and unloading of passengers.</p> <p>To reduce the length of restrictions back to the property door would reduce the amount of visibility available as well as be in direct contravention of the Highway Code.</p> <p>WBC should be seen to be adhering to the National Legal Framework when installing restrictions for safety and visibility reasons.</p>
--	---	-------------------------	---

Keane Close/Ravensbourne Drive	<p>As a resident of Keane Close since 1982 I fully endorse the 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions and positioning indicated by letter and plan dated May 2019 and 25/04/2019 respectively. Please can I request that the painted double yellow lines be of the minimum width i.e. 50mm and the palest of yellow <i>[as per Traffic Signs Manual (2009) as below: 20.4 Three widths are prescribed for yellow lines. The 75 mm size should be used on roads with a speed limit of 40 mph or less, and 100 mm on roads with a higher limit. In areas regarded as environmentally sensitive, the 50 mm wide line may be used. Alternative shades of yellow may be used (see para 23.18). The gap between double lines must in all cases be the same as the width of each line.</i></p>	Support	<p>In support of the proposals. The respondent has been informed that due to the colour and size of the double yellow lines in the vicinity of the proposed area, the lines will be in the same colour and size. This is in keeping with the surrounding area and nearby other roads within the estate.</p>
	<p>The Woodley Town Council Planning and Community Committee have considered the following traffic management proposals for Woodley: Keane Close & Ravensbourne Drive - protect junction with new double yellow lines Duffield Road - extend double yellows outside school by approx. 20 metres and re-align School Keep Clear markings, install controlled crossing extents Hurricane Way - extend yellow lines, re-align School Keep Clear markings and install controlled crossing extents The Committee has no objections to the proposals, but seeks assurance that residents in Ravensbourne Drive, on either side of Keane Close, have been made aware of the proposal to install new double yellow lines in this location.</p>	Support – Response sent	<p>This comment is in support of the proposals and the respondent has been informed that all affected residents have received the same letter and plans that relate to their specific area.</p>

<p>Kenton Road</p>	<p>In regard to the proposed change to parking waiting I feel strongly that this change is not sufficient to rectify the many issues at that junction. The principle issues present are that this junction gets severely congested at times and / or approaching traffic from Wokingham Road in to Kenton Road cannot be easily seen due to illegally parked cars and are approaching at 40mph at speed in to a 30mph limit. As you are aware there is a Community Day Centre at that junction for which the clientele and visitors are principally elderly in to their 90's and as such are frail and can be unaware of approaching cars especially if concealed by parking. I am a friend of the Day Centre and have witnessed elderly persons attempting to cross Kenton Road there or attempt access to their own cars there too all of which is a highly risky situation for all concerned. I support a change to restrictions but the proposed change will do little to address these issues. I am asking you to consider extending the no waiting any time lines to cover the frontage of the Day Centre please (both sides of the carriageway.)</p>	<p>Support – but feels will not resolve issue</p> <p>Response sent</p>	<p>This comment is in support of the proposals but would like to see extra length added to the area consulted upon. At this stage of the publicised consultation it is not possible to add in extra restrictions.</p> <p>Furthermore at the end of the area of consultation is an access with dropped kerbs to the car park of the day centre, which means that this access should be kept clear at all times. Therefore there is no need for additional lines in this area. The respondent has already been informed of this situation and what they need to do if people park across any access.</p>
	<p>Concerning the extension of double yellow lines in Kenton Road Earley. Users of the Day Centre at number 1 Kenton Road have long considered vehicles parked between the entrance to our car park and the Wokingham Road to be a hazard due to the sight restriction and we understand that the occupant of number 2 is of the same mind. If it were possible to extend the double yellow lines on BOTH sides of the road to the boundary line between number 2 and number 2a we believe the safety of vehicles exiting the day centre car park would be greatly increased.</p> <p>It should also be noted that some elderly users of the Day Centre who walk there or are dropped off from cars may have poor eyesight and parked vehicles make it difficult for them to cross the road.</p>	<p>Support – but would like to see lines extended further on both sides of the road</p> <p>Response sent</p>	<p>This comment is in support of the proposals but would like to see extra length added to the area consulted upon. At this stage of the publicised consultation it is not possible to add in extra restrictions.</p> <p>Furthermore at the end of the area of consultation is an access with dropped kerbs to the car park of the day centre, which means that this access should be kept clear at all times. Therefore there is no need for additional lines in this area. The respondent has already been informed of this situation and what they need to do if people park across any access.</p>

Rose Street	On behalf of The Rose Street Residents Society we wish to fully support the proposals to vary the three notified parking areas to limited waiting or permit holders. As we have extensively canvassed this issue in order to increase the number of potential spaces we feel confident that we have the full backing of residents in supporting this proposal.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	I would like to state that I am in favour of the changes.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	We wholeheartedly accept these amendments which will improve considerably the present residents' parking	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	I look forward to the implementation of more on street parking on Rose Street.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	I am writing to express my whole-hearted acceptance of the proposals to Rose Street.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	I would like to confirm my 100% support towards the proposals to parking on Rose Street.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	We wanted to take the time to contact you in support of the changes. The changes will greatly improve things for many Rose Street residents who wish to park their cars outside/near their homes at night and currently have to move their cars by 0830 the following morning in order to avoid receiving a parking fine. A number of 30 minute spaces will still be available together with the old M&S car park and other town centre parking spaces for members of the public wishing to use local facilities and park for only a short period of time and so they should not be unduly affected by the changes. We really welcome the changes and, with luck, look forward to seeing them implemented in the best future.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.

	<p>We both fully agree with the new proposals to increase the number of residents parking spaces on Rose Street. Currently there are not enough spaces for residents to park however residents are forced to pay for permits in the chance they will be able to get a resident space on the street at some point in the year. By increasing the number of residents parking spaces we feel the council is finally listening to residents. There is sufficient parking within Wokingham town centre to provide visitors with adequate parking to visit the shops, cafes and restaurants. Residents on Rose Street are also supporters of all businesses in the town and support them on a regular basis, however more resident spaces are required.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>We would like to confirm our full acceptance of the proposals for Rose Street.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>I see the proposed increase in residential parking as a step in the right direction to help the ridiculous situation we find ourselves in.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>I fully endorse the proposed much needed extension of parking provision in Rose Street.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>My wife and I were very pleased to receive a copy of your recently published proposals dated May 2019. We wish to confirm that we wholeheartedly approve of these provisions and you can rest assured that you have our complete support for these. We look forward to receiving confirmation of the activation of these proposals as soon as possible.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>I am in favour of this change, having dual use makes use of the spaces both during the day with people using both the medical centres and the town but during the evening this would enable residents to park overnight.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>Acceptance of the proposal outside numbers 51-57 and 56-66 on Rose Street.</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>I wholeheartedly accept the proposal to increase resident parking in Rose Street</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>A neighbour has kindly given me a copy of your recent letter to some, but not all residents, dated May 2019. (Sara Allman) I did sign and send in my total</p>	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.

	<p>approval for your plans submitted last November – my letter was sent to you on 6/12/18 following receipt of this particular letter which I received 3/12/18. I was under the impression there these plans were indeed “going through” with the hope that new signage for Rose street would be in place by this Summer. For many months we have been desperate for your help in this street because parking is well-nigh impossible for residents – particularly at the moment when nearly a ¼ of residents spaces has been denied us since early March whilst the pavements are reopened at the top end of the street, we were told 8 weeks!! Still going on with no immediate end in sight.</p> <p>However, I write now to reiterate that I am totally in approval of what was submitted by you at the end of last year and along with many residents in this area, pray that it will not take any little longer before it is put into practice! At the moment it is practically impossible to get one of the remaining 13 residents spaces after 4.00pm which means constantly moving your car until a space reappears (usually the following morning!), every half-an-hour this may be ok for younger residents but I have trouble in getting in and out of cars and have the use of a stick and I challenge all councillors to support this sort of thing. I am 82! – It is not a great situation.</p>		
The Avenue	I agree with the changes outlined and believe they will make a significant improvement to the traffic movement and pedestrian safety on The Avenue.	SUPPORT	This in support of the proposal.
	<p>As I’m sure you are aware residents of The Avenue have set up a neighbourhood group and we are battling hard with Our Lady’s School to control the traffic and disruption due to out of hours deliveries, illegal parking and many other factors. They are at present being very uncooperative and don’t see that the services needed to run this School and now Nursery have turned The Avenue into a mini industrial Estate. We have enlisted the help of Local Councillors and are slowly gaining momentum.</p> <p>My comments reference the proposed amendments, is that they don’t seem to differ much from what is already there. The proposed lines just seem to protect the school not the neighbourhood. The exclusions need to be much longer, keeping parked cars from parking illegally and carelessly causing danger to pedestrians including many school children walking too and from other local schools. The proposed parking</p>	COMMENT	<p>The current proposal is to amend the restrictions directly outside of the school due to the pedestrian access routes being changed by the school. The School Keep Clear marking was therefore in the incorrect place following these changes.</p> <p>This proposal is to amend and install to the correct locations and to provide double yellow lines opposite to the junction with Lyneham Road.</p> <p>Whilst ongoing talks relating to parking in The Avenue continue, these do not form part of the consultation carried out.</p>

	<p>provisions will not stop this. The exclusion line will stop right outside our driveway (16 The Avenue) which will continue to allow cars to park directly opposite or across our drive preventing us from entering and exiting our driveway safely and sometimes blocking access completely.. The vast extension of Our Lady's School has had a major negative impact on our lives. I also have photographic evidence that the many deliveries ignore all parking restrictions whether delivering in School hours or as early as 5am. The Head Teacher and Governors are very aware and have made no effort to police the parking or deliveries causing major issues.</p> <p>To be clear these cars aren't parked temporarily, they are they are generally staff members parked all day from as early as 7.30am through to 6pm, 50 weeks per year! The Car Park often has spaces that are free but not utilised and the Drop Off zone at the school isn't used as it should be.</p> <p>We request (as will all our neighbours) that the proposed lines are extended to the minimum width of the whole premises (ideally longer), as carried out on Ellis Road and Butler Rd which has ensured Oaklands School has a safer environment for both the School and the Neighbourhood.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood group has witness statements of two incidents where a child was nearly hit by a vehicle due to unsafe and illegal parking.</p> <p>Please take into consideration all the comments received from the residents as I believe this will highlight the seriousness of the problems presently on The Avenue and hope appropriate action is taken before someone is hurt.</p>		
--	--	--	--