Item No.	Reference	Names and addresses	Comment / Objection / Support	Officers Comments
1	COMMENT	Resident	I request a copy of the plans, the consultation timeline and advise on where to formerly object to the proposed parking charges for after 6pm and Sunday charge in the car parks around Woodley shopping centre. I would also like an acknowledgment of receipt of this email.	The plans in the Order are location/car park layout plans. The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
2	COMMENT	Resident	Can you please clarify if the TRO in relation to the car parks in the Wokingham area means that the council could charge for evening parking? It is not clear in amongst the wording of the order. If the wording means that they can, why has this been done? The matter was brought up a few years ago and it was decided that it would badly affect the nighttime economy and a number of evening classes and clubs in the area. It was decided then to increase the charges during the day. If this is just a technical exercise to enable police powers to be exercised then that needs to be made clear.	The proposals don't mention introducing an evening charge. The authority to do this has always existed. The Order sets out clearly that it is setting the charging periods.
3	COMMENT	Resident	I'm wondering whether there are similar plans to tackle the ASB (e.g. car skidding at 11pm) at the car park at St Crispin's School/Leisure Centre? I understand this isn't one of the car parks listed in the consultation as it doesn't quite come under the same criteria.	St Crispin's Leisure Centre is not a car park managed under TRO
4	COMMENT	Resident	I think it's such a bad idea for the car parks in Wokingham to be able to charge 24 hours, and there will be no more free car parks after 6pm or on Sunday. Such a bad idea and a way to drive my business out of town elsewhere. People should be encouraged to shop in Wokingham!	No objection specified. Comment only
5	COMMENT	Resident	Please keep Woodley car parks free in the evenings and on Sundays. I hope there's another way that the car park can be considered operational, even without the need to pay.	The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
6	COMMENT	Resident	Please, please don't charge in the car parks on Sundays and evenings , it will ruin the shop trade, May Fair and Wokingham Carnival etc. Also those of us who attend Council, charity , Church and youth group meetings in the evenings.	The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
7	COMMENT	Resident	I'm absolutely appalled at the foul decisions or considerations made by our money grubbing, good for nothing council. You should know that the parking charge changes are entirely unwarranted, a scam, and a completely rejected and disapproved proposal by every Woodley resident. Worst of all, introducing a Sunday charge when the car parks are practically empty, how stupid and ridiculous. I can't comprehend the lack of thought into this, especially considering the recent increase in council tax. I would appreciate it if you could extend this message to the brain deficient councilmen who proposed this, no doubt they're old, rich and sunken into their own pathetic egos.	The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
8	COMMENT	Resident	Regarding consultation for TMOP02021 Proposed Wokingham Borough Off-Street Car Parks Orders 20XX, will there be a provision at the california cross roads car park for a short period, perhaps 30 mins, of free parking as I drop off and collect my son from the nursery twice a day 5 days a week so this would have a significant cost to us for 5 mins of parking time. It might even put the nursery out of business as people won't be willing to pay for such a short time.	The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods. A discretionary period could be provided at this car park.
9	COMMENT	Resident	I am extremely concerned that your proposed car parking changes to make the car parks around the Woodley precinct 24hour chargeable spaces will have a detrimental effect on Woodley restaurants and community amenities. These have already suffered economically and this short sighted policy will see them further devastated.	The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
10	COMMENT	Resident	I write reference the council proposal for parking charges at California Crossroads car park. I assume in writing, this refers to the car park immediately adjacent to Nine Mile Primary School. Your clarification would be appreciated? I would like to comment as follows: Those that currently try to avoid the busy car park at the moment, are parking in the doctors surgery, ratepayers hall and have started to park on verges in windsor ride. These areas would become increasingly used if parking charges are enforced. All of these areas should not be used by the public for school drop offs & pick up anyway, how would the council prevent this from happening? The crossroads is becoming increasingly dangerous at school pick up & drop off times. Lorries & cars do not stop to allow pedestrians to cross between the existing barriers. There are no speed limiters on approach to the crossroads. There is no longer a lollipop person helping people & children to cross safely. Something that was removed some years ago. If cars start to park on roads on approach to the crossroads, this will be putting lives at risk even more so. How does the council plan to ensure the safety of our children will be of paramount importance, should they implement charging? It seems more and more so, that adding thousands of houses to the Arborfield area, has added a massive amount of traffic through Finchampstead. This will increase hugely when the Nine Mile Ride extension is open. Why would the council then look to worsen the situation even more, by charging for 'off road' parking in relatively small car parks anyway? I look forward to hearing from you. Yours faithfully	The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
11	COMMENT	Resident	In regards to the proposed changes at Bank Holidays, Sundays and overnight fees in the area of Woodley where im a resident i completely disagree with these charges. For example if i went Woodleys precinct on one of those set days and only wanted 20 minute stay that would then cost me more than it would any other day for the same time. I think if this is necessary and not just another way to charge motorists then i would encourage a maximum charge on £1, so those staying for just the 30 minutes are charged at the normal rate and thus not paying full day rates.	The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
12	COMMENT	Resident	It is not needed for action to be taken on anti-social behaviour as the CCTV already provides that facility It removes the requirement to publicise any potential change to car park charges ahead of implementation It removes the legal need for any resident's consultation in the future which is anti-democratic.	CCTV only records the ASB, but does not provide opportunity for enforcement. Members have always been able to change parking costs by Notice of Variation. Consultation is still possible.
13	COMMENT	Resident	Will you please stop screwing around with parking charges. After 6 brings customers to food establishments in town centers. This is nothing more than plain money making or book balancing. Woodley is dying adeath as more shops close.	The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
14	COMMENT	Resident	Please can you direct me to the full consultation online for the proposed parking charges increase/extension? I have only seen a photo of a news paper article which is not fully legible; and I cannot see it on the website https://www.wokingham.gov.uk/news-and-consultation/consultation-and-having-your-say/current-consultations/	Martin Heath responded to the customer/Cllr Kerr. The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
18	COMMENT	Resident	Make bays in Wokinham carparks available to motorhome users overnight. Charge motorhome users for an additional revenue stream. In France such carparks are provided by most towns and villages and are known as Aires. With over 1/2 million people in the UK taking motorhome holidays this year it is an untapped revenue stream. The users normally are more affluent and can bring revenue into the town Read more about Aires here https://alanrogers.com/blog/introduction-to-motorhome-aires	Comment only. Suggestion relates to motorway service areas.
19	COMMENT	Resident	The areas marked outside Numbers 66 – Bar 56, 33 – 45 and 51 – 55 are currently shared spaces with 30 minute restrictions and Residents W7 permits. Can you confirm that these should be shown as "Shared Use" and not "Limited Waiting" as defined by the legend associated with the map. This additional residents parking was given to Rose Street residents only recently and we would like confirmation that it is not being removed. Please confirm that these additional spaces are not being removed as a result of this order.	This is an On-street comment. Doesn't apply to Off Street Car Parks
20	COMMENT	Resident	You want to introduce new charges for parking in Woodley, night, Sunday and bank Holidays. What you are doing is making the shopping there more expensive and one day all shops will be closed and your parks will become empty. You should focus in doing changes to improve business not affecting it.	The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
22	COMMENT	Resident	TMOP02021 Proposed Wokingham Borough Off-Street Car Parks Orders 20XX I very much doubt that any input from residents will have any impact, so I will not waste too much of my time. It is far long too and complex to expect any reasonable resident to reply in the time given I have three main points and one suggestion 1) The consultation has been chaotic First a document was put up on the website and taken down because people explained how bad it was. Second when it was reposted the Executive member said on Facebook that it too should have been taken down, when in reality it is the document being considered - very confusing The document still says Draft and it feels very much like a draft, being rushed and poorly drafted, just some examples a) There are unresolved drafting questions left in the published document (eg "RESIDENT PP?? is there a double duty of an existing permit or are we having separate off street only resident parking permit in this Order???", etc. b) In the "Arrangement of Articles" 16 has been deleted, but is referred to in the text c) I would like to know what is meant by the terms XSE and YSE in the staff parking permits sections - these are opaque terms. d) The term "town council" is defined as being Wokingham Town Council, when in fact there are other town councils in the borough. All references to Town Council in the TRO should be qualified rather than use a it is a defined term. Why is Wokingham town council/market treated differently to Woodley? 2) In order to be a true consultation a summary page should be provided to residents indicating what the true effect of the order is. The purpose for introducing the new TRO is not clear. Indeed the fact that it enables the extension of charging from the current situation to 24/7/365 is opaque. The effect of the TRO is stated as being to replace an earlier TRO. The true effect is not stated.. This feels like a "tick box exercise", rather than any real desire to consult. 3) It is not clearly set out in this TRO that it will change the process by which the council proposes prices increases and extensions of the charging times. It is not the place of a TRO to make this change on behalf of the council - it should be a council decision. I would suggest that this change should be taken to full council for approval. The Executive member has stated that the purpose of the TRO is help control ASB - no where does this TRO reflect this or explain how it would be achieved. 4) The document aims to permit free 30mins parking in Shte End, without specifying why that should be an exception. It would be better for the TRO to provide a more flexible framework where free parking can be extended to other car parks in the Borough. It would be good to have one carpark in Woodley designated to have 30min free parking so that people can pop into	No Objection is specified. These comments relate to a draft Order which regulations do not require to be in final state for the statutory consultation period. The information within the notice of proposals is correct and the **DRAFT** Order provides the backgorund text required for the formal order.
23	COMMENT	Resident	The document on the TRO consultation implies 24 hour charging at the Woodley Town Centre car parks. Cllr Jorgensen says that this is not the case, however I wonder if a suitable officer might put my mind at rest?	The proposals didn't mention introducing a charge 'at all times' just the charging period.

24	COMMENT	Resident	I would like to comment on the proposed introduction of paid and time limited parking at California Crossroads. It is not clear whether this refers to the car park immediately in front of Nine Mile Ride School, or the very small strip of parking immediately in front of the shops for a start. If it refers to the parking in front of the school I am sure the staff at the school would have plenty to say about this as surely this provides parking for the staff, as well as other people wanting to park there, which would then impose a financial burden for daily parking fees and also a logistical nightmare if it is time limited, as none of the staff would be able to park there. If it refers to the parking in front of the shops (and again, it is unclear whether this is in front of the dentist/pharmacy/Coop or on the other side of the road in front of the convenience store and fish and chip shop, by the nature of where these spaces are, it is mainly very transient usage for people using the shops. I suspect that if a parking charge was introduced for just popping to the shops for 15 minutes, people would go elsewhere, thereby having a detrimental impact on those businesses. I could understand if it was time limited parking e.g. 30 minutes free and anything more paid, which might make reasonable sense. It feels like a cynical attempt by the council to boost revenues any way possible, at the cost of local citizens going about their daily top-up shopping, and is not something I would support. Regards	No objection specified. Comment only
28	COMMENT	Resident	I say no to cctv car parking in Woodley. There is no need, and it will deter people from visiting the shops during the day and venues especially at night. I undetstand Waitrose is also against this. Do you want to force them out if Woodley? It's an unjustifiable idea Regards	Comment relates to CCTV only
29	COMMENT	Resident	Where are the actual charges on your document? I see no evidence of the actual schedule of charges? How can we comment if we don't know what you propose to charge? Charging till 10pm is ridiculous, all that will happen is people will go elsewhere for evenings out or park on streets further out. They will avoid car parks. 8-6pm is a reasonable charging period. Anything else is excessive. You tried charging at night and Sunday's before and got no revenue. You won't make enough money to pay for the traffic wardens you're going to need to police the system. Charging on sundays penalises those people wishing to go to church. There must still be the capacity to use cash to pay as anything else penalises the older generation who don't have mobiles or use apps. Plus check/ out is too complicated for many older people. The ticket machines are really difficult to use frankly. Too many options.	The proposals didn't mention introducing a charge 'at all times' just the charging period.
30	COMMENT	Resident	I have concerns that the proposal to charge to park in Wokingham Borough council carparks at all times (evenings and Sundays included) will be detrimental to the businesses in Woodley precinct as it will reduce the number of people using the restaurants in the evenings. It will also stop people like myself using the precinct as I only go on Sundays when the parking is free. If these charges are to go ahead I would start shopping elsewhere where parking is free such as the out of town shopping centres. Kind regards	Comment only -The proposals dont mention introducing a charge 'at all times' they just set out the charging periods.
31	COMMENT	Resident	Please find below my comments on your proposed car park changes. With her consent, I have copied in due to the lack of any response from you to date; to ensure these comments are correctly received/processed. These comments are based on the "TMOP02021 Proposed Wokingham Borough Off-Street Car Parks Orders 20XX" pdf downloaded from the WBC website on 30 Sep. Judging by the numerous, critical/relevant errors and omissions in it, I wonder if this was even the right document? It means residents have not been given the full facts which clearly misses the point of a consultation. My overall impression is that this is a sledgehammer to crack the nut of "boy racers" and similar "car meets" now, but with a secondary motive of setting up future "at all times" charging, especially given the very carefully avoided direct response to this question. This would be another reason to avoid Wokingham, particularly in the much-vaunted night-time economy you hoped to build with the new marketplace, Elms Field and Peach Place developments. Why spend money here, when there is more/better choice and the same (or possibly lower - I don't know as the tariffs are missing in the pdf) cost to park in Reading, Bracknell or other local towns? Comments on the document: •A lot of the document relies on the table of tariffs in Schedule 3. Except that (p75) is a blank table! How can we comment on tariffs if we do not have access to them? •P7 - The document is classified as "Private" in the footer, refers to "sensitive data". Why is this? •The first para on page 13 refers to Schedule 5. This does not seem to exist in the document. •P15 line below section (h): is an open query about resident permits that has not been clarified/corrected/deleted. •P22 (6) why does the Mayor get their own special permit and bay? •P27 11(1)(j) - another unprofessional unresolved comment. •P29 12(1/2) - why can't drivers purchase new tickets to extend parking? •P29 12(3) - what happens if we don't scrupulously clean our cars of any other ticket before parking every time we come to town? •P31 18(1) - why does the key worker clause have a deliberate strike out visible which now disallows any KW from parking a goods vehicle (i.e. a works van) under the permit scheme. •P33 (3) - refers to the empty table in Schedule 3 again. •P35 (7) - the visible strike outs give the Mayor clearly better terms than other permit holders. Why is this?	The comments raised relate to the way in which the draft order is presented. The comments were responded to by officers by email to clarify the queries raised.
32	COMMENT	Ward Member - Evendons	Thanks for your email. The reason why were asking for acknowledgment of her response is given that her 2 previous emails asking where the consultation documents were, had not been responded to. We needed to ensure that emails to the consultation email box were actually getting through and not disappearing into the abyss. also raises some very pertinent questions about the quality of the consultation document where information is missing. The consultation document is supposed to provide consultees with the information necessary to make informed comments on the proposal. When the document is missing information, and leads to further questions from consultees, it's not fulfilling its purpose. - I think this is something to discuss in the highways meeting later. comments are not in isolation. Best wishes	This comment relates to the way in which the draft order is presented and a reply from officers was provided direct to the respondent.