

APPENDIX A-

ON-STREET CONSOLIDATION ORDER AMENDMENT NO. 5 CORRESPONDENCE SUMMARY

APPENDIX A1: PROPOSED SCHEME LOCATIONS

ROAD NAME(S)	PARISH	ROAD NAME(S)	PARISH	ROAD NAME(S)	PARISH
Acorn Drive	Wokingham	Barkham Ride, St James Road and Carolina Place***	Finchampstead CP	Church Lane	Shinfield CP
Alder Mews***	Winnersh CP	Baston Road***	Barkham CP	Eastcourt Avenue	Earley CP
Aphelion Way	Shinfield	Bearwood Road and The Lilacs	Barkham CP	Equestrian Court***	Arborfield
Antrim Road and Fairwater Drive	Woodley CP	Betchworth Avenue	Earley CP	Hatch Ride	Wokingham Without CP
Aston Ferry Lane	Remenham CP	Church Road***	Woodley CP	Jersey Drive and Fresian Way***	Winnersh CP

ROAD NAME(S)	PARISH	ROAD NAME(S)	PARISH	ROAD NAME(S)	PARISH
Longwater Road	Finchampstead CP	Penrose Avenue	Woodley CP	Stanley Road	Wokingham CP
Mimosa Drive and Cutbush Lane	Shinfield CP	Pheasant Close	Winnersh CP	Old Forest Road	Winnersh CP/Wokingham
Nightingale Road	Woodley CP	Princess Marina Drive	Barkham CP	Village Close	Wokingham CP
Nine Mile Ride	Finchampstead	School Hill, Wargrave	Wargrave CP	Whitlock Avenue	Wokingham CP
Nine Mile Ride	Finchampstead and Barkham CP	Sonning Lane	Sonning CP	Remenham Lane	Remenham CP

Note: * denotes roads where objections were received on proposed schemes.**

APPENDIX A2: OBJECTIONS AND OFFICER RESPONSES

Jersey Drive and Fresian Way

FIRST OBJECTION

My name is xxxxxxxx and as a homeowner, we as a family have been living at xxxxxxx since the development was still in the early day of being built so know the road very well and I hope our comments will be taken into consideration.

We are writing to express our concerns to the proposal made by our local Wokingham Borough Council to add yellow lines on Jersey Drive and Friesian Way in reference TRO amendment No5 as above.

Our home xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx of the proposed section and probably have the best view of the road where the yellow lines are being proposed and recognize the intention of the yellow lines is to improve road safety.

However, I must object to your proposal as this will not improve things, in fact it would make them more DANGEROUS in multiple ways.

1- The cars which are parked on Jersey Drive do cause some visibility problems to oncoming cars from both directions but if there are yellow line and no cars are parked, this would cause drivers to speed down the road ever faster and have a huge risk of causing an accident.

I can't tell you how many times I have sat in the room looking out the window and cars come speeding down like it's a racetrack and must brake suddenly when the kids are playing, or cyclists are coming the other way. I have had to even shout at drivers whilst cutting the lawn to make them slow down. Having yellow lines directly outside our house, I have also been worried that one day, a car might come smash into the front of my house and cause further damages as it will free rein to speed down the road both ways.

2- With yellow lines this would cause a lot of other parking concerns. As the residents will just park the cars further up the road and cause a bottle neck or obstructions. Which will annoy many of the residents. At the moment we have van drivers park their huge vans just before the mini roundabout and they don't even live on Jersey Drive. They don't even live on Jersey Drive and live on the other side but because of the access into Jersey Drive they park here as their own road doesn't have the space.

3- On weekends and evening when the roads are busier. Where will guests or visitors park their cars. Surely this would cause a more problem and again annoy the current residents. It will create some nuisance if not road rage as people will be arguing who will park in the spot first or unwanted cars parked outside someone's driveway.

4- The huge hedges and bushes are one of the big areas which could be cut back to create more visibility, drivers can't see around the bend when these are grown.

OFFICERS RESPONSE

The Highway Code states that motorist should not park within 10m of a junction, opposite a junction or locations where the kerb has been dropped to allow wheelchair access. There is a dropped kerb with tactile paving on Fresian Way near the junction with Jersey Drive. Jersey Drive has been designed with physical traffic calming which is currently not functioning properly because of the parked cars. There is a carriageway narrowing north of the junction which drivers approaching the junction are supposed to slow down to navigate, the parked cars on and near the narrowing block the view of oncoming vehicles, so they are not able to see this feature early enough to reduce their speed. The council considers road safety paramount to the provision of on-street parking spaces, it is therefore recommended to proceed with the proposed scheme.

Another big issue I want to highlight is the safety concerns. At the moment the cars parked there do ensure drivers to slow down, so this does help. During the day when the road is mostly empty, cars go faster but, in the evening, and at weekends it is definitely more evident. So, with no cars parked it will be a lot more dangerous where safety is important.

Young kids are always playing in the park at the beginning of Jersey Drive and there is a footpath where kids cross along with dog walkers and causing yellow lines would make it a racetrack 24 hours a day and there is risk someone will get hurt due to speed. So, keep the speed low where I live and around the bend is very crucial.

A lot of the houses on our side where the proposal is on Jersey Drive and Friesian Way only have 1 car parking space, so the parking on the road is our only other option. A lot of the families living here have been here for many years and our kids are now grown up and passing their driving tests so more drivers will be getting vehicles which will cause huge parking problems to the residents itself.

Adding yellow lines on Fresian Way and Jersey Drive will have multiple issues and not have any effect of reducing the speed of drivers, especially approaching the bend in the road and as mentioned it will be the actual opposite.

Recommendation:

I don't want our suburban road to look like a car park but a couple of things which would work better would be to remove those hedges opposite and make the road wider so the 5 or 6 cars where residents including ourselves currently park can continue to park conveniently. Those hedges look ghastly and overgrown and not helping anyone. The grass is never cut on time and is a waste of space so it wouldn't be missed.

Jersey Drive is a nice and highly sought-after area so I would be grateful if my comments are considered and re-thought how this would work.

I look forward to your reply/comments and if you need any further information, or I can help please let me know.

Jersey Drive
and Fresian
Way

SECOND OBJECTION

As residents and home owners of Jersey Drive since its construction we believe that we have a perspective on the issue that you are seeking to address that we would like you to consider in the decision-making process. Whilst we recognise the intent of the yellow lines is to improve road safety by increasing visibility around the bend designed in the road, from our point of view this will not realise the intended outcome and will in fact create another new problem further along the road. The part of the road at which the yellow lines are proposed was designed with a conscious width restriction to slow drivers and provide in particular a safer crossing point to both the playground and the national footpath. This has proven to be a very effective measure. Ensuring vehicles reduce their speed through this area is a critical safety measure and ironically the parked cars are adding to this deterrent by forcing vehicles to slow. That being said we cannot compensate for individual standards of driving which we would consider to be totally inappropriate to the road layout and actually the problem that really needs to be addressed. It is the individual drivers taking appropriate care and attention to the road layout that is the source of the problem referenced regarding passing. There is plenty of space to allow for those considerate drivers to manage and navigate the designed road width restriction. Provided that the driver is paying due care and attention and driving at an appropriate speed to the road layout and situation. Adding yellow lines will not have the effect of reducing the speed of drivers approaching the bend in the road, quite the opposite, in particular for those less considerate drivers which are actually the greatest risk to safety. These are the drivers that you are in fact trying to address in your proposal not the vast majority that approach and navigate any congestion with care and consideration towards other road users and pedestrians. Placing yellow lines on this bend will push the problem further long Jersey drive and create a greater risk for pedestrians crossing this road at the various points to cut through the estate or to enjoy the open space and playground further long Jersey Drive. This issue is exacerbated by the number of vehicles that are parked on Jersey drive by non-residents, particularly at weekends and evenings. Those less considerate drivers with a propensity to drive at speed will then accelerate through any "frustrations" from passing issues towards the bend not reduce their speed given they have the right of way based on the road design. Pushing the passing problem further along Jersey Drive, whilst not only increase the dangers of crossing will also have the effect of amplifying the passing issue as there is not a natural point in the road design as exists in the Fresian Way / Jersey Drive junction to allowing safe passing of vehicles. Having carefully considered the proposal, in conclusion, we do not believe that the objectives of the proposed measures address the problem and will not have the intended impact of improving road safety. This is not an effective investment of council money. There are alternative measures that should be considered, such as speed bumps or cutting back the shrubbery to enable a wider view around the bend upon approaching that would have a great impact without creating the additional issue and risks of not reducing vehicle speed upon approaching the bend and increasing the passing problem given the parking limitations that already exist.

OFFICERS RESPONSE

The Highway Code states that motorist should not park within 10m of a junction, opposite a junction or locations where the kerb has been dropped to allow wheelchair access. There is a dropped kerb with tactile paving on Fresian Way near the junction with Jersey Drive. Jersey Drive has been designed with physical traffic calming which is currently not functioning properly because of the parked cars. There is a carriageway narrowing north of the junction which drivers approaching the junction are supposed to slow down to navigate, the parked cars on and near the narrowing block the view of oncoming vehicles, so they are not able to see this feature early enough to reduce their speed. The council considers road safety paramount to the provision of on-street parking spaces, it is therefore recommended to proceed with the proposed scheme.

Jersey Drive
and Fresian
Way

THIRD OBJECTION

There are several roads on the estate that are already very busy with off road parking and roads such as Angus Close contain many houses that have only one parking space and nowhere else to park so they will undoubtedly be affected. The overall effect of these lines could affect many roads within the estate, spreading a risk of unsafe parking and driving around the whole of the estate. We would like to add that your proposed lines are planned to be xxxxxxxxxxxx. This part of Jersey Drive is not part of the bend and we do not understand the relevance of it being included. For many years there was not generally a car parked outside our house and on at least two occasions the bollard just to the side of the road narrowing/crossing was hit and destroyed due to cars seeing this as a chicane. We have a shared drive with our neighbours with no provision for visitors or additional cars so we will be forced to inconvenience other parts of the estate. We are an un-usually close and friendly neighbourhood, many of which have lived here for years, and we fear your plans will divide and potentially destroy this. In your considerations and research, we would also wonder if you have looked at additional factors that may have led to concerns around the bend of Jersey Drive. When planting the estate, large, fast-growing shrubs were laid, and these have been allowed to grow very tall around the bend in question. We believe that for many years there was a clear line of sight around the bend and this along with the natural slowing of traffic created by the parked cars has continued to successfully make this a safe road for residents. The height the bushes have been allowed to grow by the groundskeepers have taken away the clear line of sight in recent years. If these were to be cut back, then we think this would have an instantly favourable effect on the visibility when passing on the bend. Same as there has always been. It goes without saying that we all want to live safe in the knowledge that the roads where we live are safe and work for everyone. Whilst there is no doubt some inconvenience to car users further up Jersey Drive we do not believe that trying to make their life easier should be priority over the safety of the drivers and pedestrians who use this road and others in the estate. Cutting the bushes right back down will in my mind help hugely and be more reflective of the situation that has worked for many years. We are concerned that you are planning to make changes to a road that so far has not been the site of any road traffic accidents and these changes will hugely increase the chance of one or more happening. We would not want to be having the conversation afterwards to justify why these changes were made. Please consider any changes very seriously, please don't put our pedestrians and road users at risk by going for a very severe change to our lovely estate. Instead take all views into account and find a way to improve the perceived issues with minimal impact. We would be more than happy to discuss ideas further and meet any of your staff for a site visit. Surely there is time for such things to take place as we doubt you would fundamentally change resident's status quo without considering all views and ideas. With thanks in advance of your consideration of our views, and we hope that you recognise that our position of being such a long-term resident of the estate means we really do care about what happens to it.

OFFICERS RESPONSE

The Highway Code states that motorist should not park within 10m of a junction, opposite a junction or locations where the kerb has been dropped to allow wheelchair access. There is a dropped kerb with tactile paving on Fresian Way near the junction with Jersey Drive. Jersey Drive has been designed with physical traffic calming which is currently not functioning properly because of the parked cars. There is a carriageway narrowing north of the junction which drivers approaching the junction are supposed to slow down to navigate, the parked cars on and near the narrowing block the view of oncoming vehicles, so they are not able to see this feature early enough to reduce their speed. The council considers road safety paramount to the provision of on-street parking spaces, it is therefore recommended to proceed with the proposed scheme.

Jersey Drive
and Fresian
Way

FOURTH OBJECTION

I have just seen the details of the above. I do agree it is dangerous to be parking on these bends, however there already is a lot of tension around here with inadequate parking spaces in this estate.

I live on xxxxxxxxxxxx, and have done for 13 years. We have 2 parking spaces and 2 adults with cars living in our 3 bedroom house. There is literally no where else for anyone to park if we have a visitor other than on Jersey drive. This will now become even more impossible than it already is.

The people on Jersey drive already heavily resent any parking that gets an overspill squeeze out from the Fresian Way cul-d-sac. This is going to cause more problems and tensions than it solves.

I understand when the estate was built there were plans for additional spaces on the green opposite the park? You cant take these spaces away without adding in some more elsewhere or its going to become very tense around here.

OFFICERS RESPONSE

The Highway Code states that motorist should not park within 10m of a junction, opposite a junction or locations where the kerb has been dropped to allow wheelchair access. There is a dropped kerb with tactile paving on Fresian Way near the junction with Jersey Drive. Jersey Drive has been designed with physical traffic calming which is currently not functioning properly because of the parked cars. There is a carriageway narrowing north of the junction which drivers approaching the junction are supposed to slow down to navigate, the parked cars on and near the narrowing block the view of oncoming vehicles, so they are not able to see this feature early enough to reduce their speed. The council considers road safety paramount to the provision of on-street parking spaces, it is therefore recommended to proceed with the proposed scheme.

Equestrian
Court

FIRST OBJECTION

I write to you on behalf of a significant number of residents at Equestrian Court, Arborfield. This is to make representations in relation to the consultation published in relation to Amendment Order No. 5 WBC/TRO/AM.5, whereby the Local Authority wishes to address the road safety concerns raised by myself and others, by placing double yellow lines on the sections identified in the consultation paper.

Having considered the proposal, we opine that the placing of double yellow lines is not an adequate step to make to address the significant risk associated in relation to the junction/corner in question. We opine that in addition to the placing of the double yellow lines, the Local Authority should also relocate/remove the accompanying visitor's parking on the nearside of the street. For further information in relation to the visitor's parking in question, I refer you to the attached photograph.

These representations are made on the following grounds:

1. That the current position of the visitor's parking is not appropriately placed, according to Rule 250 of the Highway code, as it is not 10 metres away from the bend. Please see Waiting and parking (238 to 252) - The Highway Code - Guidance - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) I believe the text therein is self-explanatory and I do not believe any court in the land would find it in the council's favour. However for the avoidance of any doubt, I wish to point it out to you that the code does apply to lay-bys -as expressly written in brackets- and the issue in contention is the distance -i.e. 10 metres away from any junction.

2. That the current position of the visitor's parking is not appropriately placed, Department for Transport's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Manual for Streets. This is with particular reference to 7.7 "Visibility splays at junctions" and 7.8 "Forward Visibility". You will note that the calculation set out in 7.8.1 and Figure 7.19, has not been appropriately applied with regard to the bend in question, if the speed limit is 30mph. Application of this calculation would see the visibility line going over the visitor's parking space and over privately owned land. This means that vehicles parked on the visitor's parking would hinder visibility around the corner for approaching vehicles, and make corner very dangerous for both motorists and pedestrians.

You may be correctly asking yourself why I am making representations that seem to relate to the visitor's parking, on a consultation pertaining to the placing of double yellow lines. The argument is actually very simple. Whilst, we support the placing of double yellow lines, our fear is that this will increase the speed around the corner in question, as traffic naturally moves at higher speed in areas where there are no vehicles parked. We therefore submit to you that the double yellow lines will in fact increase speed around the corner, and therefore forward visibility around the corner is crucial. By removing or relocating the visitor's bay in question, visibility is no longer inhibited.

As the owner of the corner plot, I am willing to work with the Local Authority and developers to resolve this issue, as safety is a key concern to me. Especially having witnessed a number of accidents and near misses, which are all attributed to visibility around the corner.

Rule 250 of the highway code advises Motorist not to park "opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space". The rule excludes authorised parking spaces. The visitor bay is a recessed bay (Cut out from the footway) which the developer provided as an authorised parking space. The bay is not directly in the sightline of drivers, so it is unlikely to cause an obstruction. The road is also not adopted so the Council is unable to propose changes to its layout without an approval from the owner.

	<p>I note that these submissions are very brief, but I trust that their succinctness makes them clear. I am happy to substantiate these with further verbal or written submissions, at any subsequent consideration.</p> <p>I trust that these submissions will be fully considered, and I would deeply appreciate a response.</p>	
<p>Alder Mews</p>	<p><u>FIRST OBJECTION</u></p> <p>I strongly object to the single yellow line covering the entrance to my parking space. In the drawings provided that is the space close to where the proposed sign would go and this is the end of the single yellow line (xxxxxxxxxxxx). This appears to show that the council encourage parking over this outside the hours of restrictions, as it shows that parking is not allowed here only between certain hours and therefore it is not prohibited outside those hours. It is never legal for anyone to block my car or park on this and therefore I would object to the single yellow line going over this space. I do not want any yellow lines to cover the entrance to my parking space.</p> <p>Again, I think this shows the council only considering one or two residents views, but not actually the person in this instance whose space would have the yellow line across the entrance.</p> <p>I have also attached photos (below) of yesterday morning (Friday 2 September) at 9am, showing that 6 residents of the road are parked on the road. This is right in the middle of the proposed restrictions, which not only shows that the school parents wouldn't be able to park here due to there being no free spaces, but also that the restrictions would inconvenience at least two residents of the road. It shows the cars of 6 residents and also a van. Two cars are parked where these restrictions are being proposed.</p>	<p>When the proposals were published Alder Mews was unadopted, the proposal has been requested by the developer and has not been through the same assessment process as the proposals for the adopted roads. Residents' concerns cannot be overruled until the road is fully adopted. The road is now adopted however following the feedback from residents it is recommended to withdraw the scheme at this time, re-engage with residents on the issues and re-consider it in future TRO Amendments</p>

<p>Alder Mews</p>	<p><u>SECOND OBJECTION</u></p> <p>Our objections are as follows:1. Residents we were not kept informed of developments as consultation progressed as communication by WBC was with one resident only who chose not to inform the other residents in the Mews. Mr xxxxxx was an unelected spokesperson. The erection of a fence and bollards was totally unnecessary as no cars ever parked on those spaces and is a complete waste of taxpayer’s money. If consulted the residents would have expressed this. 2. Most of the properties are now privately owned and owners have multiple vehicles. Previously there were several properties that were landlord owned and these properties were empty for large amounts of time, hence there being less cars in the Mews and the opportunity for parents to find space to park. These rentals have since moved into private ownership.3. It is very rare these days that there is any free space for parents from the school to be able to park in the Mews since the owners mostly work from home (since the pandemic) and the vehicles parked in our road belong to residents. 4. If restrictions are imposed where are the residents expected to move their vehicles to during the restricted periods? 5. If residents are forced to move their cars during the restricted times, it will just free up space for parents to park illegally anyway. 6. If residents are forced to move their cars up into the Mews it will cause parking/access issues as there is limited space around the properties. This may also result in damage to the current paving as this is not tarmac as there will be substantially more traffic movement. 7. If residents are away from home for any period of time such as on holiday, where are they supposed to move their car to as it is not feasible to keep moving cars throughout the day? 8. If these restrictions are supposed to deter parking by parents taking/picking their children to school, why are the restrictions so long? 9. If these parking restrictions are imposed, we believe it will make the sale of our properties difficult. Who will want to buy a house here if they cannot park their vehicles without having to keep trying to move them when there is clearly nowhere to move them to? 10. Signage regarding the proposed parking restrictions were only put outside the two properties who initially raised their issue concerning the school parking. Why was a sign not put up in the Mews for the benefit of the majority of the residents? It feels very much like the views of these two properties are being taken into account over the majority of residents.11. These restrictions may benefit 1-2 of the residents, I do not believe imposing these restrictions to make one/two resident happy is enough justification to proceed at the detriment of the other resident living here in the Mews.</p>	<p>When the proposals were published Alder Mews was unadopted and the proposal has been requested by the developer and has not been through the same assessment process as the proposals for the adopted roads. Residents’ concerns cannot be overruled until the road is fully adopted. The road is now adopted however following the feedback from residents it is recommended to withdraw the scheme at this time, re-engage with residents on the issues and re-consider it in future TRO Amendments</p>
<p>Barkham Ride, St James Road and Carolina Place</p>	<p><u>FIRST OBJECTION</u></p> <p>I refer to the above WBC TRO amendment number 5 proposal under reference WBC/AM5/WRT/006 involving the installation of double yellow lines at the above junction. I wish to formally object to the proposal which in its current form is unnecessary and excessive.</p> <p>I have lived in St James Road for 38 years and use that junction on a daily basis. I have never seen a vehicle parked at that location on The Barkham Ride. The nearest vehicle to park is the number 3 bus travelling to Reading which temporarily stops each hour for a short period to the right of St James Road when exiting that road. The positioning of the bus stop does not present any difficulties with car drivers negotiating the situation as they do in other similar cases. Please review and provide me with</p>	<p>The restrictions have been proposed in response to residents’ concerns, they are aimed at keeping the three junctions clear of parked cars at all times to improve visibility and road safety. The concerns which have been raised on other sections of the road will be considered in future traffic management schemes for the area.</p>

the road traffic accident statistics for that junction (3 incident rule) . I am sure that it is a safe configuration as I have never seen a collision at that location.

With regards to Carolina Place again the immediate vicinity of the junction is clear. There have been on occasions the odd vehicle parked on the nearside entering Carolina Place but away from the junction in accordance with The Highway Code. Traffic flow into Carolina place is smooth and does not back onto the Barkham Ride.

With regards to St James Road WBC must consider it safe as they have positioned the school bus pick up point on the nearside when entering from Barkham Ride. The majority of cars parked in St James Road on the south east side appear to be owned by residents of Ditchfield Lane who for some reason do not use their own designated parking spaces. These vehicles provide excellent traffic calming to the area.

In addition there has occasionally been a stolen vehicle abandoned on the south east side of St James in the area subject of your proposal but they were quickly removed and I am sure you will agree that no amount of lining would prevent that from occurring. There is hardly ever a vehicle parked on the north side with the exception of the occasional Council contractor.

The installation of double yellow lines at the propose locations would simply displace traffic and cause difficulty elsewhere.

Having outlined my objections I do see what WBC Highways are seeking to achieve. I recommend that if it has not already been done that traffic flow volume counters are placed on the road surface in St James Road to measure volume and peak flow times. You will find that in term times the volume of traffic in St James Road increases in the morning due to parents taking their children to Waverley Prep School in Waverley Way off Nashgrove Lane. The same occurs at the end of the school day. However the increased flow is a temporary situation. With that in mind you may wish to consider some limited peak hour restriction as you do outside of many schools to ensure that St James Road on its approach to Barkham Ride remains clear. The length on the north side is excessive.

I have considerable knowledge of this area and would be happy to meet on site with one of your Highway surveyors to discuss the situation.

Church Road

FIRST OBJECTION

I am writing in regard to the proposed Traffic Installation Order of Waiting Restrictions on Church Road, Woodley near the junction with Butts Hill Road as I would like to object to this installation. My reasons for objection are below: 1. Residents parking: This section of the road is currently used by residents for parking as most of us live in rented accommodation. We have little to no driveway space and garage space, meaning this area is our safest option. In many cases, there are young families that use this area to park. If the proposed Traffic Installation were to go ahead, this would make it extremely difficult for these families in order to safely access their cars and their homes. It would also force residents to look at other housing arrangements, as without parking outside the block of flats/maisonettes, they will become very difficult to live in. 2. Car safety – There has been an increase in car thefts recently in and around the Woodley area. By removing this area for parking, the council would be putting our cars at risk with us unable to protect them as we would be forced to park on another street, meaning we might be unable to see them. I have experienced this before, and it if were not for the kindness of my strangers who witnessed this accident, my car would have been written off in a hit and run. 3. Work/travel – All of the residents use their cars/vehicles as transportation for work. As a mobile Personal Trainer, I rely on my car to travel to my client’s houses. I also keep equipment in there between my clients. By installing the proposed Traffic Installation it would make it extremely difficult to load and unload my car safely and keep my equipment in there during my day to day client sessions. 4. Residents consultation – At no point have we, the residents, been consulted about this proposed Installation. The first we heard about it was through a Facebook post on “Woodley Chants and Rants”, which you have to be a member of to view the posts. This was posted by xxxxxxxx and it was very disappointing that when we approached xxxxxxxx about this, he could offer no alternative for us. Mr xxxxxx referred to this junction as being an area of “road rage” for drivers, however we feel strongly that we should not be punished for living in rented accommodation with little to no driveway space by potentially having this option removed just because some drivers struggle with the waiting restrictions as they are. We would welcome a conversation with the Traffic Management, Parking and Road Safety Department about how to make this section of the road safer for everyone, whilst still allowing us residents an area to park safely. As mentioned at the beginning of this letter, I object highly to installation. It will make it incredibly difficult for the eight households impacted and during this time of uncertainty, will no doubt put stress and pressure on all the residents who use this area to park. I look forward to discussing this matter with Wokingham Borough council and reaching an agreement where all parties can benefit.

The scheme is not expected to lead to loss of parking because the 11m extension along the northern kerb line runs between the existing yellow lines and the dropped kerb for properties numbered 1-7 Church Road, the space between the dropped kerb and the end of the existing double yellow lines is less than the length of a standard size car. The same situation exists on the opposite side where the restrictions are to be extended by 12m. It is not possible to park at these locations without obstructing the existing dropped kerbs. It is recommended to proceed with the scheme.

Church Road

SECOND OBJECTION

I am writing in regard to the proposed Traffic Installation Order of Waiting Restrictions on Church Road, Woodley near the junction with Butts Hill Road. I would like to object to this installation due to the reasons outlined below. As a resident of Church Road who like the other households in my block of accommodation currently use this area to park, I am deeply concerned as to where the council expects us to park should this installation go ahead. As most households rent, we have limited garage space and no drive way area. We try to park as safely and considerately of others as possible and have used this area on the road for many years without any issues. The installation of Waiting Restrictions in this section of the road will not stop the traffic, it will simply push it on to other roads in the area. Selsdon Avenue is a prime example of this. The road and residents are struggling to cope with the number of vehicles that are parked on the road, this installation will only make that worse. It is also a matter of security, as there have been several car thefts in Woodley recently. By parking on another street, there is a potential for our vehicles to be damaged and us unable to do anything as we might not be there to witness it. xxxxxxxxxxxx, I rely on my car for my transportation to work. Without it I would struggle to commute to work and if my car were to be damaged and/or stolen, it would therefore have a huge impact on my income. In our block of accommodation, we also have residents who keep important work equipment in their vehicles, whom without that would also not be able to work. This would directly impact their income and earnings, which during this current time of financial pressure for us all would have a huge impact. At no stage have we been consulted regarding this plan, as the first we heard about the proposal was through a Facebook post on a member's only Facebook group for Woodley from xxxxxx. I have spoken to xxxxxx via email and asked for an alternative measure to be offered for us and he could not provide a solution, which was very disappointing. In my emails to xxxxxx, I also raised the idea of a cycle provision scheme for parents/children during school drop off/pick up, as the 'rush hour' time seemed to be the issue with traffic on this junction during those times which I understand the council is looking to implement with a similar cycle path scheme around Woodley. This potential installation has already caused a large amount of stress and anxiety for the households impacted. We are living in very uncertain and challenging times due to the cost-of-living crisis and fuel/energy bills. The potential Waiting Restrictions has put a huge amount of pressure on us; some households that have happily lived here for several years and are part of our tight knit community, are now considering moving. Installing Waiting Restrictions would make this accommodation potentially unliveable for anyone with a car and/or vehicle unless the council offer an alternative parking arrangement. I highly object to this installation and would welcome a conversation with Wokingham Borough Council about alternative measures for residents parking for this block of flats.

The scheme is not expected to lead to loss of parking because the 11m extension along the northern kerb line runs between the existing yellow lines and the dropped kerb for properties numbered 1-7 Church Road, the space between the dropped kerb and the end of the existing double yellow lines is less than the length of a standard size car. The same situation exists on the opposite side where the restrictions are to be extended by 12m. It is not possible to park at these locations without obstructing the existing dropped kerbs. It is recommended to proceed with the scheme.

Church Road

THIRD OBJECTION

Letter received : SUMMARISED AS : Double yellow lines will lead to a reduction in parking spaces, leading to cars moving to other parts of the road which is already congested, the Council should have asked residents what their concerns were and how they can be addressed

The scheme is not expected to lead to loss of parking because the 11m extension along the northern kerb line runs between the existing yellow lines and the dropped kerb for properties numbered 1-7 Church Road, the space between the dropped kerb and the end of the existing double yellow lines is less than the length of a standard size car. The same situation exists on the opposite side where the restrictions are to be extended by 12m. It is not possible to park at these locations without obstructing the existing dropped kerbs. It is recommended to proceed with the scheme.

APPENDIX A3: EMAILS AND LETTERS OF SUPPORT		
<p>Jersey Drive and Fresian Way</p>	<p>I would like to thank you for proposing that the area near the junction of Friesian Way and Jersey Drive in Winnersh is being considered for traffic restrictions. My family has lived in this area for ten years and I have requested a traffic order be considered on a couple of occasions. This is a blind bend which in my opinion is taken far too quickly by some drivers. The number of vehicles parked here typically by residents that choose not to use their garages is considerable to the point that there is often no suitable passing place. Furthermore, the type of vehicles typically parked here are commercial in nature preventing motorists from catching a glimpse of an oncoming vehicle as one can not see through panel vans. In addition to driving a car, I also cycle and can testify that motorists' visibility of me is significantly impaired. I realise this will cause some inconvenience to residents near the bend in the road however with many of the houses having three cars, the current situation is not sustainable in addition to being unsafe.</p>	
<p>Jersey Drive and Fresian Way</p>	<p>I live at nos xxxxxxxx -Further to the plans to put double yellow lines, I would like to say we are in favour of this. In the past, when I have contacted the council about this, I was advised unless there is a severe road accident or someone is killed, it is not possible. It is a night mare trying to turn into our road at times as cars and vans race down Jersey Drive with all views blocked because of the vans parked around the corner, your view is obstructed. We have had many near misses, and the drivers get grumpy with us as there is nowhere to pull in. I have had many near misses, but more importantly, it must be a nightmare for the refuse lorries.</p> <p>Where the pavement is lowered at the entrance to Fresian Way for pedestrians to cross cars, park on either side for people wi.th buggies etc, it is a pain the access is blocked, and the residents don't care it's so frustrating.</p> <p>No doubt people will complain that they gave a right to park there. Where the road narrows on Jersey Drive, the bit I call the waiting zone one of the houses uses that permanently for their 3rd car.</p> <p>Will these lines are enforceable and it all day, every day? When do we hear if it gets approved, as I have been hoping for this for years?</p>	

<p>Pheasant Close</p>	<p>Please can you tell me what has happened for the application to put double yellow lines in at the beginning of Pheasant Close RG41 5LS. It closed on the 8th of September but I can't find easily anywhere on the council website the outcome.</p> <p>I am hoping it has gone through as we have been trying to get this ever since they altered the size of the entrance of the road. With the lorries that come into the carpet shop having to mount the pavement every time they try and do their deliveries and now we have the same for the mini bus that comes and collect the occupants that live in the special needs house in the dog leg of the close. We have had lorries even block the close as they can't get in to do deliveries so you are stuck in the close. There has been a number of times I have been nearly driven into as I have had to stop in the main road to allow cars out as there is not enough space to be in the correct place on the road to to leave the close, specially with this that are not following the instruction use the RH lane for Sainsbury only as they approach the close. Plus then you have the bus stop blocking your view as you turn out. I think you get the message.</p> <p>I have always had concerns that an emergency services could have difficulties to reach any house as there are a number of times that people double park down there specially at school times.</p> <p>If you can update me I would appreciate it.</p>	
<p>Eastcourt Avenue</p>	<p>I am so pleased to see this is going ahead. We live at xxxxxxxxxx and even though traffic cones have been put outside our house various people still just move the said cones on to pavement and park. Under notice. Please go ahead.</p>	
<p>Penrose Avenue</p>	<p>I am emailing regarding the proposed installation of double yellow lines outside of No. 2 Penrose Avenue. Whilst I fully support the installation of these lines, I would like you to consider the adverse knock on affect of them for the rest of the road. Cars have always parked along this road, they are mainly staff from Woodley precinct, causing problems with cars travelling along the road and meeting other road users travelling in the opposite direction. The parked cars also pose a danger to pedestrians trying to cross the road, visibility issues when travelling along the road and it also makes it very difficult pulling in and out of our driveway. I believe that installing the proposed double yellow lines will cause the cars to park further up and down the road, making the junction with Nightingale at the top of the road and the junction with Antrim at the bottom of the road dangerous. There are many elderly people and school children that use this road on a daily basis and consideration needs to be given for their safety. I would also ask that someone from the Council comes out and considers the impact of the cars when they park further down the road especially opposite No.6, 8 and 10 as this section of the road is on a bend. Perhaps even putting a single yellow line on the rest of the road with restrictions during certain times to stop the majority of the parking? I am more than happy to discuss this further with a member of the Council.</p>	

APPENDIX A4: COMMENTS

<p>Jersey Drive and Fresian Way</p>	<p>I write in reference to the above road proposals on Jersey Drive & Fresian Way.</p> <p>Whilst I do not object to the work you are intending to do as being a resident of Fresian Way I have many a times had a near miss on this junction and it is very dangerous, sometimes cars can be parked all the way down Jersey Drive to the mini roundabout so maybe some yellow lines need to go down that end too. I do recall when I purchased this house, the original plans for this development showed a parking area would be provided next to the play area by the junction of Fresian Way and this has never been implemented, the estate has even been provided with visitor parking bays. Had this parking area been put in place, cars would not be parking on the road and the use of double yellow lines would not be required. You cannot take away residents only means of parking when the estate was never provided with the parking it was originally supposed to have been supplied with.</p> <p>So my question has to be what is the council going to provide instead?</p>	<p>The Council is not required to provide on-street parking spaces for residents as part of their traffic and road safety management obligations. The proposed restrictions are necessary and are aimed at improving road safety. Issues relating to proposals which are not fulfilled by developers should be referred to the Councils planning enforcement team.</p>
-------------------------------------	--	--

Sonning Lane

I write in reference to your consultation on proposals for the above amendments, in particular Sonning Lane Sonning – Waiting restrictions opposite Access into Laundry Cottage. xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx proposed amendment in Sonning Lane and we have a right of way across this access to our garage at the bottom of our garden.

The proposal meets with our approval and we would support the proposed restrictions as large and smaller vehicles park opposite the access and make it difficult for delivery and emergency vehicles to enter or leave the site.

However it has been noted that, although the map is correct the description is incorrect in that it says 'opposite Access into Laundry Cottage'. This is incorrect because Laundry Cottage is a separate property in Pearson Road and cannot be accessed via this Access. The wording should correctly read 'opposite Access to Thatched Cottage'. Thatched Cottage is the large detached dwelling at the end of the access drive which is owned by the owner of Thatched Cottage. Laundry Cottage is a land locked cottage accessed through a small pedestrian path from Pearson Road, it does not have any vehicular access from Sonning Lane or off Pearson Road.

I attach a copy of a poor quality print taken by a mobile camera of the map accompanying the notice put up in Sonning Lane, but it does illustrate the northern boundary of Thatched Cottage, it is unfortunate that the map you have used has Laundry Cottage printed in the garden of Thatched Cottage, which has led to this misunderstanding. Thatched Cottage is large property set in 4 acres of land. All the land shown south of the boundary belongs to Thatched Cottage

I have had correspondence from Jennifer T. Yeboah but I was unable to provide the map for clarification as it was not available until today. I must thank Jennifer for her help.

I hope this clarifies the issue but I would be pleased to meet a representative on site to discuss.

This was an administrative error and the description on the draft TRO will be amended before signing and sealing.

Baston Road

Further to the Notice of proposal WBC/TRO/AM.1 found in the laminated document attached to a lamppost on Baston Road, I am very concerned that double yellow lines were painted both sides of the road this morning 24/08/22) My first concern is this action took place before the deadline for objections, this being by 23:59 on 8th September. Why were the line painters deployed two weeks sooner than the deadline?

Another concern is this is very inconsiderate for growing families residing in Baston Road and visitors of the residents too. We have a family with four grown up children who all own cars and have to park opposite the house on Baston Road because the developers only allocated two parking spaces for a four bedroom home. You can appreciate the anxiety and concern this created this morning when the line painters rang on our doorbell.

I was fortunate enough to be visited by a concerned Farley Hill parent, who also works for Wokingham Borough Council, since the plans the school had made them aware of are different to what can be found on the laminated document. Fortunately she had contacted her manager who has been looking into this today and she came back to me to give me details of when this was passed and who proposed these measure in the first place, two years ago before houses had been planned in, not the most ideal position I would suggest.

Everyone who's had to park on Baston Road due to lack of allocated spaces will now be forced to park somewhere else, not too far from their homes, which will become a safety concern and detrimental to the neighbourhood as there are not enough allocated spaces for these displaced cars. Also, where will all the parents park that have to drive to school at drop off and pick up time?

Please take my comments as a huge concern since I am already disillusioned by the Arborfield Green development with the lack of village infrastructure delivered for the number of residents, the lack of later night buses to and from Wokingham and Reading, the planning of even more houses to be built and also the antisocial nature of cars and motorbikes speeding up and down Biggs Lane and Langley Common Road.

None of these endear this area to me and I already have plans to move on in the not so distant future which is a shame since it all has so much promise.

Baston Road is currently unadopted, the instruction for the installation of the double yellow lines was made by the developer and not by the Council. The restrictions will not be enforced until the road is fully adopted.

Barkham Ride,
St James Road
and Carolina
Place

I'm responding to the TRO notice put up on St James Road. I would like to better understand how this will make this route safer. The proposed yellow lines are generally and commonly where cars do not park. The areas where parking causes danger is along the east side of St James road beyond the 77m proposed lines from the junction with Barkham Ride. As a resident accessing St James Road from Fir Cottage (heading south, towards Barkham Road) the left-hand lane is habitually blocked from the junction of Fir Cottage and St James Road towards Barkham Road forcing vehicles into the right-hand lane where visibility of oncoming traffic is obscured by the parked cars. This has led to many altercations and oncoming vehicles mounting the curb to drive around.

As a resident accessing St James Road from Fir Cottage (heading north, towards Roycroft Lane) the left-hand lane is commonly blocked by parked vehicles obstructing any view of the oncoming traffic and forcing vehicles into the right-hand lane. This is then obstructed by cars parked in the right-hand lane causing a chicane and affecting the junction with St James Road /Roycroft Lane and at peak times St James Road / Fir Cottage.

Resident's cars are habitually parked outside 23-29 St James Road and 2 Fir Cottage which obstruct the junction and pavements of Fir Cottage Road and St James Road. Poor visibility, speed, parking on pavements and vehicles being on the incorrect side of the road makes this area dangerous for walkers, users of prams and disability scooters/chairs, and children walking/cycling to/from the local schools. Additionally, vehicle access for emergency services is compromised and worrying for many elderly people living in and around Fir Cottage Road. St James is a pickup and drop-off point for school buses and is on the rat run for 3 schools (Waverley – to the north - and Gorse Ride, Bohunt and Nine Mile Ride schools to the south) all of which are within walking/cycling distance.

I wonder if you can review your TRO as your current plans add nothing to the safety of the use of St James Road from Fir Cottage and Roycroft Lane. This route has high volumes of traffic serving all three local schools and is used as a rat run for those wanting to avoid the congestion at the roundabout (Barkham Ride/Nashgrove Lane). Children crossing Barkham Ride, to access the schools to the south, have no appropriate crossing point for access to the SANG route to Bohunt - the pedestrian crossing to the east is not convenient - and this means that children crossing Barkham Road with a combination of school buses on Barkham Ride at the junction with St James and the local traffic is dangerous to them. WBC states they provide safe routes for children to get to school. This route from St James to Bohunt via Carolina Place is probably one of the most dangerous crossings I've witnessed. Children rely on bus drivers and vehicle users to stop for them and provide safe passage. By the way – no child is going to cycle down Barkham Ride and use the crossing into Gorse Ride North if they need to go from St James Road to Carolina Place. It just won't happen – they are attempting to have a route that has fewer roads/pavements. In addition, Gorse Ride North is busy with drop-offs and pick up from Gorse Ride School making this road and the car park access to California Country Park busy and erratic for children on bikes. There is no cycle lane provision in this area on any of the roads or pavement provision to support alternatives from vehicles as WBC is fully aware of when they planned the new housing development and Bohunt School (in my view an entirely ill-planned, conceived and executed venture).

The restrictions have been proposed in response to residents' concerns, they are aimed at keeping the three junctions clear of parked cars at all times to improve visibility and road safety. The concerns which have been raised on other sections of the road will be considered in future traffic management schemes for the area.

	<p>This has impoverished the facilities and experience of living in Finchampstead. It's a place where people use their cars because it's not safe and unpleasant to walk around to shops and amenities.</p> <p>While I'm here, there is a massive issue with parking outside the COOP/pharmacy at California crossroads in Finchampstead. Employees of businesses locally use these spaces for parking for the day rendering the "pop-in" nature of the use of the shops impossible especially during school term times. Please consider putting a 30-minute or even 2-hour limit on parking (with no return in an hour) here so that these spaces can be freed up to provide access to the shops – BEFORE these amenities die and Finchampstead disappears. Please discuss with Nine Mile Ride where their staff should be parking as Avery Corner car park seems to be a school staff parking-only area. Please don't put this off until decisions are made about the junction.</p> <p>Please come and look at what happens and how the roads are used over some time. In St James Road your measures are not going to support safety in this area. Ultimately, we need more people walking/cycling to school, our pavements back and safer multi-use of local roads and WBC measures should work towards this.</p>	
<p>Barkham Ride, St James Road and Carolina Place</p>	<p>Letter attached; The proposed double yellow lines will increase traffic speeds and make the junction less safe.</p>	<p>The restrictions have been proposed in response to residents' concerns, they are aimed at keeping the three junctions clear of parked cars at all times to improve visibility and road safety.</p>
<p>Eastcourt Avenue</p>	<p>The biggest concern we have with your plans is that if you take away the parked cars on the bend, you create a risk of increased speed both around the bend, through the road narrowing/crossing and directly outside the children's play park.</p>	<p>The description does not match the location for the proposed restrictions</p>

Penrose Avenue

I am emailing concerning the proposed double yellow lines outside 2 Penrose avenue, Woodley, RG5 3PA, supposedly to ease traffic congestion.

Penrose Avenue is now used as a parking area for people shopping and working in Woodley Precinct to avoid paying for parking and so can cause congestion throughout the road. Putting in double yellow lines in a small part will only shift the congestion.

We live at number 6 Penrose Avenue and on a normal working day I often come home from work to find cars parked throughout Penrose Avenue and no longer come into the road by turning right into Penrose Avenue (invariable meeting a car coming the other way which has used the road as a cut through) but continue and turn into Antrim Road and then into Penrose in the hope that it will be easier to turn into our drive which often has cars parked outside.

Double yellow lines outside number 2 will not solve the congestion issue.

My other concern about the road is that it is used as a cut through from Antrim Road to Nightingale road, often by cars driving too fast as they turn the corner.

I do not know what the ideal solution would be but double yellow lines on just a small area is not going to solve the congestion issue.

The scheme is proposed to address safety concerns along the bend outside property number 2, it is aimed at keeping that stretch of road clear to improve visibility for both drivers and pedestrians. The other concerns which are being raised have been added to our database of parking and traffic management requests for consideration.

This page is intentionally left blank