

Number	Plan	Road / Street	Object	Support	Support In part	Neither	Comments
1	B4	Brookfield Park	1				By reducing the amount of parking areas will not reduce the number of vehicles visiting the area seeking a parking space- this is naive. The result will be that vehicles will seek parking in other streets roads and significantly on the major throughways being Combe Park and Lansdowne Lane. These routes are busy, exceptionally so at rush hours, but increasingly now at other time. These roads are major Bus routes and also key routes for Emergency services seeking access to the RUH. The consequence that Emergency vehicles who are already struggling with response times with then have to battle with increased congestion as a result of an increase in parked vehicles should be considered a desired outcome by yourselves, is frankly bizarre. Lansdown Lane, a congested throughway with a poor safety record, currently has no parking restrictions, school times in particular see a high level of congestion. The idea that parking on both sides of the Lansdown Lane will not increase the congestion or the risk of further accidents is naive. This proposal will simply move parked vehicles from one area to another, it is not a solution merely a treatment of the symptoms without consideration of the side effects. It's from the "moving the deckchairs on the Titanic" school of thinking. Finally, what is the use a residential road which is merely an access route not a throughway? Other than peak times when residents are coming or leaving, traffic should be light when compared to throughway. What will the use be of the spaces that will be created be used for ? something to look at maybe?. Surely it is "dead space" , by allowing parking does it not therefore have a use? In effect, by allowing parking it becomes a community resource in the same way a throughway route is for the benefit

2	B8	Apsley Close	1			<p>Firstly, I note that virtually all residents of Apsley Road have off -road parking for 2 or more cars per house. As finding a parking space is not usually a problem in this road, my concerns do not directly relate to loss of parking space. Rather, I have serious concerns about road safety on Apsley Road and I fear that your proposed removal of parking spaces will make the road even more dangerous. My road safety concerns are that the street has become a rat-run with large number so of cars driving through at high speed, ignoring the new 20 mph speed limit (which I supported, but because the Council and Police have made absolutely no attempt to enforce the limit it has failed in the aim of making the road safer). Recently, there was a collision between a car and the large horse chestnut tree which still bears the signs of damage and every morning, on the way to work I witness cars driving illegally often aggressively and at speed on (or with two wheels on) the pavement. The road is used as a route to Newbridge Primary School and Oldfield School and I fear that there will be an serious accident.</p> <p>The solution to this road safety problem is for the Police to catch and prosecute the dangerous drivers (this would not be difficult as there are so many of them) and for the Council to install a handful of bollards at the curb-line to prevent people from driving on the pavement at speed. My wife recently raised the road safety issue with PC Barrington-Scott of the Police and I know that some of my neighbours have also raised their road safety concerns with the Council, but there has to date been an apparent unwillingness to do anything about the problem. Whilst I might well support amendments to parking restrictions if they were part of a wider package of road safety improvements for Apsley Road (such as some speed bumps and/or bollards to protect vulnerable pieces of the pavement for speeding cars together with a commitment from the Police to enforce proper driving standards), at the moment the parked cars act as in imperfect, but better-than-nothing form of traffic calming and I believe that to remove parked cars from the road without taking other steps to improve road safety, would be a mistake, possibly a fatal mistake.</p>
3	D7 / D8	Cedric Road	1			<p>I would like it noted that myself and several residents are against these proposals and feel that the removal of the parking bays will be detrimental to the area. Many house owners use the parking bays, providing through their parking fees, an income to the local authority and the removal will lead to more front gardens becoming car parks with all the environmental issues this can cause with water run off etc. Also the parking bays cause a natural speed trap slowing cars as a necessity which helps to maintain safety for the various young families who live in the road. This is a specially the case with the siting of these parking bays as they are situated after the bends in the road and prevent cars from speeding out of the corners. With parking at a premium and with more cars in the road, more parking bays would surely be the answer not less and we hope that you understand our concerns and remove these proposals.</p>

4	D7 / D8	Cedric Road	1			<p>We would like to register my objection to this proposal as it will reduce the number of spaces available to park in the road which are already at a premium. There are a significant number of permit holders in the road who use the set parking bays and if this proposal goes ahead it will mean parking is simply moved further down the road putting more pressure on bays in the South side of Cedric Road where parking is already difficult. It seems to us that this proposal has arisen by one or two complainants who may be finding it difficult to access their drives. There is in fact a simple solution to this which many residents have already employed. By moving the gatepost a few feet to extend the gap on to the drive is both simple and effective and costs very little. To take the parking away is of course a solution but one which will have a significant impact on all residents in the road. There is also an environmental consideration to be had in that the more parking that is taken away from the road the more the front gardens of the houses will become car parks. This reduces run off for water and would seem to contravene environmental considerations.</p>
5	D7 / D8	Cedric Road		1		<p>By all means prohibit parking but there should be no unrestricted parking during the day. Cedric Road is a quiet residential street whose residents don't want it to become a street where cars will drive around looking for parking. There is a new car park at the hospital and that is sufficient.</p>
6	D7 / D8	Cedric Road		1		<p>Many houses with similar circumstances to our driveway benefit from double lines opposite their driveway. We have an added restriction of a telegraph pole on the pavement side of the stone pillar separating our neighbours driveway, which further restricts the turning space available. There have already been two accidents and several very tricky manoeuvres negotiating the gateway. I have been dependent on my neighbours goodwill for using their driveway on many occasions.</p>
7	D7 / D8	Cedric Road		1		<p>Over a considerable number of years I have campaigned to have these parking spaces removed as it causes much inconvenience. Indeed, myself and a number of family and friends have caused very expensive damage to their cars while trying to negotiate the narrow space created by vehicles parked in the road opposite my drive. On the odd occasions I wish to take out my small caravan, I have had to wait several hours in order to access the road. In terms of residents of Cedric Road parking outside their houses, all of the houses in Cedric Road have on-drive parking for three or more cars (I have seen four to six cars parked on drives) therefore arguments for additional personal parking are spurious. May I respectfully request that the order for removal of the parking spaces be upheld?</p>
8	D7 / D8	Cedric Road	1			<p>When we moved here 12 years ago, the on street parking situation was horrendous, with little thought given to residents being able to get in and out of driveways. We therefore welcomed the introduction of double yellow lines on one side and allocated parking bays on the other. Whilst we have never had to use permit parking, because our driveway is more than adequate, neither is it a problem for us to having parking bays opposite; a couple of manoeuvres and we're out. I can only think of one minor accident in the past 12 years, when an inexperienced learner driver went round the green too quickly and clipped the wall of number 55. I do not think these bays are positioned dangerously; of far greater concern are the final two bays at the bottom end of the street where visibility of traffic coming round the bend from the right is vastly reduced by parked cars. I know that none of my direct neighbours have objected to these bays and cannot see that their position would impact on anyone else.</p>

9	D7 / D8	Cedric Road	1			<p>I am concerned that this change will reduce further the already restricted street parking available to residents in Cedric Road. The present scheme when first proposed was for residents parking but when it was implemented it was for permit parking. This allows staff from the RUH to park at all times for indefinite periods to the exclusion of residents who have paid to park outside their own property. In order to allow proper access to residents the parking should be amended to residents only as in other similar residential areas. Because of the layout of the driveways and the narrow width of the road great care needs to be taken to ensure that any parking space does not obstruct access to the entrance to each property.</p>
10	D7 / D8	Cedric Road	1			<p>Historically this road/housing was granted planning permission in the 1950's when construction regulations were far different to those in place today. I doubt any builder would be granted permission to construct a 'new build' road servicing housing with the dimensions (width) that Cedric Road has. Accepting these restrictions the council introduction of a limited number of resident parking bays in the road was universally welcomed by residents, especially those with length/width restrictions on their existing driveways. The plan to reduce the number of parking bays will only lead to more 'competition' for the remaining ones either end of the road or for residents to seek alternative solutions. Already, many of the front gardens in the road have been hard landscaped (turning front gardens into car parking) which is environmentally not the solution your council would support I would suggest? If however if this proposal is successful, and more residents seek this solution, is the council in a position to fund the cost of dropping kerbs along the road and increasing the sewer/drainage capacity which already struggles to cope in heavy rainfall? The proposal tiles show that the resident parking bay outside properties no. 56 and 54, and the resident parking bay outside properties no. 80 and 78, have been proposed to be removed and replaced with double yellow lines. As an outcome of this proposal, our adjacent neighbours and those properties opposite us are in full agreement they do not want these parking bays removed, and have no issues with access/egress onto their drives. We all agree it is never a single driving manoeuvre when arriving or departing from our driveways, but accept the situation for the benefit the parking bays offer us as residents.</p>
11	D7 / D8	Cedric Road	1			<p>Removing these spaces will significantly decrease the number of spaces available to visitors and permit holders. At the weekends when families visit these spaces are usually full. Although we are very fortunate to have driveways along the road, these are very narrow (houses were built in the 1950's when cars were a lot smaller) We pay the council to have a permit to allow us to park on the road. Lost revenue for the council? If you remove these spaces you are potentially opening up a request for more spaces to be removed. Where do you draw the line to who can or cannot have them removed? The road is very narrow and has a high number of families, whose children play out. By removing the bay's this will allow drivers to travel faster along the rd. It has been noted that when Combe Park has been shut, the volume and speed along the</p>

	12 D7 / D8	Cedric Road	1			<p>Firstly, it took a long consultation process to agree a residents parking system for Cedric Road and talking to my immediate neighbours, we have been pleased with the changes it has made. Before residents parking there were many people parking illegally and blocking drives. Cars also travelled at speed along the stretch of road. Several neighbours have a need to park on the road and have therefore purchased annual parking permits. Many of us have also purchased daily permits especially when visitors stay. Personally we have the permits available as my father-in-law prefers to park on the road as he struggles parking on the drive. To remove parking bays will limit the option of parking on the road and residents will therefore need to reconsider purchasing future permits if there aren't the spaces available to use. This will have an impact on the Council's revenue particularly in these difficult financial times. The parking bays near number 54 and 56 are always used by local residents and act as a way to slow traffic down. Without the bays at Cedric Road, it could be used as a 'rat run' to avoid the traffic and traffic lights on Combe Park. I therefore have concerns if the bays were to be removed, cars would speed along this stretch of the road and as there are many families that live at this stretch of road it would be a safety concern. I don't understand why there is a need to remove the bays and cannot see any advantages; this feeling is shared with many of my neighbours.</p>
	13 D7 / D8	Cedric Road	1			<p>Although we do not object to resiting of any residents bays that are inconvenient for any residents that may have a problem getting out of their drive, for example, having a single bay instead of a double bay, and putting in some other single bays that are practical in Cedric Road to alleviate the parking issues, we strongly object to any less parking spaces than are currently available. At the weekend, some RUH staff still park in Cedric Road when there are no restrictions and the parking spaces in the road are frequently full up at these as well as at weekday times. This also leads to additional strain for residents who have family/and or visitors come to stay or to visit. There are other places in Cedric Road that would be able to have single bays to alleviate this problem. We therefore object to these proposals.</p>

14	D7 / D8	Cedric Road	1			<p>I object to this idea, as we use these spaces frequently. We purchased a permit to allow us to do so, and also frequently use virtual permits so our visitors can park there. Whilst we have a drive we can use, we have not paved over the entire front garden, so have limited parking. We do not wish to pave over our front garden as this causes flooding and removes habitat for wildlife. I have a general concern that by removing spaces on our street, residents will find it harder to find a space, and will be more likely to pave over their garden, removing wildlife habitat and increasing surface water which can lead to flooding. I also object to the idea of removing permit holders only on Cedric Road, as I know historically Cedric Road had a real problem with people parking, leaving nowhere for residents to park on the street. Cedric Road should not be used as a carpark for the hospital. I believe that if you go ahead with these two ideas, they will create a compound effect due to a reduction in the number of spaces at the same time as an increase in demand for spaces! It seems counter-intuitive to me, and I don't understand it. So my request is very simple - please do not remove any parking spaces on Cedric Road, and please keep it as permit holders only. Having said that, I would not have an issue with the permit holders only being removed at the end of Cedric Road nearest to Chelsea Road, as we rarely use these, and there are not many houses there. However, those residents at that end of the street and on Combe Park may feel differently. From the 6-7 other households that I have spoken to, I have yet to find a resident that supports your plans. In fact, everyone I have spoken to is against them.</p>
15	D7 / D8	Cedric Road	1			<p>I would not be in favour of the removal of the Resident Parking bay. I can see that it makes it slightly more difficult for the residents in numbers 81 and 83 to use their drive, but it does not prevent the use of the drives and it has, of course, been used for a number of years like this. There are a number of other places in the road where parking is directly opposite a dropped kerb and these are used without problems. If the problem is a lack of visibility when entering/leaving the drive, I would encourage the owners of numbers 81 and 83 to look at reducing the height of the fence between the properties so that the road is visible from the drive (I'm not sure who is responsible for that boundary). Parking is particularly difficult on the street on weekends (when there are no parking restrictions and hospital staff and visitors fill the road), and I would therefore not be in favour of losing any parking unless this was done in conjunction with extending the residents parking to at least Monday-Saturday.</p>
16	D8	Audley Park Road	1			<p>I am writing to object to the very limited nature of the proposals which are to simply regularise the existing white keep clear markings. These proposals do not extend far enough and do not manage the irresponsible parking further north on the same road where parking problems are worse. The proposals should be extended.</p>

17	D8	Audley Park Road		1		<p>I am relieved that at very long last you have agreed that the White-Keep Clear line opposite the drive entrance to 32 Audley Park Road is too short. I and my family are in favour of the proposal to replace that by the 11m long 'No Parking at any time'; providing that it is centred on the centre of the drive entrance, so that vehicles, which almost without exception are travelling from and to the junction with Edward Street, can be reversed into the drive and can leave in forward gear, all without the need for being shunted backwards and forwards. I do not consider the proposed 'No Parking at Any Time' proposal for the junction with Edward Street is of sufficient length within the north west side of Audley Park Road. Due to the height of the retaining wall on the north-east side of that corner, there are no sight lines when approaching from the eastern direction. Far too frequently traffic approaching that junction from the north meets traffic from the south and east on the same east side of the road. The same potentially dangerous situation occurs for traffic travelling north on Edward Street.</p>
18	D8	Audley Park Road		1		<p>I have an objection to the removal of parking on Audley Park Road for two key reasons: - 1. the impact it will have on the safety of residents and other pedestrians crossing this intersection and owners such as myself that have to feed out of our drives at this point 2. The negative impact it will have on local residents and especially their visitors and service providers not having access to the properties. Removing parking and having more open roads will create a situation where people will drive faster thereby putting the local residents, especially the young and the elderly at risk of harm when they cross the road at this intersection. Pedestrians are forced to cross due to the pavements not being available on both sides or the road in this area. Also as myself and Neighbours are exiting our drive at this critical point, if cars are travelling faster, this puts us in greater danger of accidents and injuries occurring. While our off road drive is the normal place for myself and neighbours to park, if anyone is having work or deliveries made, we have nowhere other than the section of Audley Park Road detailed to park upon. In addition when visitors come or services such as Childcare & baby sitters are at the property, they have to park on this part of the road as our shared driveway has limited space and right of way to all must be maintained. Several of the main roads in the area such as Weston Lane, are regularly blocked as cars must wait to pass parked cars. I can see the benefit of removing parking on these roads to increase the flow of traffic and reduce emissions from stationary and stop/start cars. Audley Park Road is however not one of these, and the very nature of the unkept part of the Northern end of Audley Park Road minimises through flow of traffic. I am in favour of tighter restrictions such as residents permits so that local residents can have parking and access that they need to their properties, but to have no parking available will be very detrimental to the local residents. With a wider more open road, cars will tend to travel with less care and faster. The risk this poses is high and no clear benefit of removing local residents access and parking around their properties has been identified, so I strongly object to the proposal as it stands.</p>

19	D8	Audley Park Road	1			Whilst I can sympathise with access difficulties I am currently not in favour of the proposal. As a resident of Audley Park Road I have severe difficulties in finding a parking space for my car from 8am until 6pm Monday to Friday. If further spaces are taken from the road this will give me and my fellow neighbours on this side of the road even greater problems. We currently have access difficulties ourselves with cars parked right up to the edge of the drop curb but parking spaces are more precious than us taking more care in accessing or leaving our drive. Until the problem of commuter parking is solved we would not be in favour of further lines on the road. We are also concerned with the current safety issue with cars accessing the road from this end at speed disregarding the 20 mph limit. I believe a clearer road will add to a further increase speed.
20	D8	Audley Park Road		1		We approve of your proposal to replace the white 'Keep Clear' line opposite the drive entrance to 30 Audley Park Road with double yellow 'No Parking at Any Time' lines.
21	D8	Audley Park Road			1	There is a significant problem with vehicles exceeding the 20mph limit on this stretch of road. The issue is most noticeable during rush hour and school collection/drop off times. To deal with this we suggest: Instead of maintaining the double yellow lines on the East side as per the plan, alternating those between the East and West side to create a chicane. To provide passing points, all the existing courtesy (white) lines should be converted to double yellow lines. The residents of Nos 91 – 93 would accept a double yellow line across their communal driveway opening to protect their exit. The residents of Nos 77-89 and 95 do not want double yellow lines across their drive mouths. When changing the double yellows on the East side, care would need to be taken to preserve reasonable exit space in both directions for properties 30-40) Implementing a residents parking scheme on this stretch of Audley Park Road to discourage long term and commuter parking. Insertion of fixed term, 2 hour no return parking slots or bays at the South entrance (perhaps as far as No 79 – taking into account the amount of space needed to exit this steep drive safely) and North entrance (allowing reasonable space for exit from No 95) to provide some temporary parking facility for the nearby nursery and school, 20mph speed signs painted onto the road, 20mph signs on the lamp posts, and If budget allows, a speed checker close the unadopted road.
Totals:			15	50	1	



