

Plan	Road / Street	Object	Support	Support In part	Neither	Comments
Plan 12 / Plan 18	Englishcombe Lane	X				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We live on Englishcombe Lane and have never experienced problems with parking. Speed is the main issue on the road despite 20mph limits. Parking changes would not help this. The impact would be on residents guests and their ability to visit / stay. Not on general traffic flow in the city. Restrictions would not make the road safer (instead, a speed camera would help this). Residents have not been contacted to ask if the parking is a problem - it is not. Existing parking does not affect the flow of traffic on Englishcombe Lane.
Plan 12/18	Englishcombe Lane	X				<p>I would like to object to the proposed traffic proposal to the above streets as part of a collection of streets you are proposing to change.</p> <p>They are highly populated with residential parking and with the sudden influx of RPZs this is just going to push the problem onto these streets more and cause even more congestion and pollution.</p> <p>I strongly believe they should be left as they are before even more chaos is caused in the Moorfields area.</p>
Plan 12Plan 12/18	Englishcombe Way / Englishcombe Lane		X			We the undersigned residents of Englishcombe Way, write to support the extension of double yellow lines as documented on your map ref . 23- 008. The extension of the double yellow lines will limit parking and improve residents line of sight when exiting Englishcombe Way, hopefully making the junction less hazardous. Please see letter included in the file signed by 9 local residents.
Plan 12	Englishcombe Way / Englishcombe Lane	X				The properties along this section of Englishcombe Lane are all 4-5 bedroom properties, and therefore likely to have 3-4 adults and their vehicles. If the amount of parking is to be reduced outside 31a/31b/33, I would like to know where it is expected that the vehicles that currently use this section of road are to park ? There is no room on Englishcombe Way, and this will get worse as the council has given permission for 7 flats at number 33 (they will have cars and visitors), and Englishcombe Way is quite at saturation point too. The likely outcome is that cars will instead park on the opposite (east bound) side of the road, opposite 29/31/31a/31b/33, or on its pavement. This will surely then introduce another new problem to the nearby junction and cause pedestrian issues/narrow traffic flow etc, -has this been considered ? I am not aware of any residents requesting this proposed reduction in parking spaces, see it as not essential to the locality, and it will introduce a different kind of problem as the quantity of cars needing parking will not reduce as a result of this proposal.
Plan 10	Hensley Gardens			X		This is NOT what the residents requested, and it does not have the consensus of the residents. The residents agreed to, and requested double yellow lines on the east side of Hensley Gardens opposite Nos 1 - 3. This was requested on 28/10/22 in line with the email submission to Councillor Jess David and the Highways Dept which we were expecting to be faithfully reproduced into the TRO. The request never included restriction of parking in the bay at the end of the cul-de-sac. There has never been a problem with vehicles parking there, and it provides a useful place for visitors to temporarily park whilst visiting residents. The bay is sufficiently large that with a vehicle in the bay there is ample room for Sainsbury's, Asda, Tesco and Morrison's delivery vehicles to turn around. Their is no materiel reason why this bay should be included. One resident keeps requesting it as " they don't like to look out of the window and see vehicles there" notably referring to the garden maintenance man who parks his van whilst attending to gardens for 1 hr on Friday mornings. This "not like seeing" is not a reason for imposing parking restrictions in a street that does not have a problem with traffic flow, and its location does not present a hazard to road users. We have placed notices (No Parking, Turning area) in the bay which has kept the bay clear the last 4 years. Parking restrictions in this area is not necessary and will cause issues for the occasional visitor or maintenance tradesman servicing the area. If the Traffic Order cannot be amended to remove the parking restrictions from the bay, then I request that all proposals for Hensley Gardens are removed from the Traffic Order, to allow further discussion among residents on the way ahead. This further discussion will include the provision of 3 parking bays on the private land opposite No 3 Hensley Gardens, which will in itself negate the need double yellow lines within this area. Recommendation I have no objection to the traffic order being amended to have parking restrictions opposite No 1 - 3 Hensley Gardens only, as per the original request. I request the TRO is amended to remove proposed parking restrictions from the bay, and our original request be implemented as requested and reproduced below.
Plan 10	Hensley Gardens			X		I wish to object to double yellow lines in the bay at the end of Hensley Gardens, outside No 8 Hensley Gardens. This has not been discussed by residents and its inclusion is a complete surprise. Some residents had requested double yellow lines outside Nos 1 - 3 Hensley Gardens which we all agreed was a good idea or had no objection to. When the traffic order came out, it is showing double yellow lines in the bay at the end of the cul-de-sac. The residents have not agreed to this. Cllr Jess David was contacted and she said it was a mistake, but is not willing to get the order changed. This is wrong. It is her mistake and should be corrected. It is wrong that known mistakes are deliberately included in legal documentation. Please remove the double yellow lines from the bay outside 8 Hensley Gardens.

Plan 10	Hensley Gardens		X			I support the proposal to join the existing yellow line at the junction with Hensley Road to the yellow line on the bend in Hensley Gardens. At present, when vehicles park opposite numbers 1-3 Hensley Gardens, residents have difficulty in entering and leaving their driveways. More importantly is the safety issue caused by these vehicles. Cars turning into Hensley Gardens are forced to enter on the wrong side of the road and on at least two occasions this year, have parked in such a way that access beyond the parked vehicle has not been possible. Several cars that do park here appear to be using it for long term parking as the cars have been parked, without being moved, for a week or more and when they do move some return a few days later. It is assumed that the introduction of No Parking At Any Time refers to additional lengths of No Parking and that the existing lengths will be retained since the TRO does not state that any are to be removed. If this assumption is incorrect then I would object to the removal of the existing lengths of No Parking since they were introduced for safety (to increase visibility at the junction with Hensley Road) and to avoid parked vehicles overhanging the dropped kerb outside numbers 6 & 7 and parking opposite these driveways.
Plan 10	Hensley Gardens			X		I am in full support of the above proposal with one minor alteration. Please only apply double yellow lines to the straight section of road between No's 1 to 3 of the cul-de-sac. All residents of Hensley Gardens have discussed and are in agreement that this is the best solution to the problem. From my personal perspective as resident of Hensley Gardens I can confirm that these double yellow lines are required as soon as is humanly possible. I presently have to execute a 3 point turn to enter and leave my driveway as there are vehicles constantly parked opposite. Note that these are not even residents vehicles, they have usually been dumped there for some extended period of time, the cars parked opposite at present has been there for around a month and the vehicle before that (a large camper van) was dumped for 6 weeks. Vehicles also mount the curb to park on the lawn opposite. This lawn is actually my private property and is constantly ruined by cars parking on it. Most importantly there simply isn't room for emergency vehicles to manoeuvre down the cul-de-sac at present with multiple parked vehicles blocking their access. Also note that there is still free parking available in the immediate area around the corner on Hensley Road which unlike Hensley Gardens does not block residents driveways or access to emergency vehicles and refuse collection as this road is wide enough to accommodate. The introduction of double yellow lines in Hensley Gardens should not therefore be construed as "moving the problem elsewhere".
Plan 10	Hensley Gardens			X		We wish to comment on the traffic control measures for Hensley Gardens. We support yellow lines as proposed at the top of the cul de sac to ensure traffic flow, especially emergency vehicles, but not more yellow lines at the bottom. This is because a combination of yellow lines on the bends and No Parking notices in the turning circle are currently preventing habitual nuisance parking there.
Plan 10	Hensley Gardens			X		I am writing to support the no parking restriction (double yellows) directly opposite numbers 1 -3 Hensley Gardens only. We have cars parked here on a daily basis often left for days which block access to our drives and make access to the rest of the road very difficult. I do not support the yellow lines extending into the hammer head opposite no's 8-9. This is unnecessary and there are no issues with turning in this area.

Plan 13	Southdown Road	X			<p>The proposal is to remove the parking at the points specified between Teddington Close and Loxley Gardens (looking approx south and uphill). For the future, this will create havoc for the residents who park outside their houses at the lower end of Southdown Road. Under the other new proposals further down into Oldfield Park with only residents permit parking and two cars per residence, the knock on effect for student property/multiple occupancy and with properties with more that two cars will be to park up Southdown Road. So restricting parking up between Teddington Close and Loxley gardens will produce parking friction. It will mean, a loss of parking potentially with the residents at the lower end of Southdown Road, whom would suffer the results of the overspill from Oldfield Park. In other words parking would be used up at the bottom of Southdown Road, partially denied to the residents there and whom would have to park elsewhere. The obvious overspill parking for both sets of drivers, is where the new parking restrictions are proposed. Safety argument, slowing down of vehicles. The proposed blanket no parking at any time on Southdown Rd between Teddington Close and Loxley Gardens (looking approx south and uphill) would appear to be totally unnecessary. We have had parking on both sides of the road at the bottom of Southdown Road for longer than 40 years. In other words, between Lymore Avenue and Teddington Close. Traffic still moves relatively freely and in busy periods there is a very good safety benefit in that it does slow vehicles down. If you hypothetically retain parking on both sides up the hill, up between Teddington Close and Loxley Gardens the same safety benefit would apply. Whereby a parking ban on one side, up the road, would increase the traffic speed. The driver sees an open space and increases speed. In this way, there is room for large vehicles to move, albeit in an effective one lane channel. The council's own recycling lorries negotiate the existing one lane channel at the bottom of Southdown Road. The same would apply further up.</p> <p>My view is that the safety angle for pedestrians is paramount. Finance element. There must be a case for low landscaping secret policeman down this road as the traffic has increased and there is a significant element that ignore the 20mph limit. There may be drawbacks to this, but the cheaper plan is to keep parking on each side of the road up the hill as specified.</p>
Plan 13	Southdown Road	X			<p>Just putting my objection to Southdown Road. I can understand putting this in at junctions but why on a long section of the road and Teddington close. All you are doing is restricting parking for people and moving cars elsewhere & possibly making it worse for people to park.</p> <p>The other side of it is the safety aspect as it does slow traffic going up and down the road with the car parking along those sections.</p>
Plan 13	Southdown Road	X			<p>Why is it thought necessary to have no parking restrictions outside 110-136 Southdown Road? Why are there no no parking restrictions on Southdown Road at the point Belmore Gardens joins Southdown Road, near a sharp bend in Southdown Road? It is not clear to me how far the no parking at any time restrictions extend outside 101 & 103 Southdown Road. Is the purpose of this particular no parking restriction related to the post box, shop and post office at 101 Southdown Road or is it related to increasing visibility splay from the off street parking at 103 Southdown Road? If it doesn't include the later I would like to request that the later are included.</p>
Plan 13	Southdown Road	X			<p>I OBJECT to the above proposal. The No Parking At Any Time signs will be unsightly and add to sign overload in the area of Southdown Road. The proposed No Parking lines on the road are not necessary, the majority of drivers obey the Highway Code and do not park close to the corner. There is no need for No Parking road markings to enforce this. The road markings will be visual pollution in this neighbourhood.</p>
Plan 13	Southdown Road	X			<p>I strongly object to the above proposed traffic proposal. In particular southdown road. By stopping people parking on Southdown road people will park in the adjoining roads making it very difficult for emergency services to attend to possible emergencies in these adjoining roads. I do not see an issue with the parking on Southdown road at present, so I see no need to implement these restrictions. Everyone (who pays road tax) should be entitled to park outside their home, and these restrictions will stop this. Would there be a rebate or reduction in road tax if these silly proposals went ahead? The local councillors have not informed residents of these underhand proposals, which I note, have not only come to light from an eagle eyed local but also come to light after the election. Please advise who put these proposals forward as I would like to personally write to them. I also wanted to add that this will have a negative social impact on the residents. How many of the residents in these roads rely on carers, nurses etc. Have this been assessed?</p>

Plan 13	Southdown Road	X				The road markings will be visual pollution in this neighbourhood and are unnecessary. Drivers generally obey the Highway Code rules and do not park close to the corner. There hasn't been the need for No Parking signs on the corner of these roads for 60+ years, and I don't think that there is likely to be a major reason for a large number of additional vehicles in the area. Why do you now consider it necessary to add No Parking signs in this area? Definitely not necessary. Why don't you spend the extra money on fixing the potholes and improving the road surface rather than painting the roads creating more visual pollution?
Plan 13	Southdown Road	X				The reason for my objection to the traffic proposal, is that it will force traffic to park in surrounding roads, including where I live in Lytton Gardens. Parking in Lytton Gardens is already a problem and it is often impossible or very difficult to manoeuvre my car on and off my driveway due to parked cars. The parking restrictions already in place on Lytton Gardens are insufficient and unpatrolled, so if the above traffic proposal is to go ahead, I would like to it be amended so that the parking restrictions on Lytton Gardens are extended and patrols put in place to ensure they are adhered to.
Plan 13	Southdown Road		X			We approve of the installation of yellow lines on the left hand side of the Road, proceeding down the hill, to prevent the parking of vans, cars by local residents who already have private drives and garages to park their own vehicles. Continuous parking by such residents and non residents of Southdown Road contributes to a hazard when exiting/entering our drive. Although there are speed restrictions these are ignored by cars, commercial vehicles and the most dangerous of all, cyclists and electric scooters, speeding down the hill. This dangerous situation has been apparent to us and other residents for a number of years with the local Councillors ignoring the residents situation. For the safety of residents such as us, and traffic speeding down the road, we would appreciate some action as proposed, under ref:23-008,.
Plan 13	Southdown Road		X			We would like to express our thanks for the effort you are going to in order to try to make our lives safer. Anything that you can do to make it safer when driving on and off of our drive onto Southdown Road will literally be a life saver. If there could be a permanent way to ensure we have clear vision that would be wonderful. There are very frequent occasions when we cannot see up or down the road and cannot see approaching traffic up or down the road. Needless to say we have many near misses. Where possible someone will wait across the road to beckon the driver out when the road is clear, which is not without danger. Needless to say speeding traffic does not help, but sadly wherever speed monitoring is positioned it is very easy for motorists to see the vehicle. So there is no effective speed control. An automatic digital speed camera would be the ultimate deterrent, but we understand from Council representatives that such a camera can only be sanctioned following a fatality! We hope that somehow the Traffic Management Team can help us and other neighbours similarly affected.
Plan 3	North View Close	X				In the years that I have lived here the number of vehicles parking in the Close has steadily increased, at times it's not possible to secure street parking. The kerb/middle island at the turning end of the Close has already been moved further back by the Council many years ago, this has been more than adequate to assist larger vehicles turning. It is rare that even the largest vehicles that use the Close are unable to do a 3-point-turn, even with cars parked in the area that the Council wish to make No Parking Zones. I'm not aware of any accidents caused by parked vehicles. In North View Close alone I estimate that, including residents with driveways no longer being able to park over their driveway, this proposal will remove the ability to park approximately 8 cars. Larger vehicles, such as Council refuse trucks, rarely use the Close in comparison to the residents who use the Close for parking 24/7. Removing the ability to park in these Zones 24/7 purely for the benefit of the odd vehicle that has to reverse to turn is not acceptable. The proposal will also make it easier to take the turn at speed and increase the overall speed up and down the road, which is less safe than the current position whereby drivers have to take the turn slowly. Parked cars act as a traffic calming measure here. A lot of children live in this Close and providing unnecessary extra space for all vehicles, including the numerous delivery vans, to turn at greater speed is not acceptable. Removing parked vehicles from the large tarmac area at the end of the Close will also create a large 'playground' which is also not acceptable or particularly safe. I have spoken to neighbours in passing who are also against this proposal and are annoyed that necessary street parking, parking outside houses that has existed forever, is being removed for little notable benefit.
Plan 16	Moorfields Road	X				I would like to object to the proposed traffic proposal to the above streets as part of a collection of streets you are proposing to change. They are highly populated with residential parking and with the sudden influx of RPZs this is just going to push the problem onto these streets more and cause even more congestion and pollution. I strongly believe they should be left as they are before even more chaos is caused in the Moorfields area.

Plan 9	Moorefields Drive	X				I would like to object to the proposed traffic proposal to the above streets as part of a collection of streets you are proposing to change. They are highly populated with residential parking and with the sudden influx of RPZs this is just going to push the problem onto these streets more and cause even more congestion and pollution. I strongly believe they should be left as they are before even more chaos is caused in the Moorfields area.
Total:		13	4	5		