

## Appendix 3 - Summary of Objections Received, including Officer Responses

No.	Summary of Main Issues Raised	Officer Response
1	<p><u>Arbury Road</u></p> <p>There is no real justification or need for a parking scheme.</p> <p>Insufficient parking spaces at Milton Road end with too many double yellow lines.</p> <p>Short-stay parking is required to support businesses near Milton Road.</p> <p>Properties on the north-east side should be included in zone as it will create parking issues for residents, their visitors, tradespersons, etc.</p>	<p>The Milton Road Area was highlighted by local members as being a priority area for an RPS. Following the 2022 consultation, residents of the zone were overall 54% in favour of its introduction, although on Arbury Road this was 18%.</p> <p>Arbury Road has been assessed throughout designs as residents highlight the need for parking capacity both pre and post consultation, Given the road widths and layout of the road itself we have maximised parking bay capacity where it can be done safely.</p> <p>The current parking that shops on Milton Road were able to use has not been removed. These parking areas are retained as part of the Milton Road construction project.</p> <p>The Northern side of Arbury Road was not included within the boundary due to the amount of private properties (many with private parking) on this side. The predicted permit eligibility of these properties would far exceed available capacity and potentially negate the purpose of the RPS. There is scope to review this after implementation when we will have a better sense of occupancy rates for the scheme as defined.</p>
2	<p><u>Hurst Park Avenue, Highfield Avenue, Highworth Avenue, Leys Road and Mulberry Close area</u></p> <p>The parking issues are not severe enough to justify a residents parking scheme.</p> <p>Cost and administration of permits unacceptable, particularly due to current cost of living crisis.</p>	<p>The Milton Road Area was highlighted by local members as being a priority area for an RPS. Following the 2022 consultation, residents of the zone were overall 54% in favour of its introduction. On these specific roads support was 61% (Hurst Park Avenue), 52% (Highfield Avenue), 53% (Highworth Avenue), 39% (Leys Road) and 29% (Mulberry Close).</p> <p>Costs are maintained in line with all other RPS within the city and set by Parking Policy and Parking services to ensure that the programme remains costs neutral to the authority.</p>

	<p>The operational hours should be reduced to make it more convenient and less costly for residents and visitors.</p> <p>RPS will create serious problems for Dental Practice's clients and staff.</p> <p>The scheme will result in too much street furniture/clutterA.</p> <p>Concerns about the reduction in number of available parking spaces.</p>	<p>The hours proposed are what is deemed required to ensure enforceability whilst ensuring the best possible scheme for all residents, these currently represent the lowest permit costs within the pricing structure.</p> <p>It is proposed to provide some mixed-use bays (2 hour or permit holders) near the dental practice on Hurst Park Avenue.</p> <p>When installing the scheme we would limit street furniture to the minimum requirement possible within legislation.</p> <p>Given the road widths and layout of the road itself we have maximised parking bay capacity where it can be done safely.</p>
3	<p><u>Havenfield, Arbury Road</u></p> <p>The site has limited parking capacity and many visitors, including carers, frequently park in Leys Road and other streets in planned RPS zone. Havenfield should be included in the RPS to enable these essential visitors to purchase permits to park with the RPS.</p> <p>Residents are being unfairly discriminated against, partly due to their age.</p> <p>Other RPSs do not split roads in the way that is proposed for Arbury Road.</p> <p>It will force Hevenfield residents to walk long distances to find suitable parking which is unreasonable and unsafe, due to their age and vulnerability.</p> <p>Inadequate consultation and notification of results.</p>	<p>The north side of Arbury Road was not included within the boundary due to the amount of private properties (many with private parking) on this side considering permit eligibility of these properties would far exceed available capacity.</p> <p>Similar comments were received during the public consultation. These comments have been reviewed and discussions have taken place with residents and members. However, it is felt that at this time including the northern side of Arbury Road (particularly given the large number of properties here) could negate the purpose of the scheme due to extreme capacity issues, resulting in few residents within the area being able to park near their homes.</p> <p>It is proposed that this be considered under a 6-month review and should there be a proven concern, and capacity demonstrated capacity available, that there be consideration to extend the boundary to include these properties.</p> <p>Blue badge holders of any address will be able to park within the Resident Parking Scheme without needing a permit.</p> <p>The proposed RPS has been the subject of a multi-stage public consultation process. The responses received during the earlier engagement exercises, were used to inform the final design. That design was fully consulted on as part of the more recent statutory TRO publication.</p>

4	<p><u>Milton Road</u></p> <p>RPS will harm local businesses which have already lost parking due to Milton Road improvements. Short-stay parking is required.</p>	<p>The current parking that shops on Milton Road were able to use has not been removed. These parking areas are retained as part of the Milton Road construction project.</p>
4	<p><u>Herbert Street and Springfield Road</u></p> <p>Proposed single-sided parking and resultant reduction in parking capacity will significantly impact residents.</p>	<p>This road is below width requirements to install double sided parking within Policy.</p> <p>Extensive investigation has taken place within the area including meeting with Fire and Rescue services to confirm, as currently emergency vehicles cannot access the road due to width restrains with double sided parking.</p> <p>In the 2022 consultation support for the proposed RPS from Herbert Road residents was 71%. Support was 33% from Springfield Road residents. This compares to 54% for the area overall.</p>
5	<p><u>Hawthorn Way</u></p> <p>Not justified as residents can usually find parking spaces.</p> <p>Negative impact on nearby businesses.</p>	<p>The Milton Road Area was highlighted by local members as being a priority area for an RPS. Following the 2022 consultation, a majority of residents of the zone overall (54%) were in favour of its introduction. Hawthorn Way residents were 40% in support of its introduction. Whilst parking may not currently be constrained on all streets it is oversubscribed on others and some balancing will be required across the area.</p> <p>No change is being made to parking restrictions on Chesterton Road itself, although it is noted that customers may park on the side streets on the north side at present. These are some of the most congested streets in the proposed scheme. RPSs are generally used in areas where there is competing parking demand from a mixture of users such as residents, businesses and shoppers. They aim to give priority to residents who live in the area a fair chance of parking close to their homes. Blue badge holders who need to access to businesses will be able to park in resident bays. The proposed hours of operation are 9.30-3.00.</p>
6	<p><u>Chesterton Road</u></p>	

	<p>Properties on the north side of Chesterton Road rely on parking in side roads, but are excluded from Milton RPS.</p> <p>Eligibility to buy permits for De Freville RPS is illogical and inconvenient.</p>	<p>Chesterton Road is outside of the proposed boundary for the RPS, but is within the existing De Freville RPS. Residents of Chesterton Road are able to park anywhere within the existing scheme boundary.</p> <p>The 'Chesterton Triangle' area has highly constrained parking capacity and including residents of an existing residential parking scheme is likely to lead to the scheme as a whole being over capacity. However, there is potential to reconsider this at the six-month review when there is clearer evidence of available capacity post-implementation.</p>
7	<p><u>Chantry Close</u></p> <p>Households should be eligible to park in adjacent streets within the RPS.</p>	<p>This will be the case: a Resident Parking Permit entitles residents to park in a marked bay on any street inside the scheme boundary.</p> <p>Only one response to the 2022 consultation was received from residents of Chantry Close, which was opposed to the proposed scheme.</p>
8	<p><u>Chesterton Hall Crescent</u></p> <p>Concerns about overspill from Herbert Street and request to extend the operational hours to cover weekends.</p>	<p>A Resident Parking Permit entitled residents to park within any street inside the scheme boundary.</p> <p>Hours were set to ensure that the scheme is in the best interest of all residents while ensuring costs are appropriate for the concerns. The proposed review at six months is an opportunity to pick up any issues with operation, including hours, whether it works as intended.</p> <p>Only two responses to the 2022 consultation were received from residents of Chesterton Hall Crescent. Both were in favour of the proposed scheme.</p>
9	<p><u>George Street</u></p> <p>Concerns about overspill from Herbert Street due to reduced spaces in that road.</p> <p>Parking is heaviest during evenings, so the scheme won't work, but will still cost residents.</p>	<p>A Resident Parking Permit entitled residents to park within any street inside the scheme boundary.</p> <p>Hours were set to ensure that the scheme is in the best interest of all residents while ensuring costs are appropriate for the concerns. The proposed review at six months is an opportunity to pick up any issues with operation, including hours, whether it works as intended.</p> <p>Properties within the scheme boundary can apply for permits and will be eligible to park anywhere within</p>

		<p>scheme boundary. There are a number of streets that may have capacity deficit on the street, however being within the boundary aims to assist with locating nearby resident parking.</p> <p>There was 50% support for the proposed RPS in response to the 2022 consultation from George Street residents.</p>
--	--	--

