

APPENDIX A: MERSEY ROAD AREA PARKING SCHEME - SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS AND COUNCIL'S RESPONSE

Street	Ref	Object (Y/N)	Comments	Council's Response
Arnside Grove	14	Y	<p>I would like to object to an aspect of the plan sent through our door today. I live at ■ Arnside Grove, Sale. The plan shows that only part of the road (Arnside grove) will be permitted parking area for residents (green squares). The other part of the road will be waiting restrictions or limited parking for 2 hours (blue section and green dotted line).</p> <p>As a resident, I do not think that any restrictions on this second part of the road will be required (the blue and green dotted line), essentially because our needs are covered by the green square section of the map 'proposed permitted parking area for residents'.</p> <p>The grounds that I object to this are that: A. As the needs of residents are already accounted for in the green square section, there is no justification for further restricting parking (because the main reason for parking restrictions are that resident are complaining).</p>	<p>The results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised as presented to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Atkinson Road	238	Y	<p>Can you tell me how many permits we can have? There are 4 adults living at this address with 4 cars, so we would need 4 permits.</p> <p>All 4 adults at ■ Atkinson Rd sale m33 ■ strongly object to the parking restrictions outside our house on the grounds we have 4 cars so won't be able to obtain "resident permits" for 3 of the cars so will have nowhere to park unless you can suggest sometime suitable the previous reply by e-mail by Spencer Pritchard was of no help what so ever.</p>	<p>Properties with no dedicated off-street parking are eligible to apply for two resident permits and those properties with some form of off-street parking, i.e. driveway or garage, are eligible to apply for one permit. Up to two vehicles can be registered to a single permit allowing them to be transferred between vehicles during the hours of operation.</p> <p>The proposed TRO has been revised, removing the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm (single yellow line) restriction subject to the approval of the recommendation of this report. This would provide additional 'free' on-street parking for residents and non-residents.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Atkinson Road	33	Y	<p>Following receipt of your letter dated 30th August 2018 in respect of the above proposals I confirm my objection to the scheme as currently proposed. Specifically, as a resident which occupies the corner plot of Atkinson and Merton Road, my comments relate to the proposed parking scheme to Merton Road given this is where our driveway is accessed from and where we / our visitors park.</p> <p>There is currently ample unrestricted parking for residents on Merton road to service local households. The one issue has always been the lack of available parking for residents during weekdays due to parking by people who work in some of the local commercial premises.</p> <p>The currently proposed solution of creating circa 3 spaces of unrestricted parking, circa 4 spaces of residents parking and one complete side of the road with no parking between 8am and 6pm does not address the problem whatsoever. In fact, it creates 2 issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reduction in available parking space for residents, particularly between 8am and 6pm, noting local residents have varied working patterns so the 8-6 restriction is restrictive for residents • Safety. Merton Road is used extensively as a cut-through, with vehicles already travelling at speed despite parking on both sides of the road. Creating more space by restricting parking along one side runs the risk of traffic traveling at greater speed which, given the densely populated area, adjacency to local primary school and number of young families along the road, presents an increased safety risk <p>In light of the fact the current proposal does not resolve Merton Road parking issues, reduces parking options for local residents and creates a significant safety issue I object unreservedly. Furthermore, if the plans cannot be amended to provide Residents' Parking to both sides of Merton Road then Merton Road should be removed from the proposed scheme altogether.</p> <p>Following local consultation and as you state in your correspondence, it is clear other residents across neighbouring roads have successfully opted out of this parking scheme having reviewed the proposed plans. This would appear to suggest the proposed plan does not work nor does it take account of the issues being raised by the residents the scheme is attempting to resolve.</p>	<p>Permits will be valid across the entire scheme area and not on an individual road basis, i.e. a permit issued to a car registered to Atkinson Road could park in Mersey Road. Permits are not transferrable or valid between different schemes, i.e. a Mersey Road area permit would not be valid in the Barker's Lane area scheme.</p> <p>The proposed TRO has been revised, removing the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm (single yellow line) restriction as well as effectively removing Merton Road from the proposed resident permit parking scheme subject to the approval of the recommendation of this report.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			Finally, can you please respond to my query raised previously in respect of whether I qualify for Residents' Parking permits on Merton Road given our address.	
Atkinson Road	132	Y	Reduction of available on street parking for residents. The inconvenience and cost of permits for resident, visitors and trades people.	<p>The proposed TRO has been revised, removing the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm (single yellow line) restriction as well as effectively removing Merton Road from the proposed resident permit parking scheme subject to the approval of the recommendation of this report.</p> <p>It is Borough-wide Council policy, and has been for several years, to charge for resident and visitor permits. The fees derived contribute towards the cost of administration, the production of the permits and an element of the enforcement costs. A ruling in the High Court found against a Council that intended to generate additional income to defray other road transport expenditure and reduce the need to raise income from other sources. This is not the case in Trafford where, as indicated, the permit income off-sets the cost of introducing, maintaining, administering and enforcing the scheme.</p> <p>It is accepted that some residents will not feel the need to purchase a permit, not only because they have off-street parking; residents with no off-street parking have a greater entitlement to purchase permits than those with off-street parking and it is the Council's view that residents with no access to off-street parking derive greater benefit than those who do in terms of increased opportunities that the scheme would afford to find a convenient on-street parking space during the operational hours.</p> <p>Whilst there is no guarantee that residents will be able to find a parking space near to their homes during operational hours, and no-one has a fundamental right to park their vehicle on the public highway, the Council is of the view that by removing a significant amount of long-stay daytime on-street parking by non-residents it is far more likely that residents will be able to park which would outweigh the cost and perceived inconvenience of applying for a permit.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Belmont Road	11	Y	<p>With reference to the Mersey Road area parking scheme, I am writing to express my objections. For 35 years, my wife and I have lived on the cul-de-sac end of Belmont Road (no [redacted]) and have never had any issues with parking at the times you now wish to institute parking restrictions in the nearby roads. Indeed, the only difficulties we have encountered have been at evenings and weekends and have been caused by the residents themselves.</p> <p>Sale is a major employer in the area and I find it bewildering that Trafford should want to make it so difficult for people by restricting street parking for workers and shoppers who are effectively taking up parking spaces of residents who are out at work anyway! You talk of congestion in the streets in the area. Probably, Park Avenue is one of the busier streets, but nonetheless perfectly navigable. Also, at least 50% of the vehicles parked there on weekdays are the white vans of people working in the road and their associated skips with the rest a mix of residents, visitors and workers at "Cap Gemini" who, I believe will be leaving once the planning application to turn their offices into flats goes through.</p> <p>I must also most strongly protest at your intention to put double yellow lines at the junction of Belmont Road and Park Avenue. In our 35 years here, there have NEVER been any collisions at this junction due to the presence of parked cars (I challenge you to contradict me on this). Every week the refuse collectors happily reverse four axle rigid trucks into the cul-de-cac without any hassle and in any one week we enjoy a parade of delivery vehicles large and small which come and go with no problem! In your efforts to resolve a problem which doesn't exist you will reduce the parking spaces for at least 4 cars thus greatly increasing parking pressure on Belmont Road. Indeed, are you under any legal obligation to install double yellow lines?? If so why only now and not 5,10,20 years ago???</p> <p>Talking to residents in the surrounding streets, I have yet to find anyone who is for this scheme which leads me to suspect that this project was initiated by only a small number of residents. Is this the case??</p> <p>Lastly, a near neighbour who moved from the road recently gave, as a principal reason for leaving, the impending imposition of traffic restrictions. I hope and trust that it is not your aim to make life unpleasant for the residents of this area.</p> <p>With reference to the Mersey Road area parking scheme, I am writing to express my objections.</p>	<p>The proposed TRO has been revised, removing much of the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm (single yellow line) restriction effectively providing a significant amount of unrestricted road space available for long-stay on-street parking.</p> <p>It is Borough-wide Council policy, and has been for several years, to charge for resident and visitor permits. The fees derived contribute towards the cost of administration, the production of the permits and an element of the enforcement costs. A ruling in the High Court found against a Council that intended to generate additional income to defray other road transport expenditure and reduce the need to raise income from other sources. This is not the case in Trafford where, as indicated, the permit income off-sets the cost of introducing, maintaining, administering and enforcing the scheme.</p> <p>It is accepted that some residents will not feel the need to purchase a permit, not only because they have off-street parking; residents with no off-street parking have a greater entitlement to purchase permits than those with off-street parking and it is the Council's view that residents with no access to off-street parking derive greater benefit than those who do in terms of increased opportunities that the scheme would afford to find a convenient on-street parking space during the operational hours.</p> <p>Whilst there is no guarantee that residents will be able to find a parking space near to their homes during operational hours, and no-one has a fundamental right to park their vehicle on the public highway, the Council is of the view that by removing a significant amount of long-stay daytime on-street parking by non-residents it is far more likely that residents will be able to park which would outweigh the cost and perceived inconvenience of applying for a permit.</p> <p>The proposed No Waiting At Any Time (double yellow lines) at the junction of Belmont Road and Park Avenue seek to allow for protection of access and visibility at the junction and the effective enforcement by the Council's Parking Services team and to safeguard against the effects of parking demand migrating as a result of the proposal in the vicinity of this location.</p> <p>Council officers and Ward Members have received many complaints/requests for permit parking from residents throughout this area over a significant period, therefore it's right that these requests are considered as part of a wider scheme taking into account roads on the periphery that might not currently experience parking problems but would likely do so if a scheme were to be implemented in neighbouring roads. The origins of the proposed scheme are these specific requests received from residents to assist residents.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

<p>Belmont Road</p>	<p>42</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I am interested in your comments on double yellow lines, particularly your acknowledgement that there will be additional pressure caused by displaced parking on adjacent unrestricted roads (such as Belmont Road). Your admission, serves only to highlight the folly of Amendment 212 as all it will do is move the perceived parking problem elsewhere thus making life more difficult for people on those streets who have not opted for the mod. You don't solve a problem by "parking" it elsewhere other people's doorsteps!!!</p> <p>Lastly, on a recent walk round the surrounding streets, I was shocked to note the appalling state of the yellow lines some of which have been only recently painted. At best, they are all broken up with some reduced to powder. Also, the roads themselves are in desperate need of repair/resurfacing. Would it not be more intelligent to spend ratepayers' contributions on making these repairs good first before making any additional expenditure on implementing "212"?? (unless, of course, Amey/Trafford stand to make a profit from this amendment - I sincerely hope not as that would be completely immoral and unethical)</p>	<p>The proposed TRO has been revised, removing much of the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm (single yellow line) restriction effectively providing a significant amount of unrestricted road space available for long-stay on-street parking. It is considered that this will minimise the likelihood of a transfer of demand for long-stay on-street parking to roads further away from those where the proposal is to be implemented.</p> <p>It is accepted that some residents will not feel the need to purchase a permit, not only because they have off-street parking; residents with no off-street parking have a greater entitlement to purchase permits than those with off-street parking and it is the Council's view that residents with no access to off-street parking derive greater benefit than those who do in terms of increased opportunities that the scheme would afford to find a convenient on-street parking space during the operational hours.</p> <p>Whilst there is no guarantee that residents will be able to find a parking space near to their homes during operational hours, and no-one has a fundamental right to park their vehicle on the public highway, the Council is of the view that by removing a significant amount of long-stay daytime on-street parking by non-residents it is far more likely that residents will be able to park which would outweigh the cost and perceived inconvenience of applying for a permit.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
<p>Belmont Road</p>	<p>170</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed parking scheme in the Mersey Road / Southern Road area of Sale.</p> <p>As a resident of Belmont Road, I am extremely concerned about the implications of the scheme for my family and our neighbours. As the scheme currently stands, Belmont Road will be the first road after Washway Road without any sort of parking restrictions. Although we do not currently struggle to park on Belmont Road during the day, this will change if the scheme is introduced as we are bound to suffer from displacement from areas within the boundaries of the large scheme. Unlike huge swathes of the area in which the scheme is being introduced, most houses on Belmont Road are reliant on on-street parking for our own cars as we have no off-road parking space. As a part time worker who is dependent on my car to get to work, I am at a loss at what I am expected to do if the scheme is introduced. On days when I return from work in the middle of the day, I expect that there will be occasions when I am unable to park on my own road because it will be taken up in its entirety by commuters. I won't be able to park anywhere else either, because all the roads that surround Belmont Road will be included in the permit scheme. Am I expected to keep trying to move my car every two hours until the parking restrictions end? Please can you suggest what am I expected to do in these circumstances?</p> <p>When we were originally consulted on these proposals, I indicated that I did not think a scheme was necessary on Belmont Road at present. However, I was quite clear that if it was decided to formally advertise a scheme, then Belmont Road should be included in the TRO for the reasons above. The proposed scheme will not resolve any issues that exist in the Mersey Road / Southern Road area - it will simply push them two minutes further down the road into terraced streets that have no off-road parking. It will not solve the supposed issues with inconsiderate parking but will instead just push them into a smaller area.</p> <p>Like many residents from across the entire area of the scheme, I have grave concerns about the overall loss of parking spaces if it is introduced. Although Belmont Road (and its neighbouring roads, such as Abbey Road and the top of Park Avenue) suffer with no daytime parking issues, parking spaces are at an absolute premium in the evening and at weekends. This pressure is not because of commuter parking but because there are too many residents with too many cars, all vying for too few spaces. The parking scheme proposes to introduce lots of waiting restrictions that will remove parking from one side of whole streets after 8am and to introduce a restricted number of parking bays. Overall there will be a huge loss of on street parking space in the area and it is local residents, not commuters who be penalised. There will be ridiculous situations, with householders rushing out their houses just 8am in a desperate panic to try and park their cars somewhere else within the scheme before it starts again. I do not believe that Trafford Council or Local Members have really considered the level of car ownership in the area against the number of parking bays the scheme will introduce.</p>	<p>The proposed TRO has been revised, removing much of the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm (single yellow line) restriction effectively providing a significant amount of unrestricted road space available for long-stay on-street parking. It is considered that this will minimise the likelihood of a transfer of demand for long-stay on-street parking to roads further away from those where the proposal is to be implemented.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>If the Council really believes that a scheme is required to tackle problem parking by commuters and office workers in this area, then perhaps it could have considered other ideas that would not have penalised local residents. Some areas that suffer with problems with commuter parking have introduced schemes that have resident only parking between 10am - 12pm. This sort of scheme would have prevented long day commuter parking, but equally would mitigate some of the problems with displacement that Belmont Road residents are likely to suffer from, by allowing us to park on neighbouring roads if we arrive home in the middle of the day and find our own road completely full.</p>	
<p>CROSS STREET (BUSINESSES)</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Training Qualifications UK is a local employer with a current staff count of 24. We are currently in the process of recruiting for more staff members to start with us in the next 8 months, all of whom are likely to come from the local areas of Sale, Altrincham, Sale Moor, Stretford or Timperley. We recently relocated from Salford to Trafford and as a result have provided direct employment for local people. Our growth projections for the next 3 years indicate that in total we will be recruiting around 20-25 people by the end of 2019.</p> <p>In addition to the contributions we make via business rates, these staff members will all contribute to the local economy in smaller ways: engaging with independent local businesses and shops. We are now entering into regular, permanent arrangements with local barbers and catering companies to provide our business with staff perks and meeting catering services.</p> <p>As a company based in a commercial building located on Cross Street, the proposed restrictions would have a direct and significant impact on our ability for us to carry out our work. With limited car parking available with our building, and regular visitors to our offices, there are not enough spaces to accommodate our staff. Already we have several staff members who utilise the on-street parking available in order to allow them to come to work. Introducing these restrictions would, inevitably, result in some members of our current staff being unable to work here as they do not have alternative means of transport.</p> <p>In addition, it would severely restrict the pool of candidates who would be available to us for recruitment purposes. Our inability to offer suitable and convenient parking arrangements to potential candidates would be a deciding factor in candidates' decisions to take a role. We have experienced this before and it was a contributing factor to our decision to relocate offices back in August last year.</p> <p>The commercial occupiers in the area have existed alongside the residential occupiers for a substantial amount of time. To consider the proposals mainly from a residential perspective fails to take into account the mixed use and combined needs of the area. I do understand the motivations for the review and why parking restrictions are necessary in some areas. It is, however, essential to properly consider the impact upon all stakeholders and not prioritise the consequences to one over another. We do not feel that enough has been done to engage with local businesses to consider options, offer alternatives and gather feedback or impact statements.</p> <p>I would also question whether the low response rate – largely from frustrated local residents – is a valid evidence base for introducing restrictions with such far reaching consequences. Whilst I appreciate that the frustrations of these residents are valid, it is a well-known fact that those who are frustrated are far more likely to respond to a consultation than those who are not, and a low sample size of voluntary feedback is likely to reflect what may be a relatively small section of the local resident community.</p> <p>TQUK moved to this area on the understanding that we could rely on the availability of additional parking in the local area that is a reasonable distance from our office and would not cost our staff or the business anything to use above and beyond the substantial business rates that we contribute. If there are to be some restrictions, there is an absolute need for an accommodation of the business needs of the area in the form of permits similar to those which we presume will be issued to residents.</p> <p>We urge you to consider the impact that these restrictions will have upon our business and our ability to stay in our current offices. Our staff are enthusiastic, dedicated, local people who enjoy coming to work and contributing to building Trafford up into a thriving</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area (subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>area. To impose upon them unreasonable requirements relating to a practicality like parking will, without a doubt, have consequences on their ability to continue to work with us. These things may not seem too important in the grand scheme of things, but they matter. They matter as much as the views of the local residents and we are keen to engage with you further to better present our thoughts and ideas on this proposal.</p>	
Cross Street (Business)	20	Y	<p>We have today received your letter, dated 30th August 2018, relating to the proposed parking schemes for the Mersey Road/Southern Road area in Sale, Manchester.</p> <p>I believe my colleague, [REDACTED], got in touch last year to express our concerns, as a local business, at the parking schemes you are proposing to implement.</p> <p>Our business is based at [REDACTED] Cross Street, Sale, Manchester, in between Florence Street and Elm Grove. We own both [REDACTED] and the two flats located above the retail units. We have been at this address since November 2013 and currently have 9 full time employees who are office based as well as sub-contractors who are site based but visit the office regularly.</p> <p>The parking restrictions will affect our business operation and if permits cannot be issued to our company/employees to allow us to park on Elm Grove/Florence Street we will be forced to move from these premises – this will obviously come at a costly expense to the business, an expense that we feel we shouldn't have to pay.</p> <p>Although there are other roads within walking distance to our offices, it would not present a professional picture of our company and facilities for prospective clients and employees.</p> <p>Can you confirm whether parking permits can also be granted to our business for Florence Street/Elm Grove? If so, we will have no objection to the permit parking scheme but if not then we will have to contest your proposals and would look to seek compensation for the expenses and costs involved in locating our business elsewhere. Having to relocate our business elsewhere, to find suitable premises, could mean losing employees who have already expressed concerns with us potentially have to move the business to another site.</p> <p>I would just like to make you aware that issues with parking have become much worse since Styles & Wood moved into the building on Cross Street, opposite the Shell Garage. There appear to be at least 50-100 employees at this business with limited to no parking available for them apart from on the local residential streets.</p> <p>There are a number of businesses along Cross Street that I assume will be affected by these proposed parking restrictions. Has the council thought about any parking plans for local businesses?</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>There is no change to the proposal relating to Elm Grove, the revised proposal presented for approval in this report removes the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) on the south west side of Florence Street.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	26	Y	<p>I wish to object to the proposals regarding the parking restrictions in the Mersey Road area, I work within the vicinity and need to use my car to travel to work.</p> <p>I am a Children's Case Manager and attend many meeting a day for which I need my car for, I am rarely in the office all day so need fairly easy access to my car. I also work with vulnerable families and I would consider this a risk for my own safety if I had to park further away. I work 8-4 and I know when I am leaving work many of the residents are still at work or returning from the school run.</p> <p>I work full time and who parks on my road outside my house during the day while I am at work does not concern me, as long as I have access to my house, we all pay our road taxes,</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised as presented to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	27	Y	<p>I work for Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Trust (joint NHS and social care funded team - CMHT) as a clinical psychologist. I am an essential car user, which basically means I have to use my own car for company business (council/NHS business), which invariably involves lots of home visits to vulnerable people. I do ride my bike when possible but at times this is not practical or possible – I often have to travel to Urmston from Sale and the off-road track is already almost impassable by bike. There is</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised as presented to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p>

			<p>no parking provided by the council or NHS at our site – Crossgate House - for the majority of employees, myself included, due to a very limited car parking facility. There is also very limited parking available within a 10-minute walk, which is mainly the area you are considering for parking restrictions.</p> <p>Whilst I can acknowledge there are frustrations from some residents, this is not solely a residential area and these parking restrictions would have a very detrimental impact on the care provided by social care and health care staff, as well as a detrimental impact on local businesses, especially office-based staff and smaller shops. Such restrictions would certainly mean that locally based organisations would have to look at locating elsewhere where staff can park, which would in turn affect occupancy and long-term survival for local office space providers, possibly causing closures and a loss of business rates.</p>	<p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	41	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On roads where there are drive ways the proposal is to virtually remove any parking, save for short stay. Surely this can be controlled with white lines across the drive ways so as to keep available full unrestricted parking on both sides of the road. • The proposed “Residents Permit Parking” scheme has not appreciated the mixed use of the subject area and has only sought to protect 1 demographic occupier (residential dwellings as the name of the scheme clearly dictates), and with no alternatives provided. There will be a consequence to this which will either produce a parking issue in the surrounding areas or indeed drive commercial occupiers and visitors away from the area thus having a greater long-term economic impact. • No consideration has been given to the wider economic impact of this scheme which either gives a complete restriction to parking or only provides parking largely for residential occupiers. The agenda appears clear to make this a residential only area and thus commuter belt for people to work in Manchester, who will in turn not be working and contributing towards the Trafford economy. • The proposal appears to remove the majority of the parking, which its reasoning is cited due to parking issues in the area. Surely, that shows there is a demand for parking therefore the scheme should seek to for instance provide parking on a pay and display basis so that the supply is still there and provide more conscientious parking practice. The net effect of this poorly planned scheme can only be to create issues on the periphery of the subject area. A more balanced scheme would be far more sensible. • The proposed scheme appears to be an extreme over reaction to resolve the presented issue. There are middle ground measures which should be undertaken for instance protecting the entrances to drive ways and allowing parking on both sides of roads, whereas this restricts parking on both sides. There appears to be no thought other than absolute restrictions, which is mindless and will have knock on consequences. • Scheme doesn’t make sense from an economical point of view. Removing something that has been available for a long period of time which there is obviously a demand for and not providing alternatives. There has been too many spaces and restrictions proposed and not enough availability on either a free or paid for basis. • The scheme shouldn’t use Bay marked spaces as this renders opposite sides of the road unusable for parking based on highways guidance on allowances for road width’s etc. As the area is so densely populated to produce a scheme with bayed spaces seems remarkably short-sited as there are a lot of vehicle movements to cater for. • Noting that Cap Gemini House has been ear marked for Residential use is the plan to force a solely residential use/agenda upon the subject area which has long term been a mixed-use site, with this parking strategy being the first step very much in line with that agenda. This is not a balanced proposal given the mixed nature of the occupiers in the subject area. • As a long term commercial occupier employing local people including apprentices my view is that the proposal is to solely remove any type of parking which is not related to a residential dwelling. My business and indeed the building we occupy has been here for a number of years and it is peculiar to pick this moment in time to effetely take a stance against employers and employees who on a daily basis utilise the retail and other local services in the area, when the residential occupiers are no doubt out of the area during the week days. • Large areas of the scheme especially Park Avenue are characterised by semi-detached dwellings with substantial off-road parking. Restricting all road parking to short term seems overzealous when most occupiers would likely be at work. In areas where there are large numbers of private drives why can’t the restrictions be lifted? 	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The above is also particularly applicable to Park Avenue where much of the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) has been removed under the proposal presented and recommended for approval in this report.</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Whilst there may be an amount of proposed alternative use development ear marked in this area, it is simply not practical to place on hold the potential introduction of a scheme such as this until all these types of matters can be resolved. Developers’ plans regularly change and can go through several iterations before and even after a formal planning application is submitted which may or may not eventually be approved with or without additional conditions. This is only likely to extend the timeframe for the potential introduction of a scheme, whilst the inconvenience and difficulties being experienced by residents is set to continue.</p> <p>With schemes of this nature it is accepted that there will likely be a transfer of demand for long-stay on-street parking it is anticipated that this has been negated by the revision to the proposal to remove much of the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line).</p> <p>In terms of response rates to the original consultation and supplementary consultation, response rates of 31% and 33% are considered good and above typical response rates for schemes of a similar nature that have been successfully introduced in other areas such as Barker’s Lane.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While we object to the proposals as they stand we would possibly be open to working with the Council if our employers could have access to permits. This would enable parking to be controlled but offer scope to reflect the balance of needs. • There is a large amount of proposed alternative use development ear marked in the vicinity. I would object on the grounds that this scheme can't be properly considered until the outcome of these is known and the impact it will have on parking demand. • Why do the proposals allow effective unrestricted use of both sides of the road at a weekend, but it is deemed not suitable in the week? On Park Avenue for example there is a proposed waiting restriction mon to Fri 8-6 but not on a weekend on the right-hand side of the road. • We object because this scheme will just push anti-social parking over the boundaries of the scheme to other areas, when we have an opportunity to consider a balanced scheme here. • We object because the response rate to these proposals has been extremely low. 217 people confirmed an agreement to the scheme from a distribution to 1200 properties. 	
Cross Street (Business)	45	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On roads where there are drive ways the proposal is to virtually remove any parking, save for short stay. Surely this can be controlled with white lines across the drive ways so as to keep available full unrestricted parking on both sides of the road. • The proposed "Residents Permit Parking" scheme has not appreciated the mixed use of the subject area and has only sought to protect 1 demographic occupier (residential dwellings as the name of the scheme clearly dictates), and with no alternatives provided. There will be a consequence to this which will either produce a parking issue in the surrounding areas or indeed drive commercial occupiers and visitors away from the area thus having a greater long-term economic impact. • No consideration has been given to the wider economic impact of this scheme which either gives a complete restriction to parking or only provides parking largely for residential occupiers. The agenda appears clear to make this a residential only area and thus commuter belt for people to work in Manchester, who will in turn not be working and contributing towards the Trafford economy. • The proposal appears to remove the majority of the parking, which its reasoning is cited due to parking issues in the area. Surely, that shows there is a demand for parking therefore the scheme should seek to for instance provide parking on a pay and display basis so that the supply is still there and provide more conscientious parking practice. The net effect of this poorly planned scheme can only be to create issues on the periphery of the subject area. A more balanced scheme would be far more sensible. • The proposed scheme appears to be an extreme over reaction to resolve the presented issue. There are middle ground measures which should be undertaken for instance protecting the entrances to drive ways and allowing parking on both sides of roads, whereas this restricts parking on both sides. There appears to be no thought other than absolute restrictions, which is mindless and will have knock on consequences. • Scheme doesn't make sense from an economical point of view. Removing something that has been available for a long period of time which there is obviously a demand for and not providing alternatives. There has been too many spaces and restrictions proposed and not enough availability on either a free or paid for basis. • The scheme shouldn't use Bay marked spaces as this renders opposite sides of the road unusable for parking based on highways guidance on allowances for road width's etc. As the area is so densely populated to produce a scheme with bayed spaces seems remarkably short-sited as there are a lot of vehicle movements to cater for. • Noting that Cap Gemini House has been ear marked for Residential use is the plan to force a solely residential use/agenda upon the subject area which has long term been a mixed-use site, with this parking strategy being the first step very much in line with that agenda. This is not a balanced proposal given the mixed nature of the occupiers in the subject area. • As a long term commercial occupier employing local people including apprentices my view is that the proposal is to solely remove any type of parking which is not related to a residential dwelling. My business and indeed the building we occupy has been here for a number of years and it is peculiar to pick this moment in time to effectly take a stance against employers and employees who on a daily basis utilise the retail and other local services in the area, when the residential occupiers are no doubt out of the area during the week days. • Large areas of the scheme especially Park Avenue are characterised by semi-detached dwellings with substantial off-road parking. Restricting all road parking to short 	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The above is also particularly applicable to Park Avenue where much of the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) has been removed under the proposal presented and recommended for approval in this report.</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Whilst there may be an amount of proposed alternative use development ear marked in this area, it is simply not practical to place on hold the potential introduction of a scheme such as this until all these types of matters can be resolved. Developers' plans regularly change and can go through several iterations before and even after a formal planning application is submitted which may or may not eventually be approved with or without additional conditions. This is only likely to extend the timeframe for the potential introduction of a scheme, whilst the inconvenience and difficulties being experienced by residents is set to continue.</p> <p>With schemes of this nature it is accepted that there will likely be a transfer of demand for long-stay on-street parking it is anticipated that this has been negated by the revision to the proposal to remove much of the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line).</p> <p>In terms of response rates to the original consultation and supplementary consultation, response rates of 31% and 33% are considered good and above typical response rates for schemes of a similar nature that have been successfully introduced in other areas such as Barker's Lane.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>term seems overzealous when must occupiers would likely be at work. In areas where there are large numbers of private drives why can't the restrictions be lifted?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While we object to the proposals as they stand we would possibility be open to working with the Council if our employers could have access to permits. This would enable parking to be controlled but offer scope to reflect the balance of needs. • There is a large amount of proposed alternative use development ear marked in the vicinity. I would object on the grounds that this scheme can't be properly considered until the outcome of these is known and the impact it will have on parking demand. • Why do the proposals allow effective unrestricted use of both sides of the road at a weekend, but it is deemed not suitable in the week? On Park Avenue for example there is a proposed waiting restriction mon to Fri 8-6 but not on a weekend on the right-hand side of the road. • We object because this scheme will just push anti-social parking over the boundaries of the scheme to other areas, when we have an opportunity to consider a balanced scheme here. • We object because the response rate to these proposals has been extremely low. 217 people confirmed an agreement to the scheme from a distribution to 1200 properties. 	
Cross Street (Business)	59	Y	<p>I work for Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Trust (joint NHS and social care funded team - CMHT) as a clinical psychologist. I am an essential car user, which basically means I have to use my own car for company business (council/NHS business), which invariably involves lots of home visits to vulnerable people. I do ride my bike when possible but at times this is not practical or possible – I often have to travel to Urmston from Sale and the off-road track is already almost impassable by bike. There is no parking provided by the council or NHS at our site – Crossgate House - for the majority of employees, myself included, due to a very limited car parking facility. There is also very limited parking available within a 10-minute walk, which is mainly the area you are considering for parking restrictions.</p> <p>Whilst I can acknowledge there are frustrations from some residents, this is not solely a residential area and these parking restrictions would have a very detrimental impact on the care provided by social care and health care staff, as well as a detrimental impact on local businesses, especially office-based staff and smaller shops. Such restrictions would certainly mean that locally based organisations would have to look at locating elsewhere where staff can park, which would in turn affect occupancy and long-term survival for local office space providers, possibly causing closures and a loss of business rates.</p> <p>I would therefore like to request that these objections are considered when evaluating these proposals.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	60	Y	<p>I work within the vicinity and need to use my car to travel to work, having carer responsibilities for my elderly mother.</p> <p>It appears that there have been no alternative parking proposals made so it will mean that everybody who is currently using this area will move to the next available roads, where parking is available.</p> <p>Surely, this will then cause problems in that area?</p> <p>I own a semi-detached house with a driveway and always use that driveway to park my car and my husband's car. I would not expect to be given exclusive access to the portion of road that sits outside my house.</p> <p>We all pay our road tax so should have equal rights to parking – even in residential areas.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>With schemes of this nature it is accepted that there will likely be a transfer of demand for long-stay on-street parking it is anticipated that this has been negated by the revision to the proposal to remove much of the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	62	Y	<p>We would like you to consider our objection before finalizing the proposed Residents permit parking scheme and associated new and amended waiting and loading/unloading restrictions.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single</p>

			<p>The current situation on Mersey road results in non-residents parking on this road all day which makes it extremely difficult for residents, business owners and customers to park their own vehicles and receive deliveries.</p> <p>-We will need to have a resident parking space as we live at 103 cross street, Sale. -We will need a loading bay as we will be running a business which will require daily deliveries/ drop offs - Customer parking will also be needed for other business next to ours such as; Sale Glass Centre, Garvey's and Hair Cosmetics.</p>	<p>yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>Domestic residents residing above the commercial premises on Cross Street are eligible to apply for a resident parking permit.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	63	Y	<p>I am writing to express my concerns about the above suggested parking restrictions. I currently am employed by NHS Greater Manchester Mental Health and am based at Crossgate House, Sale. My team and I use Mersey Rd and Southern Rd to park as it is close enough for us to attend emergency visits/appointments without unnecessary delays. We provide an urgent support to vulnerable members of the community who suffer with complex mental health issues and rely on our team to enable them to function in society.</p> <p>It is also necessary to not have far to walk in early mornings and late evenings as we are ourselves vulnerable when lone working.</p> <p>We are respectful when parking near residential properties as to not block driveways and cause obstructions. Please work with us in enabling a smooth and efficiently run NHS service deliverable to local service users in our local areas.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	64	Y	<p>As an NHS worker working across two sites (Sale and Manchester Parkway) I am concerned to hear about possible implementation of Parking Permits in the area mentioned in the subject line.</p> <p>In order to support effective delivery of my NHS role it is essential that I am able to park near to the sites where I am working. This ensures I am not wasting taxpayer's money walking considerable distances to and from Q and NCP type parking whilst I am supposed to be doing my job.</p> <p>Many of the residents around the area have "off road parking" therefore I do not understand what issues I cause by parking on the street which I am entitled to do because I pay my car tax and council tax to support the road system.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	65	Y	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions around Cross Street, Sale. I understand that some residents may feel aggrieved that staff park outside their homes during the day, this has been proved by the acts of criminal damage to cars in the past, they have been scratched and had stones lined up along wind screen wipers, it has been reported to the police but as yet nobody has been prosecuted. Surely this is not acceptable behaviour to bestow on staff providing a challenging service with already limited resources.</p> <p>However, Crossgate House is occupied by NHS Staff who are doing crucial and critical roles to combat Mental Health Problems. Having a car is an essential part in achieving the best results possible.</p> <p>Vulnerable people depend on the service of the nurses, social workers, care workers, consultants and administration staff on a daily basis.</p> <p>In order the achieve safe health it is vital the staff have access to a vehicle close by. They may be in and out of the premises several times a day attending home visits and clinics which can be urgent, routine or time limited.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>Please could you tell me what is to gain by taking away the street parking facilities that are already in place, most if not all the residents have driveways, also a large percentage of the driveways are vacant during the day.</p> <p>The staff are daytime staff can already spend a considerable amount of time currently trying to park.</p> <p>This is valuable time wasted for the NHS staff who are dedicated to vulnerable and at-risk people.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead I feel it will be the council's responsibility to find suitable alternative parking facilities for the NHS staff as already parking at present can be problematic so to take away the limited availability at present is a recipe for disaster.</p> <p>The role of the NHS is to save lives and not to endanger or put them at risk.</p> <p>Please consider carefully your decision and the effects it may have.</p>	
Cross Street (Business)	68	Y	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed parking restrictions around Cross Street, Sale. I appreciate residents in the area feel aggrieved at members of the public parking outside their homes but where does the council expect NHS staff to park if there are no car parks available in a commercial area. The council have given planning permission for Offices to be built in and around residential homes, but no consideration has been given as to where staff are supposed to park their cars. Most office staff work 9-5 Mon to Friday so therefore parking wouldn't be an issue in the evening or weekends.</p> <p>I feel it is the council's duty to give further consideration to the need of staff in the local community who need a vehicle to travel to and from work.</p> <p>Sainsbury's have an enormous car park that is empty most of the time can you not come to some agreement for NHS staff to use their car park at a reduced rate? Surely that would alleviate the problem.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	69	Y	<p>I am writing to object to proposed parking restrictions in the Mersey Road/Sothorn Road Area of Sale.</p> <p>I work for both Trafford Council and the NHS as a social worker/AMHP. I am an essential car user, which basically means I have to use my own car for company business (council/NHS business), which invariably involves lots of home visits to vulnerable people. There is no parking provided by the council or NHS at our site for the majority of employees, myself included, due to a very limited car parking facility. There is also very limited parking available within a 10-minute walk, which is mainly the area you are considering for parking restrictions.</p> <p>Whilst I can acknowledge there are frustrations from some residents, this is not solely a residential area and these parking restrictions would have a very detrimental impact on the care provided by social care and health care staff, as well as a detrimental impact on local businesses, especially office-based staff and smaller shops. Such restrictions would certainly mean that locally based organisations would have to look at locating elsewhere where staff can park, which would in turn affect occupancy and long-term survival for local office space providers, possibly causing closures and a loss of business rates.</p> <p>I would therefore like to request that these objections are considered when evaluating these proposals.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	70	Y	<p>While I understand the concerns and the objectives of the consultation I object to the proposed changes. I frequently work in Trafford and the option for parking does not feel balanced, please find my personal objection to the planned changes.</p> <p>I also would like clarification on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of parking spaces have been removed with no alternative provision being provided. Why is there no alternative areas in the same number been provided? This will surely only create more issues. 	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The creation of resident only locations will only move the problem to other areas, for example one street further to work is not an issue for 90% of people who work in Trafford. Ultimately you move the problem. • While parking in residential areas is legal, there is a belief by some that parking in front of their house is private space, pandering to a select few seems at odds to the various stakeholders of the economy. • The proposed "Residents Permit Parking" scheme has not appreciated the mixed use of the subject area and has only sought to protect 1 demographic occupier (residential dwellings as the name of the scheme clearly dictates), and with no alternatives provided. There will be a consequence to this which will either produce a parking issue in the surrounding areas or indeed drive commercial occupiers and visitors away from the area thus having a greater long-term economic impact. • No consideration has been given to the wider economic impact of this scheme which either gives a complete restriction to parking or only provides parking largely for residential occupiers. The agenda appears clear to make this a residential only area and thus commuter belt for people to work in Manchester, who will in turn not be working and contributing towards the Trafford economy. • Scheme doesn't make sense from an economical point of view. Removing something that has been available for a long period of time which there is obviously a demand for and not providing alternatives. There has been too many spaces and restrictions proposed and not enough availability on either a free or paid for basis. • The scheme shouldn't use Bay marked spaces as this renders opposite sides of the road unusable for parking based on highways guidance on allowances for road width's etc. As the area is so densely populated to produce a scheme with bayed spaces seems remarkably short-sited as there are a lot of vehicle movements to cater for. • There is a large amount of proposed alternative use development ear marked in the vicinity. I would object on the grounds that this scheme can't be properly considered until the outcome of these is known and the impact it will have on parking demand. • Why do the proposals allow effective unrestricted use of both sides of the road at a weekend, but it is deemed not suitable in the week? On Park Avenue for example there is a proposed waiting restriction mon to Fri 8-6 but not on a weekend on the right-hand side of the road. • I object because this scheme will just push anti-social parking over the boundaries of the scheme to other areas, when we have an opportunity to consider a balanced scheme here. • I object because the response rate to these proposals has been extremely low. 217 people confirmed an agreement to the scheme from a distribution to 1200 properties does not represent the wider community. 	<p>The above is also particularly applicable to Park Avenue where much of the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) has been removed under the proposal presented and recommended for approval in this report.</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Whilst there may be an amount of proposed alternative use development ear marked in this area, it is simply not practical to place on hold the potential introduction of a scheme such as this until all these types of matters can be resolved. Developers' plans regularly change and can go through several iterations before and even after a formal planning application is submitted which may or may not eventually be approved with or without additional conditions. This is only likely to extend the timeframe for the potential introduction of a scheme, whilst the inconvenience and difficulties being experienced by residents is set to continue.</p> <p>With schemes of this nature it is accepted that there will likely be a transfer of demand for long-stay on-street parking it is anticipated that this has been negated by the revision to the proposal to remove much of the previously proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line).</p> <p>In terms of response rates to the original consultation and supplementary consultation, response rates of 31% and 33% are considered good and above typical response rates for schemes of a similar nature that have been successfully introduced in other areas such as Barker's Lane.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	74	Y	<p>Why on earth is it that the local authority have to implement schemes whereby this would have an adverse effect on those people employed within the area, however do not propose providing any additional parking where those which were originally there are proposing to be removed. As an employee of the CCG, along with many of my colleagues would definitely oppose this idea on the grounds that this would have an effect both financially and possibly employment wise as a lot of people would have to look elsewhere to work due to the restrictions you are proposing. Why not offer employees some discounted street parking if that is what you are bothered about, the money and income that is generated.</p> <p>Please reconsider this lunatic proposal and take into consideration the economy of the area and the scale and disruption this would have on a lot of people. However, I would also have thought as a local authority that you would be wanting to keep the businesses in the area and not drive them away.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	101	Y	<p>I am employed by Training Qualifications UK. As a company based in a commercial building located on Cross Street, the proposed restrictions would have a direct and significant impact on our ability for us to carry out our work. With limited car parking available with our building, and regular visitors to our offices, there are not enough spaces to accommodate our staff. There have been occasions when I have utilised the on-street parking available in order to allow them to come to work. Introducing these restrictions would, inevitably, result in some members of our current staff being unable to work here as they do not have alternative means of transport.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p>

			<p>A number of parking spaces have been removed with no alternative provision being provided. Why is there no alternative areas in the same number been provided? This will surely only create more issues. On roads where there are drive ways the proposal is to virtually remove any parking, save for short stay. Surely this can be controlled with white lines across the drive ways so as to keep available full unrestricted parking on both sides of the road.</p> <p>The proposal appears to remove the majority of the parking, which its reasoning is cited due to parking issues in the area. Surely, that shows there is a demand for parking therefore the scheme should seek to for instance provide parking on a pay and display basis so that the supply is still there and provide more conscientious parking practice. The net effect of this poorly planned scheme can only be to create issues on the periphery of the subject area. A more balanced scheme would be far more sensible.</p> <p>I would urge you to consider the impact that these restrictions will have upon my employment. I and my colleagues are enthusiastic, dedicated, local people who enjoy coming to work and contributing to building Trafford up into a thriving area. To impose upon them unreasonable requirements relating to a practicality like parking will, without a doubt, have consequences on their ability to continue to work with TQUK. These things may not seem too important in the grand scheme of things, but they matter. They matter as much as the views of the local residents and we are keen to engage with you further to better present our thoughts and ideas on this proposal.</p>	<p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	108	Y	<p>Training Qualifications UK is a local employer with a current staff count of 24. We are currently in the process of recruiting for more staff members to start with us in the next 8 months, the majority of whom are likely to come from the local areas of Sale, Altrincham, Sale Moor, Stretford or Timperley. We recently relocated from Salford to Trafford and as a result have provided direct employment for local people. Our growth projections for the next 3 years indicate that in total we will be recruiting around 20-25 people by the end of 2019.</p> <p>In addition to the contributions we make via business rates, staff members contribute to the local economy in smaller ways: engaging with independent local businesses and shops. We are now entering into regular, permanent arrangements with local barbers and catering companies to provide our business with staff perks and meeting catering services. Staff make purchases from the local shops on a daily basis and access other services such as banks, travel agents etc.</p> <p>As a company based in a commercial building located on Cross Street, the proposed restrictions would have a direct and significant impact on our ability for us to carry out our work. With limited car parking available with our building, and regular visitors to our offices, there are not enough spaces to accommodate our staff. Already we have several staff members who utilise the on-street parking available in order to allow them to come to work. Introducing these restrictions would, inevitably, result in some members of our current staff being unable to work here as they do not have alternative means of transport. The proposed changes would cause significant inconvenience and stress to our staff and potentially to our customers.</p> <p>In addition, it would severely restrict the pool of candidates who would be available to us for recruitment purposes. Our inability to offer suitable and convenient parking arrangements to potential candidates would be a deciding factor in candidates' decisions to take a role. We have experienced this before and it was a contributing factor to our decision to relocate offices back in August last year.</p> <p>The commercial occupiers in the area have existed alongside the residential occupiers for a substantial amount of time. To consider the proposals mainly from a residential perspective fails to take into account the mixed use and combined needs of the area. I do understand the motivations for the review and why parking restrictions are necessary in some areas. It is, however, essential to properly consider the impact upon all stakeholders and not prioritise the consequences to one over another. We do not feel that enough has been done to engage with local businesses to consider options, offer alternatives and gather feedback or impact statements.</p> <p>It is difficult to see what alternative parking arrangements would be available to our staff and customers. Although we support moves towards encouraging the use of public transport and reduction in car use it is difficult to see how this is practical in this case. I would also question whether the low response rate – largely from frustrated local residents – is a valid evidence base for introducing restrictions with such far reaching consequences. Whilst I appreciate that the frustrations of these residents are valid, it is a</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>well-known fact that those who are frustrated are far more likely to respond to a consultation than those who are not, and a low sample size of voluntary feedback is likely to reflect what may be a relatively small section of the local resident community TQUK moved to this area on the understanding that we could rely on the availability of additional parking in the local area that is a reasonable distance from our office and would not cost our staff or the business anything to use above and beyond the substantial business rates that we contribute. If there are to be some restrictions, there is an absolute need for an accommodation of the business needs of the area in the form of permits similar to those which we presume will be issued to residents. We urge you to consider the impact that these restrictions will have upon our business and our ability to stay in our current offices. Our staff are enthusiastic, dedicated, local people who enjoy coming to work and contributing to building Trafford up into a thriving area. To impose upon them unreasonable requirements relating to a practicality like parking will, without a doubt, have consequences on their ability to continue to work with us. These issues matter as much as the views of the local residents and we are keen to engage with you further to better present our thoughts and ideas on this proposal.</p>	
Cross Street (Business)	109	Y	<p>I would like to state my objections to the parking restrictions plan proposed for the Mersey Road/Southern Road, Sale area.</p> <p>I am a commercial resident, working for Trafford CCG, and don't feel the plans sufficiently consider the commercial residents' need at a fair level with the residential residents.</p> <p>There is no proposed solution for the commercial residents who are already restricted as to where they can park.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	110	Y	<p>I wish to object to the proposals regarding the parking restrictions in the Mersey Road area.</p> <p>I work within the vicinity and need to use my car to travel to work, having carer responsibilities for my children.</p> <p>It appears that there have been no alternative parking proposals made so it will mean that everybody who is currently using this area will move to the next available roads, where parking is available.</p> <p>We all pay our road tax so should have equal rights to parking – even in residential areas.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	153	Y	<p>We have received the amended permit parking for this area. We are still concerned that there still isn't adequate unrestricted parking in this area of Sale. As stated in our previous email below, we have clients who need to park for in excess of 3/4 hours, and still don't feel that our needs as a business are being met.</p> <p>Please can you take our concerns into account, and advise us where there is parking that isn't limited to 2 hours in the local area?</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

<p>Cross Street (Business)</p>	<p>165</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I am contacting you regarding Mersey Road Area, Sale Proposed Parking Scheme. I would like you to consider my objection before finalizing the proposed residents permit parking scheme and associated new and amended waiting and loading/unloading restrictions.</p> <p>At present i have no customer parking due to non-residents (office workers) parking all day on Mersey Road. Delivery drivers and myself have to load and unload on double yellow lines on the corner of cross street and Mersey road.</p> <p>There is no parking in the front of sale glass centre, ■■■ cross street due to pedestrian crossing. Originally, I had parking on Mersey road until the residents parking was introduced on the other side of cross street. I have contacted the council on numerous occasions about customer parking, also a loading and unloading bay, and after 15 years of battling on I thought I was going to finally get some customer parking, loading and unloading bay.</p> <p>The proposal for customer parking, loading and unloading bay should be retained. I have also received parking fines whilst loading and unloading glass. Customers are forced to carry their glass up and down Mersey road and cross street due to no parking provision, which makes it extremely difficult for residents, business owners and customers to park their own vehicles and receive deliveries. I have been trading on cross street for over 45 years and parking has been a constant headache for the past 15 or so years. I would welcome the council supporting customer parking and recognising the value that small businesses have within the local community.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
<p>Cross Street (Business)</p>	<p>175</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I would like to express my view on the new parking proposal both as a Trafford local resident and worker. I appreciate that Trafford Council must ensure a smooth traffic flow and car parking is in order. It appears to me that Trafford Council has put much emphasis on pleasing the local residents whilst this busy area is in fact shared by the residents and the local businesses, both residents and local businesses including their employees and visitors should have the equal rights to the use of public space. I believe most people working in this area are just like me, having a job with modest income, having a family to support and bills and mortgage to pay.</p> <p>We are also very having a family to look after, particularly in the morning, we have to get our children to school then we ourselves rush to work, not many people are Directors or Managers who would have the privilege of a designated on-site parking space, we have to drive around to look for a space and then half running half jogging to work even with the current number of on street parking available. I can't imagine what would happen if the spaces are reduced.</p> <p>To think the best for the surrounding residents it would be better to provide sufficient on street parking to prevent car users blocking their driveways and causing obstruction, besides most residents would also be at work, they themselves would probably having the same problem at their workplace. I would appreciate Trafford council to re-consider their proposal not only not to reduce parking space but to increase parking space, only with sufficient space to meet the demand could achieve orderly parking and prevent obstruction to local residents and businesses.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
<p>Cross Street (Business)</p>	<p>200</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the packing restrictions currently proposed under this scheme.</p> <p>I run a business and lease a business within the Dunham House office building. I have 10 employees an only space within the facility for 5 car parking spaces. If the proposed permit holder restriction comes into force I will be forced to give notice on this building and move to another area.</p> <p>My team are located in various locations across Greater Manchester and Cheshire with several having absolutely no options for public transport to the office being distances of 33, 21 and 15 miles away and not on local transport links. I cannot run my business without employees and I cannot expect employees to work if there will be no means for them to park when they arrive at work.</p> <p>Please bear in mind that we bring business to the local shops and restaurants, we pay rates and contribute to the local economy.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>We are respectful of the residents when we part on the road and we think that it would be more effective to patrol to see parking violations than to bring in a unilateral restriction.</p>	
Cross Street (Business)	201	Y	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions around Cross Street, Sale. I understand that some residents may feel aggrieved that staff park outside their homes during the day, this has been proved by the acts of criminal damage to cars in the past, they have been scratched and had stones lined up along wind screen wipers, it has been reported to the police but as yet nobody has been prosecuted. Surely this is not acceptable behaviour to bestow on staff providing a challenging service with already limited resources.</p> <p>However, Crossgate House is occupied by NHS Staff who are doing crucial and critical roles to combat Mental Health Problems. Having a car is an essential part in achieving the best results possible.</p> <p>Vulnerable people depend on the service of the nurses, social workers, care workers, consultants and administration staff on a daily basis.</p> <p>In order to achieve safe health it is vital the staff have access to a vehicle close by. They may be in and out of the premises several times a day attending home visits and clinics which can be urgent, routine or time limited.</p> <p>Please could you tell me what is to gain by taking away the street parking facilities that are already in place, most if not all the residents have driveways, also a large percentage of the driveways are vacant during the day.</p> <p>The staff are daytime staff can already spend a considerable amount of time currently trying to park.</p> <p>This is valuable time wasted for the NHS staff who are dedicated to vulnerable and at risk people.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead I feel it will be the council's responsibility to find suitable alternative parking facilities for the NHS staff as already parking at present can be problematic so to take away the limited availability at present is a recipe for disaster.</p> <p>The role of the NHS is to save lives and not to endanger or put them at risk.</p> <p>Please consider carefully your decision and the effects it may have.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	204	Y	<p>Please be advised that I am the Property Manager for Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust, and the Trust have a staff base at Crossgate House,</p> <p>I have previously expressed my concerns about the details of this improvement Scheme, and although I recognise the changes that have been made I would still ask you to lodge my objection to the Scheme as now proposed.</p> <p>The proposed parking restrictions will have a noticeable effect on the work of the Trust who are primarily out and about in the local community delivering services. It is a particular requirement for the work of the Trust to be very much focused on working in the local community which is supported by the base at Crossgate House. All community members of staff must be flexible to be both in the office and able to work out of the office, and there is a regular movement both in and out of the office.</p> <p>There is an over-subscribed car parking area at Crossgate House, and this is simply not adequate. As a matter of course, the staff working in the community must park elsewhere and still retain the flexibility to be close to their transport for their regular work activities.</p> <p>The site at Crossgate House has provided a solid base for the Trust and effectively will continue. However, the additional time and stress from parking much further away from</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>the area will severely impact on the work of the Trust. As a matter of fact, the effective working week of the staff will be reduced by the restrictions. This flies completely in the face of the "One Public Estate" working together to provide a much-welcomed service in the community, and in turn this will directly impact on the number of avoidable referrals to already over-stretched hospitals. The missed opportunity to maintain an existing successful community service will be a serious retrograde step for the work that the whole of Greater Manchester is working towards.</p> <p>I understand the issues that you are trying to deal with, but Is there no possible recognition of a commercial parking permit for the local businesses such as the Trust?</p>	
Cross Street (Business)	51	Y	<p>I am writing to formally object to the proposals to introduce a Residential Permit scheme and severely restrict parking in the Mersey Road, Atkinson Road and Park Avenue areas close to Dunham House.</p> <p>We feel this will have a direct impact on our business and other businesses in the area and make the renting of those offices less attractive in the future. As a business based in the area we contribute to the local economy and pay business rates. Our presence not only provides direct employment but also supports independent retail and other businesses in the area.</p> <p>Commercial occupiers have existed alongside the residential occupiers for a substantial amount of time and we feel considering the proposals mainly from a residential perspective fails to take into account the mixed use and combined needs of the area. If there have to be restrictions, surely there should be discussions as to what alternatives or compromise could be offered to commercial business who have, for years, relied and built their businesses round an ability for additional parking in the area.</p> <p>The proposal appears to remove the majority of the parking, which its reasoning is cited due to parking issues in the area. Surely, that shows there is a demand for parking therefore the scheme should seek to provide parking on a pay and display or business permit basis so that the supply is still there and provide more conscientious parking practice. The net effect of this poorly planned scheme can only be to create issues on the periphery of the subject area. A more balanced scheme would be far more sensible.</p> <p>We currently rent and use 3 parking spaces within the complex of Dunham House but regularly have visitors and are hoping to expand our staff-base in the coming months. The imposition of parking restrictions in areas where parking is currently freely available would make things very difficult.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Cross Street (Business)	88	Y	<p>I am writing to object to further parking restrictions on Mersey Road in Sale, as it is also a commercial area and the council has not seemed to give any due consideration to health and social care workers to be able to work in and around the local community, to deliver health and social care. How as a council do you propose to only provide increased residents parking, with little or no consideration to the other needs of the community. I do not consider working for the NHS or the Council as "commercial" parking. We have NOT be privatised or sold off as yet. So the council should allow for provision for such essential workers in the area.</p> <p>As a social worker I need access to flexible parking in the area that I serve. It is essential I have a car to deliver care to the local community and to further restrict being able to deliver this care or to make it so difficult to do so is I think Unreasonable.</p> <p>How does the council think that their residents will be helped with restricting further parking just for residents? As we work 9 – 5 Mon to Friday we would not be interfering with parking in the evenings and/ or weekends.</p> <p>So, I strenuously object to this proposal and think the council needs to give further consideration.</p> <p>I work with colleagues who have been given parking tickets for being 5 minutes late because they have been caught speaking to a very upset patient, relative or need an important discussion with a Dr. We are being continually penalised with bringing our cars to work when it is for the purposes to serve the local community in the first place.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>WITHOUT OUR CARS WE CANNOT do our jobs effectively for the local community. As a council employee, I feel the council needs to give this serious consideration to provide suitable non-expensive parking for their staff.</p> <p>The council CANNOT have it both ways to request for social work posts with essential car user's only to apply for a job and then ask them to pay for the parking or not to provide us with any.</p> <p>THIS HAS GOT TO BE GIVEN SERIOUS CONSIDERATION OF HOW RIDICULOUS A POSITION THIS PUTS TRAFFORD EMPLOYEES.</p>	
Cross Street (Business)	168	Y	<p>I am writing to object to proposed parking restrictions in the Mersey Road/Sothorn Road Area of Sale.</p> <p>I work for the NHS as a mental health nurse, and I am based at Crossgate House in Sale.</p> <p>My job is to serve the communities in Trafford, providing mental health support to the people of Trafford. In order to perform my nursing duties, I have to travel around Trafford in my car. When I am at Crossgate House, I park my car on the road, as there is no allocated parking at Crossgate House available to me. There is also very limited parking available within a 10-minute walk, which is mainly the area you are considering for parking restrictions.</p> <p>Whilst I can acknowledge there are frustrations for some residents, I would not categorise the way that I park as anti-social.</p> <p>The area is not solely residential and as a road tax payer, I have the right to park my car on the road. I always take care to park appropriately. I do not block drive ways (even those that have been created without an official dropped kerb). I never block other cars in. During the course of my working day I might move my car two or three times, so am never in the same spot all day. Also, I work between the hours of 8:00am and 5:00pm, which are the hours that I might imagine most residents in the area might work (and are therefore not at home).</p> <p>The proposed parking restrictions would make it extremely difficult for me (and my colleagues) to work efficiently and could have a very detrimental impact on the care we provide to the residents in Trafford. Such restrictions would certainly mean that locally based organisations would have to look at relocating to where staff can park, which would in turn affect occupancy and long-term survival for local office space providers, possibly causing closures and a loss of business rates.</p> <p>It saddens me that the frustrations of a minority of residents can override the greater needs of a community.</p> <p>I would therefore like to request that these objections are considered when evaluating these proposals.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Somerset Place & Cross Street (Business)	188	Y	<p>I have a business premises on ■ Cross Street Sale M33 7JW (Manchester Fireworks) and i also live at no ■ Somerset place Sale M33 6HW</p> <p>The proposed parking scheme will affect both my business and also my quality of life at my home address. I do not agree that a parking scheme in any way is necessary in any of the areas outlined by the council.</p> <p>I will outline my objections below for both of my premises that will be affected by the scheme.</p> <p>CROSS STREET - DENMARK ROAD</p> <p>I think that it is unfair to make most of the parking on Denmark road residents only as all but one of the houses on the road have their own driveways and it will cause disruption to my business due to a lack of parking spaces becoming available.</p> <p>I think the fairest way for the parking to be managed is that the whole of the street to have parking allowed for up to one hour this will stop people parking all day but will also allow essential parking for the local businesses that need to have parking for short stay.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

Dane Mews	157	Y	<p>I wish to formally register objection to the above mentioned proposed parking scheme in the Mersey Road area of Sale.</p> <p>It is apparent that the properties in Dane Mews (M33 [REDACTED]) have not been consulted or indeed invited to be included in the scheme.</p> <p>This raises the very real and serious prospect of the displaced parking adversely affecting the residents of Dane Mews and its access once the proposed scheme is implemented.</p> <p>I would very much welcome timely correspondence on the possible resolutions to this issue.</p>	<p>During the initial consultation Dane Mews properties were identified for inclusion to receive consultation documents. Subsequently, a response from a resident of Dane Mews was received - this is taken as confirmation that properties here did receive copies of the relevant documents.</p> <p>Whilst Dane Mews hasn't been included in the published TRO or revised proposal if parking migration occurs consideration will be given to additional parking restrictions if justified.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Doveston Road	66	Y	<p>Thank you providing information regarding the Permit Parking Scheme.</p> <p>We both welcome the news regarding parking permits along Doveston Road.</p> <p>However, we have significant concerns regarding the hours; 9am-5pm.</p> <p>We live directly opposite [REDACTED], which has significant congestion and parking issues between the hours 5:00pm-7:00pm which the current proposals fail to address. There have been several incidences where cars have parked on the pavement and blocked the pathway. As we have tried to gain access to our property, whilst holding our children, cars have pulled out of Sale Dojo and nearly hit us and our children. We have discussed this with the traffic wardens and have been informed that they are powerless to fine as they have technical not broken any high way laws.</p> <p>We would be most grateful if we could propose extending the parking restrictions to 7:00 pm along Doveston Road or even just by Sale Dojo to protect the general public, especially venerable children and adults.</p>	<p>No further requests to amend the hours of operation were received further to the publication of the proposed TRO. For effective enforcement, it is generally necessary to implement a scheme with consistent times of operation across all areas. This also increases the likelihood of driver compliance with the restriction in place. Therefore, revising the times of operation for the proposed resident permit parking restriction for Doveston Road isn't considered justified.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Florence Street	78	Y	<p>It is very positive that the side of the street in front of the houses will be a limited waiting time area. If I return earlier, then 5.15pm then I have no chance of being able to park on Florence street. This will be increasingly challenging in the future when partner has a child. In view of the number of residential households (13) and that each could have 2 cars, I'd propose that the side of the street where the factory is should also be a limited waiting time area. During working hours, the street park my is all taken up by the offices on the corner of wash way road and Glebelands Road. Should the responsibility to provide parking fall to them? And therefore, not take up parking spaces for residents of the area?</p>	<p>Feedback received during the consultation identified a need to provide some long-stay on-street parking on Florence Street.</p> <p>The limited waiting bay except permit holders will reduce long stay parking outside the houses giving a greater chance for residents to park than currently. Objection is therefore not acceded to.</p>
Glebelands Road	35	Y	<p>I write in response to the above Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and recent correspondence dated 30th August 2018.</p> <p>We have reviewed the proposed parking restrictions and we would like to bring the following to your attention.</p> <p>Although our address is [REDACTED] Glebelands Road, we own a driveway which is accessed on Mersey Road (adjacent to [REDACTED] next to [REDACTED] Mersey Road). The TRO states that across our access there will be parking bays (and Parking restrictions; green dotted line on the plans, running from Glebelands Road to Lyons Fold).</p> <p>Although our driveway is fairly long we have to large family cars and we store our bins at the bottom of the drive and cannot fit both our vehicles on it.</p> <p>We would request that due consideration is taken when lining out the parking bays around our access and possibly a special dispensation that allows us to park across our driveway access; meaning that when either me or my partner park on the drive the other can park on the across the driveway entrance.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that all residents from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] Glebelands Road Access their property from Mersey Road as this is where their rear access is... Does this effect their permits i.e even though their address is Glebelands Rd will the permits allow them to park on Mersey Road in and around the current waste land area.</p>	<p>Where shared use bays are proposed to be marked on the carriageway, the practice in Trafford is for a single elongated bay to be marked out, covering all driveways with an access protection marking ('H' bar) to be laid within the bay, adjacent to each dropped kerb vehicular crossing.</p> <p>Typically this would mean that parking in the bay, directly adjacent to the dropped kerb is restricted to the exclusive use of residents of that property (useful if more than one vehicle is owned with limited driveway space), although there is no reason why a neighbour couldn't park there having discussed whether access across the driveway would be required before or after the vehicle parked blocking the driveway would be driven away, i.e. if a neighbour returned home later and was expected to leave earlier.</p> <p>All vehicles parked within the bay must display a valid resident or visitor's permit to park, whether that's directly in front of/adjacent to a dropped kerb driveway or otherwise, including residents of the driveway property.</p> <p>The risk of not marking the bay across the driveway is that it effectively renders that section of carriageway as un-restricted and liable to a non-resident parking there. Trafford's own Civil Enforcement Officers would therefore be unable to issue a Penalty Change Notice as no parking contravention would have occurred. It is presumed that a resident permit holder, not associated with that property, would be considerate enough to not block a fellow resident's access.</p> <p>Only residential properties with a vehicular access onto Mersey Road will be eligible to apply for a residents parking permit subject to the normal eligibility criteria. Properties with a rear 'on foot' access only would not be eligible.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Glebelands Road	52	Y	<p>Glebelands Road near Lawson Grove needs to be included in the scheme or properties issued with permits to use Lawson Grove as parking is limited with nurse staff using spaces during the day.</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) which previously affected Glebelands Road as well as removing the previously proposed restrictions for Lawson Grove in their entirety. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p>

				The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.
Glebelands Road	83	Y	<p>After reflecting over the traffic permit letter, I received this week, I whole heartedly agree with the initiative, as parking outside my home has been an issue especially within working hours and employers from local businesses taking my spot. However, after reviewing the proposal for Glebelands, I am concerned about how I will not be unable to park outside my house completely.</p> <p>My husband and I (with baby on the way) live at ■ Glebelands Road. After consideration your application, you have made this a no park zone altogether. Can you explain where I should consider parking everyday? We are a 2-car household and the streets beside (Windsor and Gordon do not have enough spaces as they are taken by the residents).</p> <p>Furthermore, parking my car 'down the road' with a baby seat, shopping etc. is simply not manageable. You must consider how this will impact on daily life? I propose that you also make this a permitted area (as from 8am-5pm our cars will be at work) but will allow us to park freely at evenings and weekends. This permit will stop the daily employers clogging the road during weekdays-as this is the issue.</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) which previously affected Glebelands Road. It is proposed however that the road between Gordon Avenue and Windsor Avenue is subject to a No Waiting restriction that would operate Monday to Friday, between 9am and 5pm. The result of which is that some on-street parking capacity outside of normal working hours would be retained.</p> <p>The objection is therefore mitigated and not acceded to</p>
Glebelands Road	113	Y	<p>The issue for Glebelands Road is daytime commuters to Dane Road Metrolink or Sale town centre parking on the road close in the Dovestone Road-Gordon Avenue area. The proposed waiting restrictions on Glebelands Road will probably push some of these commuters further west down the road, closer to where I live and currently park, in unrestricted on-street parking areas. This would make it harder for me to park my car during the day. As my partner now works part time, this is something we may need to do on some days of the week.</p> <p>However, to the west of my house are the anomalous, and confusing (different on each side of the street) restrictions on Lawson Grove. The main issue on this street, and the reason why I think residents there supported parking restrictions, is parents dropping off and picking up from Busy Bees Nursery, opposite Lawson Grove on Glebelands Road. This will not be prevented by the proposed waiting restrictions on Lawson Grove.</p> <p>What will happen is there will be less daytime on-street parking available on Glebelands Road close to my house. Because of the restrictions on Lawson Grove, it will also be harder to park there during the day instead.</p> <p>I would therefore ask that the waiting restrictions on Lawson Grove be reviewed.</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) which previously affected Glebelands Road as well as removing the previously proposed restrictions for Lawson Grove in their entirety. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p>
Glebelands Road	71 129 146	Y	<p>I am writing to object to the proposals for residents' permit parking — in particular on Lawson Grove.</p> <p>I live on Glebelands Road, adjacent to Lawson Grove. To set the scene — I live in a semi in a block of four, numbered ■. There is a parking bay outside our properties which, when sensibly parked, holds four cars. Between our four properties we have nine/ten vehicles. We park our second/third vehicles on Lawson Grove, at the top end — which is NOT directly outside anyone's house.</p> <p>The proposals to implement permit parking will have a massive impact on our lives. I understand the proposal has come about from just four residents of Lawson Grove who are in favour of the scheme. I don't have an issue with the area directly outside their properties but the zone at the top of the road should remain as it is at present i.e. able to park on BOTH sides of the road. The road is wide enough for vehicles to access up and down the road safely. To impose a 'no waiting' zone between 8am-6pm, Monday-Friday on the east side of the road is wholly unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Busy Bees Children's Nursery on Glebelands Road, directly opposite Lawson Grove, daily drop-off and pick-up children by parking in Lawson Grove or outside our properties, when space is available. I fear a major safety concern in that carers/parents WILL double park on Glebelands Road at peak periods creating traffic</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) which previously affected Glebelands Road as well as removing the previously proposed restrictions for Lawson Grove in their entirety. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>congestion, chancing removing children from vehicles on the road-side — risking serious accidents!</p> <p>I have lived in my property for over thirty years and do not feel the necessity for the parking scheme. I have also consulted with my local Councillor — the first time I have ever felt the requirement for this action. I have enquired about possible off-street parking (kerb-dropping and creating a drive at the front of the property) but the length is too short to facilitate this. Therefore, on-street parking is our only option.</p> <p>I also understand that other roads encompassed in the scheme (particularly Mersey Road) will encounter massively restricted parking areas if it goes ahead. My concern here is that they will be able to park on Lawson Grove as it will be within the eligible zone, but we may not, even though we live around the corner!</p> <p>If, after all the above comments, you decide to impose the scheme then we would request that we are allowed permits to park on Lawson Grove and that the four bays outside our properties 87-95, are also included to possibly allow us to park outside and near our properties.</p>	
Glebelands Road	18 23 43 46 182 195	Y	<p>Hi I am enquiring about the restrictions on Lawson grove that have been proposed. I reside in █ Glebelands Road and my garage is on Lawson grove. This is not excluded on the map.</p> <p>We have been advised we can purchase a permit, but we would like for it to be confirmed that we can park in front of the garage without one if we require. I have asked about This a number of times so please can you confirm.</p> <p>Please can you advise of the specific concerns of the 4 residents you mention on Lawson grove who requested parking proposals put forward. I fail to see that they will have requested no waiting 8-6pm on one side of the road and wondered where this has come from. This is a wide road that wagons etc. come down all the time.</p> <p>Please can you tell me the specific number of bags that will be available for permit parking so that I can calculate whether this will be sufficient for the need in place. This seems to be a common issue/ concern being raised</p> <p>Thank you for your reply. I am aware of what the policy is around informing landlords as it states it's clearly in the letter, what I am asking is if the names of the people responding on Lawson grove have been checked. Of not, this would not be a relevant representation of the views of the relevant people on the road.</p> <p>Please can we as local residents request that we are provided with the specific reasons for the enforcement of the programme on Lawson grove specifically. General statement of particulars does not represent the views of our local community as we are not affected by people parking and walking into sale for work purposes like other areas of the scheme. Please can you provide specific reasons for the scheme being implemented in Lawson grove so that local residents have a change to respond to these. It is difficult to put a relevant argument forward if we are not aware of the specific reasons on that road.</p> <p>please can you clarify with respect to Lawson grove parking permit plans whether resident who have purchased parking permits on other roads (e.g. Mersey Road) would be able to use their permit to park on Lawson grove? Or is it street by street. Also, please can you advise if you have consulted appropriately with landlords on Lawson grove rather than residents directly as there are a number of rented properties that I am aware of.</p> <p>Please can you outline the specific reasons why residents requested the scheme? This information should be available under freedom of information? Only once the specific reasons are known can we oppose those actual reasons. Those implementing the scheme should be being more transparent instead of blindly talking into account the views of a very small number of residents when this will have a significant impact on many more!! Has anyone even looked at the validity of claims/ comments received?</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) which previously affected Glebelands Road as well as removing the previously proposed restrictions for Lawson Grove in their entirety. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Correspondence delivered to residential properties is clear in that it stated that if you are not the legal homeowner, you have a responsibility to inform your landlord of the proposal. This is the standard procedure in Trafford when consulting on schemes of this nature.</p> <p>From information provided via the One Trafford Partnership, I can tell you that from November 2006 to March 2015 the Council typically received, on average 2 to 3, complaints per year from various roads within the area of the proposed scheme. A further 9 complaints were received in the period March 2016 to August 2016. I am also aware that Ward Members have regularly received complaints and requests for permit parking but I am unable to confirm exact numbers.</p> <p>Complaints received have included obstruction of resident's driveways and difficulty being able to park in the vicinity of their own home or even in their own road entirely. Typically, with proposed schemes of this nature, parking demand is likely to transfer to neighbouring roads once a scheme is implemented. Subsequently this has led to the development of the proposed scheme that includes roads that may not currently experience a high demand for on street parking throughout the day or from which complaints/requests have been received from residents.</p>

			<p>Based on your calculations, of 12 plus 5 (shares use bay) this provides room for 17 vehicles which will not be enough for the local community. Between 87-93 there are 9 vehicles alone and as the top of Lawson grove does not have Lawson grove residents situated it is established custom and practice to park on this part (not on the residential part at the bottom). Plus, all the cars from Lawson grove residents which equates to approximately 18 cars equal 27 cars if everyone is home.</p> <p>There are clearly not enough spaces with what you are proposing. However, residents currently do not have any issues parking in the local area. This issue is whether people can park directly outside of their own door which is not realistic. It's concerning that by not enabling cars on Glebelands road to park on the top end of Lawson grove will cause issues on Glebelands road and could be a danger to traffic, etc.</p> <p>I have sent my formal objections by way of a previous letter, but please can you provide me with specific reasons from residents about why this should be implemented.</p> <p>Ok don't feel like you have answered my query. I would like to know the comments why people have requested the parking scheme in the first place so that I can put my views forward re the specific reasons. Please can you share the comments by today so that I can include further formal objections should I require.</p>	
Glebelands Road	184	Y	<p>I am supportive of the concerns raised by certain residents of Glebelands Road, numbers ■ to ■, in that the proposals put further pressure on the spaces outside their own homes yet there is a section of Lawson Grove that could be useful, but it will be wrongly designated. If Lawson Grove proposals still proceed, then a small alteration will help these Glebelands residents. Amend the Blue Line section on Lawson</p> <p>FROM Proposed waiting restriction (Mon to Fri, 8am to 6pm) TO Unrestricted road space/long stay on-street parking AND CHANGE Proposed limited waiting parking bay (Mon to Fri, 9am to 5pm 2 hours, no return within 2 hours, except permit holders) TO Unrestricted road space/long stay on-street parking</p> <p>The Glebelands residents are not then in receipt of preferential treatment and the top part of Lawson is put to more efficient use. Again, road widths look capable of meeting the needs</p>	The proposal has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) which previously affected Glebelands Road as well as removing the previously proposed restrictions for Lawson Grove in their entirety. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).
Heywood Grove	193	Y	<p>I object to the proposed plans for parking restrictions on Heywood Grove. There are 11 Terrace Houses and 16 Cottage Flats in Heywood Grove. The current road space available isn't enough to serve the current residents living in Heywood Grove. There are a number of lock up garages at the side of the Cottage flats, but these are all rented privately off the council by people who don't live in Heywood. Residents have no access to them.</p> <p>Residents would be better served if the whole of road space in Heywood Grove was designated a "Proposed Designated Parking Area". Implementing a "Proposed Waiting Restriction" and "Proposed Limited Waiting Restriction" as per the proposed plan would see residents put at distinct disadvantage to other streets and roads affected by the proposed changes.</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) which previously affected Heywood Grove. The result of which is that additional un-restricted on-street parking in the immediate area (subject to normal Highway Code parking rules) will be provided.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Lawson Grove	102	Y	<p>I would like to voice my objection to permit parking down Lawson Grove, Sale M33 ■ I recently bought ■ Lawson Grove in May and it was not advised during the sale that there was any proposal for this, as if so I would not have purchased - namely because one of my reasons from moving away from Harley rd was my annoyance with the permit scheme not helping with the parking issues down that road and the additional annoyance of having to provide passes for my parents who provide my childcare and any visitors.</p> <p>On your diagram you also have the entrance for my drive blocked out as requiring a permit, so I would like to know whether you will be painting white lines across my drive or intend to just make the area as requiring a pass, as I already struggle with people parking so close I have difficulty to get in and out of my drive without hitting something.</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) which previously affected Glebelands Road as well as removing the previously proposed restrictions for Lawson Grove in their entirety. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>Additionally the path on my side of the rd is quite narrow and currently all cars are parking on the path which causes me problems, as I have a toddler and cannot get the push chair past - they do this, due to fear of the lorries who come down to the businesses at the end of the road in the day, damaging their cars so again how will bays on this side help as it will just encourage people to park there blocking the pavement?</p> <p>From my experience at Harley, I seen no reason why permit parking would help on this road, as the only issue I have seen with parking is in the evening when People who live on Glebelands park here and that many of the terraces opposite have more than one car, neither would be resolved by day time permit parking. Quite frankly this just looks like a money-making scheme for Trafford and I certainly see no upside so would like to understand your rationale for introducing?</p>	
Lawson Grove	199	Y	<p>I am writing to strongly oppose the introduction of permit parking on Lawson Grove.</p> <p>First of all, there is simply no need for such a scheme, as there is no issue with the volume of cars that park there during the day. I myself live [REDACTED] Glebelands Road, and along with the other four houses (87-93) we all need access to Lawson Grove to park (normally our second cars).</p> <p>We never park in front of the peoples' houses on Lawson Grove, but do park on the first part of Lawson Grove closest to Glebelands Road. (After all, it is a public road). If the scheme goes ahead, it will become very difficult to park elsewhere as lower down Glebelands Road will become even busier and lead to other people parking in front of our houses (4 bays in front of houses 87-93) so just compounds the parking issue and moves a problem elsewhere.</p> <p>Furthermore, this area of Glebelands Road will become more congested and dangerous, as there is a children's nursery (Busy Bees) opposite Lawson Grove, and people use Lawson Grove to park for dropping of their children at the nursery on a morning – only for a few minutes. If only one side of Lawson Grove can be used for drop-off, as per the suggested scheme, this will impact rush hour times in the morning, as more cars will no doubt park outside the nursery on Glebelands Road which will make traffic congested and even dangerous for parents taking children out of their cars on Glebelands (as it is a busy road on a morning). This problem is currently minimised with full access to Lawson Grove.</p> <p>Also, I believe that only four houses out of the nine on Lawson Grove have expressed any interest in wanting this scheme. Additionally, I believe that two out of these houses are rented out, and that the landlords have not been consulted on the scheme, which is what should have happened, i.e. the landlords have the definitive say, not the tenants. I doubt that these two landlords would want the scheme to go ahead as it would make renting out their rental properties less desirable to potential new tenants. (We are trying to speak to the landlords of these two houses so that they can provide their view on the scheme), but time is pressing.</p> <p>As a good law-abiding citizen, as with our neighbours at houses [REDACTED], we pay a lot of money for council tax, and don't believe it is fair to have the use of Lawson Grove, which is a public road taken away from us. Furthermore, my wife and I have two very young children, and our neighbours at [REDACTED] also have two very young children, and feel the proposed scheme would make it more difficult to park safely near to the house, as we would need to look for other parking spaces on Glebelands Road, which as stated is a busy road, and makes it difficult getting into and out of the car safely. Parking on Lawson Grove is a much safer option for parents with young children. Regarding similar proposed schemes on nearby roads, such as Belmont Road, as you know, there was a categorical answer that residents did not want such a scheme, which I would believe is for many of the same reasons I have laid out. Therefore, why should Lawson Grove be any different?</p> <p>To add to this, Lawson Grove is nowhere near to the town centre, which is where parking restrictions / permit schemes are normally introduced, so again, there is no logic to why Lawson should be treated any differently.</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line) which previously affected Glebelands Road as well as removing the previously proposed restrictions for Lawson Grove in their entirety. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>Up until two years ago, we lived at no. [redacted] Lawson Grove for five happy years (feel free to check council tax records for instance), and rarely experienced any issues with parking, other than an obsession with one or two houses on the street who think it is their divine right to park outside their houses 24/7. Again, as I alluded to, people on Lawson Grove do not actually own that road and possibly need reminding of this fact with regards to only a few of them actually wanting to introduce such a scheme.</p> <p>Lastly, if said few residents on Lawson Grove want to go ahead with the permit parking scheme, I and indeed people living at [redacted] have no problem with this if it only relates to spaces directly outside of their houses. (not on the first stretch of Lawson Grove, both sides of it as you enter it, so that other people can use the street for parking).</p> <p>I urge you to consider the above points, and the overall views of people in the surrounding area that would be impacted by the introduction of such a scheme, as opposed to the apparent needs of a handful of houses on Lawson Grove.</p> <p>It would not be difficult to get further support from more surrounding houses in the immediate area, but time is pressing, therefore I urge you once again to consider the view of the majority, not the minority who shout the loudest.</p> <p>We (people from houses [redacted] Glebelands Road) met with councillor Mike Whetton a few weeks ago to express our concerns about the scheme, and he was supportive of our view that it should not go ahead. We expect him to back us and his voice be listened to before a decision is finalised.</p> <p>If you do go ahead and decide to impose the scheme, then we would request that we are allowed permits to park on Lawson Grove and that the four bays outside our properties [redacted] are also included to possibly allow us to park outside and near our properties.</p>	
<p>Lyons Fold</p>	<p>4 85</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Phone enquiry - requesting detail of operation of scheme, timescales for implementation</p> <p>We have lived at Lyons Fold since 2012 and during this time have had no parking issues what so ever. Only residents park on our road with the very occasional visitor or local worker - but this has NEVER been problematic.</p> <p>We firmly object to the proposal of 'no waiting Mon to Fri 8am to 6pm' on the North section of Lyons Fold for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House numbers [redacted], [redacted], [redacted], [redacted] and [redacted] are a row of large 4-bedroom terraced houses that have no off-street parking. • The above houses have large families living in them with the majority having 2 or more cars • Without permit parking on both sides of the road there will be nowhere for residents to park their 2nd and third cars during the day • The majority of resident's work from home, are housewives/husbands or are retired - therefore residents cars are parked on Lyons Fold during the day on both sides of the road throughout the day • Reducing car parking to one space per house (during the day) on this section of Lyons Fold will be totally impossible for residents to live with <p>Our response to the communication in December was to request permit parking on BOTH side of Lyons Fold - and this is the absolute minimum requirement. What would be preferable is the same as Doveston Road and for Lyons Fold to be entirely resident only parking - this would reflect precise usage of today - which as stated previously is not in any way problematic.</p> <p>I trust that serious consideration will be made in changing the plan that is currently proposed to prevent further necessary action.</p> <p>Further to my email below [redacted] wish to withdraw our vote from the petition (produced [redacted]) to abolish the parking scheme completely.</p> <p>After further discussion with the neighbours of Lyons Fold, [redacted] and I are of the opinion that if the parking scheme has to go ahead we stand primarily by our position below. To have permit parking on both side of Lyons Fold and 2 hour waiting on the North side.</p> <p>We support the views presented by [redacted] Lyons Fold wholeheartedly - not wishing to labour the points, however please can you note our duplication of support on the points made by them in the attached</p>	<p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			document? Particularly the point about the precedence that has been set on other local roads similar to ours.	
Lyons Fold	10 48 112 178	Y	<p>We refer to the above proposal, and in particular the section of road opposite our house, known as Lyons Fold, Sale north & west A point 3 metres west of its junction with Mersey Road Its junction with Southern Road 5C and would like some points clarified as soon as possible:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We presume this means No Waiting Mon to Fri 8am to 6pm and will therefore have a single yellow line (and therefore will not be eligible for parking with a permit)? The North section of this road, is at the most part, along the full length of ■ Mersey Rd's rear garden. Along this rear garden, there are no houses, no driveways or issues with parking, so what justification do you have to make this section No Waiting Mon to Fri 8am to 6pm? 2. We can understand restrictions being introduced on the junctions, and across people's driveways on the Western section, but we do not understand your proposal for the North section and will be strongly opposing this based on the current lack of information. Please can you provide your justification for this proposal on this stretch of road. 3. Has anyone from Trafford Traffic visited this road to see what it looks like during the day or enquired as to which car belongs to which resident? 4. Have you consulted with residents' face to face? If you had visited and consulted with residents, you'd understand that 95% of cars parked on both sides of this road, day or night, belong to residents of ■ Lyons Fold (odd numbers only), or ■ Mersey Rd. Residents that work from home, are retired, or are on maternity leave. 5. How many permits will each house on Lyons Fold be eligible for? No one has ever consulted with residents or informed us. 6. Where would you suggest we move our cars to at 8.00am on a Monday morning, if we a) work from home, b) retired, c) on holiday, d) away on business, e) don't work, f) on maternity/paternity leave or g) don't need to leave the house until the school run at 8.35am? 7. Are you proposing us to now park at a 45-degree angle facing our houses? This is the only way we'll (possibly) all manage to park our cars? 8. Are we all expected to now be 1 car households? 9. Are you proposing we move cars to Mersey Rd's Proposed limited waiting parking bay around the South East corner, if we have a 2nd permit? Because if that's the case, where do we park between 8am-9am and 5pm-6pm? <p>We've lived here since 2010 and spent a lot of money (£275,000) buying the Victorian terraced house, without a garage or driveway, including a substantial amount of Stamp Duty (£8250 at the time), not to mention Council Tax, and we have a right to park 2 cars in the road. If we now only have the right to park 1 car in the vicinity of the house during the weekday, this could also affect the sell-on prices. Whilst not enforceable by law, we all have 1 space each outside our own house on the South side of the road and the local rule is, if there's a space opposite, the other car can be parked there. All residents abide to this and it works well without any disputes. In 8 years, we have only had to park our cars 'around the corner' a handful of times, but that is normally because of residents or their visitors. Now, around the corner won't be a valid place to park on a weekday. We have 1 or 2 workers parking down here during the day, we could identify those cars for you, but there's no huge issue on Lyons Fold to justify this level of restriction on the North side.</p>	<p>To respond directly to the points you have raised;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It was considered more appropriate to locate the on-street parking bay directly adjacent to the residential properties on this section of Lyons Fold. Subsequently due to the width of the road, it would be necessary to restrict parking on the opposite side to allow safe passage of 2 opposing vehicles. 2. This appears to be a similar issue to that raised in your first point and would therefore refer to the points made above. 3. Residents from a number of roads in and around this area have requested that parking restrictions be investigated and implemented. As a result, it is likely that parking will be displaced, and it is therefore necessary to look beyond those roads that currently experience parking problems from non-residential vehicles and include neighbouring roads where parking is likely to displace to. 4. Consultation has taken the form of a hand delivered letter, plan and questionnaire which is typical in Trafford. Whilst the proposed restrictions will restrict parking during the day, vehicles could in effect be parked on the single yellow line from 6pm till 8am the following morning, or within the on-street parking bay without having to display a valid permit from 3pm to 11am Monday to Friday. 5. Trafford's permit allocation allows one permit for each property with off-street parking and two permits for each property without any available off-street parking. A single permit can also be registered for use by two vehicles. This information was contained in the original consultation material delivered in May 2017. 6. Vehicles parked on-street should be parked in a marked bay and if intended to be left for more than 2 hours, should have a valid resident or visitor's permit displayed. 7. Vehicles should be parked parallel to the kerb in accordance with the Highway Code. 8. No. 9. During the days/times of operation, vehicles parked on-street should be parked in a marked bay and if intended to be left for more than 2 hours, should have a valid resident or visitor's permit displayed. Due to levels of car ownership, it is not always possible for residents to park in the vicinity of their properties and it is typical where multiple vehicles are owned that parking has to take place away from a resident's property. <p>As a property with no available of-street parking, you would be eligible to apply for 2 resident permits. It is an unfortunate fact however, that no resident has a 'right' to park their vehicle on the road outside their property and as vehicle ownership typically increases so too will demand for the limited space available on-street.</p> <p>It is expected that if the scheme is implemented as advertised, there will be sufficient on-street parking available within all of Lyons Fold to accommodate all Lyons Fold residential parking.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Should a significant majority of residents from any single road register an objection to their road being included in the scheme, it is possible that that road may be removed all together from the proposed Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>At this point I have not added your comments to those received as an objection to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order. However, should you wish to confirm and register an objection, I can confirm that your objection would be included in an Objection report to be prepared and presented to the Executive Member for Environment, Air Quality and Climate Change, Councillor Steve Adshead (reports were formally considered by the Executive Member for Economic Growth, Environment and Infrastructure).</p> <p>The initial consultation took place in May 2017, with a follow up consultation/feedback carried out in December 2017. Following that the next stage was to progress to the publication of the Traffic Regulation Order couple with the resident information/notification letter. The publication of the proposed TRO required a report to be prepared and approved by the One Trafford Head of Service which also contains the detailed schedules associated with the TRO. Prior to this detailed discussions were held with ward members to consider all of the comments submitted to the proposal.</p>

	<p>We understand that not having any restrictions on this section, will cause people pushed out of other roads nearer Cross Street into ours, a point I made in my initial reply in 2017. So, at the very least, the North section of this road should be some kind of permit parking and each house should be allowed to buy 2 permits and continue to park as they do now.</p> <p>We look forward to your clarification on all the above points, so we can discuss the issues with our neighbours before formulating a formal objection.</p> <p>Please can you let us know when we will get a response to our email below. We do not think that an automated reply telling us to expect a response within 10 working days is sufficient, when you are only giving us 21 days to respond.</p> <p>The whole way this has been planned and communicated to the people that matter here, the residents you are affecting, is nothing short of a disgrace. You consulted us in December 2017, designed and drew up the plans on 19th & 20th February, and they were checked and approved on 18th & 19th June. It's then taken you 10 and a half weeks to drop the 2nd letter and proposed plan through our doors but are only giving us 3 weeks to object. Between the initial letter in December, until 30th August we've received no further information at all on this proposal!</p> <p>You are making a lot of residents stressed, upset and angry, do not appear to have taken people's requests from December into consideration and we're all concerned you're just going to implement the scheme without any response to our questions and concerns whatsoever, from your desk in Liverpool.</p> <p>Many thanks for the clarification and further detail with regards to the H bars, which has come up in discussions I have had with neighbours since the 30th August. It's apparent from those discussions that the amount of information we have been given is at best described as 'limited'.</p> <p>I wish I didn't have to waste my time trying to find out the information or understand the minutiae of the proposals, and it's a pity that it hasn't been provided up front to residents.</p> <p>On the letter dated 18th December 2017, that we had to have returned no later than 29th December 2017 (noted at the time of being unreasonable given how busy Christmas post is and the general holiday period) it stated that 71% of households in Area 2 did not support the introduction of parking controls. We were then given a further 3 choices. I know exactly how we responded, but we have never had any notification of how that vote went as a whole.</p> <p>Could you please let me know the figures regarding the response rate and of the responses, what percentage were for and against? My fellow residents are also interested because the last information we received was that 71% were against. Eight months later we receive the proposal, which has not gone down well at all.</p> <p>Please find attached our objection to the current proposal for the North and South of Lyons Fold, Sale. As you will see it is quite comprehensive, but we need you to understand the reasons why we have objected, plus we have offered compromises that we feel the majority of residents on these 2 sides of the Fold would support.</p> <p>We look forward to confirmation that the letter will be included in the Objection Report.</p> <p>Please include the all below comments in your Objection Report as our formal objection to the <i>current proposal</i>:</p> <p>We've lived on Lyons Fold since Dec 2010 and have had no parking issues in those 8 years. Your <i>proposal</i> will create a problem where there isn't one and has stirred up emotions amongst the residents. We have a lovely community here, on a quiet residential street and we want it to stay that way. Mainly residents park on our road, at all times, with the occasional welcome visitor(s) or even rarer local worker(s), but this has never been problematic.</p>	<p>As much as possible it has been endeavoured to keep residents informed of developments and progress of the project, however this is a balance to be struck between providing useful, relevant information and how cost effective it is to provide updates when little real progress has been achieved.</p> <p>As correctly pointed out, Amey's Liverpool office have been developing proposals, but have been working very closely with colleagues based at the One Trafford office to deliver this project.</p> <p>The current practice in Trafford is to mark out the permit bay on street as a single unbroken parking bay. This will extend and encompass dropped kerb vehicular crossings/driveways. Where driveways are present, an access protection 'H' bar marking will be installed to highlight the presence of the dropped kerb.</p> <p>Typically this would mean that parking in the bay, directly adjacent to the dropped kerb is restricted to the exclusive use of residents of that property (useful if more than one vehicle is owned with limited driveway space), although there is no reason why a neighbour couldn't park there having discussed whether access across the driveway would be required before or after the vehicle parked blocking the driveway would be driven away, i.e. if a neighbour returned home later and was expected to leave earlier.</p> <p>The risk of not marking the bay across the driveway is that it effectively renders that section of carriageway as un-restricted and liable to a non-resident parking there. Trafford's own Civil Enforcement Officers (the old traffic wardens) would therefore be unable to issue a Penalty Change Notice as no parking contravention would have occurred. It is presumed that a resident permit holder, not associated with that property, would be considerate enough to not block a fellow resident's access.</p> <p>Consultation packs containing a letter detailing the proposal, a questionnaire and plan were distributed to 118 properties in your immediate area. Of the 118 consultation packs that were delivered, a total of 39 responses were received (a response rate of 33%). Of these, 69% (27) indicated that they thought parking would migrate to your area if measures were introduced in neighbouring roads and 71% (25) indicated that they supported the introduction of resident permit parking controls in this area.</p> <p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
--	---	---

Below are photos of Lyons Fold taken at 10am on Friday 7th September 2018. All these cars are residents of 1-15 Lyons Fold. Moving them every weekday at 8am to avoid a parking fine, is simply not practical and will add to the stress of a morning. Some form of permitted parking on both sides would reflect the usage of today.



North side of Lyons Fold



South side of Lyons Fold

We firmly object to the *current proposal* for the North and South sides of Lyons Fold for the following reasons:

1. Whilst the double yellow lines at the junctions with Mersey Rd are welcome, to improve lines of sight and safety, you're displacing *at least* 4 vehicles currently parked here. With just this small change, you're therefore creating fewer spaces than currently available in the immediate area. You are in no way *creating* spaces with this proposal, so coupled with the proposals on adjacent roads, there will be far fewer spaces for all the existing resident's cars.
2. House numbers 1-15 (odd Nos) are a row of large 4-bed Victorian terraced townhouses that have no off-street parking (with the exception of No. 1). They have large families living in them, with the majority having at least 2 cars.
3. Without permit parking on both sides of the road, we do not agree with you that there will be sufficient space in the area to park our 2nd cars during the day when many work from home, are stay at home mums/dads, on maternity leave, on holiday or retired. You are **reducing** the available, currently unrestricted spaces as previously stated, in a massive area and are penalising the residents, not the out of town commuters. Why should we have to move cars at 8am? Who benefits from this on a quiet residential road? Certainly not us residents!
4. Whilst we understand we have 'no right' to park outside our own houses, we are sure residents of adjacent roads don't want our cars parked outside their houses during the day (or night) when the scheme is imposed. The fact you're allowing **non-residents** to park on the South side **for free** for a number of hours (worst case from 3pm to 11am the following morning), **when we will have had to have paid for a permit**, is not fair and is going to displace resident's cars onto other roads if we are

		<p>prohibited from parking on the North side. It's a lose-lose situation for the residents and makes no sense at all. No one voted for this.</p> <p>5. It will create a totally impossible situation for residents to live with. We travel away with work (or commute to Manchester) and one of us leaves the house on a weekday before 8am on foot to the tram/bus, or by taxi to a railway station/airport, leaving one car in our 'allocated space' outside the house. We have 2 young children, 9 & 6 years old who go to school at Park Road Primary, a 6-minute walk away. We walk them to school to exercise them, to relieve traffic congestion and parking issues around school (as requested by the Headteacher) and to reduce pollution. If the only available space at night is on the North side of the Fold, having to potentially move the 2nd car from the yellow line by 8am to 'somewhere free' is simply not going to be practical on a regular basis as we cannot leave the kids in the house alone. The mornings can be stressful enough, and we could potentially end up driving the kids around for 45 minutes, looking for a free parking space, which does the traffic congestion and environment no good at all. We doubt, with the proposed scheme around the school, that there will be anywhere to legally park to drop them off between 8.45 and 8.55am. We're not the only family that would be competing for available spaces at this time, especially as the school intake has doubled in recent years. Six children under the age of 10, living on Lyons Fold, go to 2 local schools. The single yellow line will of course stretch from Lyons Fold all the way down to the United Services Club on Southern Road. You're restricting parking massively between these times.</p> <p>6. We understand that this scheme has been requested by residents of other roads, and us not being a part of it could start to cause us issues in the future, hence our response to the December consultation was to accept a form of permit parking, but for it to be on both sides of Lyons Fold! A plea that appears to have been totally ignored. It was totally underhand the way the consultation pack was sent on 18th December and had to be returned no later than the 29th December. You knew full well that it's the busiest time of year, there are 2 public holidays and 2 weekend days in that 12 day stretch. Not everybody has the luxury of being able to be off work in that time. No wonder you got such a poor response rate of 33%. To give us only 12 days at the busiest time of year and then to communicate nothing until 30th August is absolutely shameful.</p> <p>7. We do not believe there needs to be enough width for opposing cars to pass on Lyons Fold. This stretch of road is only 55 meters long and on the rare occasion there are opposing vehicles, one can easily make way for the other without any altercation. It's understood that between 6pm and 8am under the current proposal, cars could be parked along the entire length on both sides anyway, so where's the ability for 2 opposing cars to pass then? The bin lorries come down this area on a Wednesday well before 8am and emergency vehicles can easily reach the middle house of the row either by road in the case of an ambulance, or a fire engine hose can easily reach the middle of the row from either end. Only a few houses on the West side of Mersey Rd have their bins collected from the North of Lyons Fold and the alley way is close to the junction, so there is no need for the bin lorry to drive down here.</p> <p>8. Waverley Road (off Dane Rd) and Dargle Road (off Cross Street) both have resident's schemes on both sides (see photos), with no single yellow lines, as does Wolseley Rd. Whilst slightly wider than Lyons Fold, should cars be parked in bays on both those roads, it is not possible for 2 opposing cars to pass, which we know from experience. These are much longer roads and busier thoroughfares than Lyons Fold. Trafford have set a precedent there, so we don't accept Lyons Fold needs to allow the passage of 2 opposing vehicles.</p>	
--	--	---	--



Dargle Rd, facing Cross Street, Sale. Waverley Rd, facing Dane Rd, Sale

9. Your proposal for a yellow line along the North will create a busier thoroughfare when it currently isn't, nor does it need to be. It's a quiet residential street and all the residents who live here and are affected by these proposals, want it to stay this way. It's a reason why we moved here in the first place. There is no issue with *traffic congestion* in the near vicinity, so we don't believe this road needs to become a rat run to free up traffic elsewhere. Making it an easily passable 2-way thoroughfare also makes it less safe for residents, especially young children who are currently able to play out on the street together safely when supervised.
10. How you think that there will be space for cars to park unrestricted on a bend opposite numbers 5 & 7 Southern Road (at the side of 51 Mersey) is beyond our comprehension (see photos). This will *create congestion on a thoroughfare* and will not allow the safe passage of 2 opposing cars. **You'll be narrowing the road to exactly the same width as Lyons Fold is currently**, as resident's cars will undoubtedly be parked on the South side in the parking bays during the day. **This shows a complete disregard by yourselves regarding the local area and contradicts the reasons for you not allowing weekday parking on the North side of Lyons Fold.** We have never seen cars parked in this space, for obvious reasons if you lived here.
We parked one of ours outside number 7 for you to see just how narrow that bit of road is with cars on both sides. How is this different to Lyons Fold and how can this be passed off as safe? It's incomprehensible.



Parked on the North side of Southern Rd, outside number 7, facing Mersey Rd



Parked on the North side of Southern Rd, outside number 7, showing the junction with Lyons Fold (West/East) and the blind bend. Your proposal allows for another car on this side outside number 5.



The width of the road outside 7 Southern Road with the permitted parking according to the proposal, showing the proximity to the junction of Lyons Fold (West/East).

11. The council has historically been responsible for allowing the building of offices on and around Cross Street, with insufficient parking for the workers. The brand-new Co-op has a huge car park at the rear that is always empty when we drive past during the day. Why should we, 230+ metres from Cross Street as the crow flies, have to **suffer** as a result of this scheme? The council should be looking at solutions to provide those workers with alternative modes of transport or places to park, not punish

			<p>the existing residents a few blocks away, by making their lives more difficult. This is just extra tax on top of the Council Tax and Garden Waste charge.</p> <p>12. You will find that most residents that we have spoken to would support changing Lyons Fold to a one-way system if that is the only way that we were able to retain parking on both sides of the road. Is that something that the council will take into consideration?</p> <p>13. We propose that the South side of Lyons Fold be Resident's Permits Only.</p> <p>14. We propose that the North side of Lyons Fold be Limited Waiting 2 hours - No Return 2 hours - Mon-Fri 9am-5pm Except Permit holders. That would allow non-residents to park there for a limited time. Visitors could park there for an extended time with a valid permit. Residents are therefore not penalised. This would also allow carers of school children, immediately after school for example, to park from 3pm without the need for a permit and therefore at no extra cost to the residents.</p> <p>We trust that AMEY and Trafford Council will undertake serious consideration in reaching a workable compromise with the majority of residents of North and South Lyons Fold, compared to what is currently proposed, which suits absolutely no residents at all.</p> <p>We look forward to your confirmation this objection has been added.</p>	
Lyons Fold	84 176	Y	<p>In response to the proposed residents parking scheme on Lyons Fold where we live at number ■ having looked at the proposed parking restriction on one side there won't be adequate parking spaces available for all the residents to park all there vehicles. It would fill up the residential side of the street and also push residents to have to park off their own road. Also, residents on Mersey rd and southern rd would be pushed to outer roads.</p> <p>We would like the dotted green proposed parking on both sides of the road and also surrounding roads as we feel as soon as we leave a parking spot outside our house, another resident from around the area would take the very limited spaces.</p> <p>As a follow, up to my previous email we have discovered that Doveston Rd has been given resident only parking. As a precedent has been set we feel this would be the best outcome for Lyons Fold too.</p>	<p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Lyons Fold	171	Y	<p>Further to your letter of 30th August 2018 outlining the proposals for parking restrictions in the Mersey Road / Southern Road area of Sale, we would like to register our objection to the current proposals, but, crucially, our support for some form of parking restrictions.</p> <p>We live at ■ Lyons Fold, a road in which there isn't a great deal of parking space, but there is a great deal of demand for that space, as it is also used by some residents of Mersey Road unable to park closer to their own homes.</p> <p>If parking restrictions are introduced on Lyons Fold, the number of vehicles isn't likely to diminish but the space in which to park them will more than halve during some periods, as double yellow lines will limit parking close to corners and junctions, and the north side of Lyons Fold and the east side of the adjacent Mersey Road will see the introduction of a waiting restriction Monday-Friday 8am to 6am with no exemption for permit holders. We wholeheartedly support the introduction of double yellow lines around junctions and corners, however we object to the waiting restriction without exemption for permit holders, for the following reasons.</p> <p>- We have one car. A number of our neighbours have three or four cars and no off road parking – so the parking spaces outside our home on both sides of the road are regularly occupied by others. While we appreciate we don't have a right to a parking space outside our house, these proposals will make it increasingly difficult to park anywhere on our own road, let alone outside our house. Currently, residents of Glebelands Road park on Mersey Road, and residents of Mersey Road park on Lyons Fold. With waiting restrictions introduced on the north side of Lyons Fold and the east</p>	<p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>side of Mersey Road, the resident permit parking spaces on the south side of Lyons Fold will become even more hotly fought over than they are now.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Along with a number of our neighbours, at least one of us works from home every day with the car often left at home as well. If there is no permit holder space available on the south side of the Fold we will have to move our car from the north side at 8am, while also getting our son ready for school. If we're both at home this will merely be an irritating chore, but as one of us also frequently works away, it will mean ensuring our six-year-old is up and ready to leave the house before 8am so we can go in search of another parking space or face a penalty. Dropping him off at school in the car isn't an option – because the roads around his school are likely to be permitted parking only under the proposals. Equally, if we go on holiday but aren't able to park in a permit holder space, we'll be penalised. <p>The simplest solution to this – and one which a great number of residents of Lyons Fold support – is to make both the north and the south side of Lyons Fold limited waiting except permit holders. We understand that the reason this option was originally discounted was to ensure passing space for two vehicles on the road, however, Lyons Fold is not a thoroughfare – it is little more than a cul de sac - and for many years cars have passed safely with others parked along both sides of the road. Notwithstanding the facts that other permit-controlled residential streets in the area allow parking along both sides of the road; and during off peak times the new proposals for Lyons Fold would also allow parking on both sides, if the council's primary concern is the ability for cars to pass down the Fold unchallenged, we (and other residents) would support the introduction of a one-way system, along with permit-holder parking on both sides.</p> <p>It's important to stress that we are not opposed to the introduction of all parking restrictions – we believe restricted parking will make the neighbourhood safer (especially during the day when cars can be parked all along Glebelands Road) however, any restrictions that do come into force in the area will undoubtedly reduce the number of available parking spaces and further displace cars around the neighbourhood. We believe the reduction in parking spaces should be made in areas where parking poses a safety risk, not – as is the case with Lyons Fold – unnecessarily on a residential street with very little traffic but a great deal of demand for available parking.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, our proposed compromise is that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any changes to parking on Lyons Fold should not encourage two-way flow of traffic - Both the north and south side of Lyons fold be designated limited waiting parking bays with an exemption for permit holders. - Lyons Fold be designated One Way only - All residents are provided with two permits per household 	
Lyons Fold	172	Y	<p>I write to object to elements of the proposed Mersey Road parking scheme. I am the homeowner of ■ Lyons Fold. I have spoken to all residents on our street and the vast majority see the proposal for this street as unworkable. Specifically, the proposal to designate one side of the road as a no stopping zone between 8am – 6pm.</p> <p>Most families in this street have 2 cars and several houses in the street include home workers. Very few have off road parking available. My wife and I both work from home, in her case 5 days per week, in my case 3 days per week. Having half the street as no waiting 8am - 6pm will inevitably push cars from this street onto neighbouring streets causing inconvenience, unnecessary journeys at peak times of day and irritation amongst residents on other streets. The proposed designation of our street is also likely to increase the level of traffic which will reduce the possibility of children playing safely here. This is important because the nearest public park is Ashton Park which is a 15-minute walk.</p> <p>I ask that you modify the scheme by designating both sides of Lyons Fold a resident only parking zone. My understanding is that you have done something similar for the residents of Doveston Road who requested it, so there is a precedent.</p>	<p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Lyons Fold	186	Y	<p>We would like to formally object to any form of parking restrictions being introduced on Lyons Fold. We also voted against this in the consultation, however, it appears that these restrictions are continuing to be pursued, despite there being in our minds a fairly dubiously concluded majority vote, including one carried out in the Christmas week which many residents missed.</p>	<p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p>

			<p>We do not believe there is a parking problem on our road and, therefore, no need for any form of restricted parking to be implemented. There are always sufficient spaces and ourselves and our grown-up children and visitors have never been unable to park. The last thing we want are marked parking bays being painted on our road along with double yellow lines or the introduction of a one-way system.</p> <p>Lyons Fold, as you are aware, is a very small and quiet road. It has a fantastic community spirit and friendly neighbours and residents park considerately. This old fashioned and traditional neighbourly spirit is unfortunately being eroded by the fear of this scheme being implemented. We both work from home regularly and also treat ourselves to the occasional holiday. [REDACTED] job (a Director at The [REDACTED]) means he needs to come and go at all hours and we are both very concerned about where we would leave cars during the proposed restricted times. (We do have one off road space, but are still impacted by the scheme.)</p> <p>We would implore you to exempt Lyons Fold from this scheme at this time as it is going to create a whole load of parking issues, hostility and bad feeling where there is currently none. We do not believe parking will migrate to our road if restrictions are introduced in neighbouring roads. If these residents have voted for permit parking, then presumably they will be in the possession of their own permits.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for including our objection.</p> <p>If you need any further information from myself or [REDACTED], please do let me know.</p>	The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.
Lyons Fold	191	Y	<p>We write to register that we object to Traffic Regulation Order Amendment No. 212. regarding the section proposed for Lyons Fold. We request that this objection be acknowledged and formally recorded in the Objection Report.</p> <p>The objection points raised are O1 to O10: Objection detail</p> <p>1 There is no majority in favour of the proposal For the immediate area there are 118 properties. Following the second consultation letter regarding the proposal there were 39 responses which is a 33% response. Of the responses there were 25 in favour of a residents parking equating to 22%. Both 22% and 33% are a minority. Reviewing similar schemes proposed nation-wide online a greater than 50% response would be expected and further that a majority vote in favour of a scheme before implementation.</p> <p>2 The questions on the second consultation/proposal were not adequately worded or sufficiently balanced and the response period was artificial the wording of question 1 is biased towards giving an answer 'Y' and 'Y'. There is no evidence or comfort that the questions have been either produced or vetted by a neutral or sufficiently qualified independent (i.e. not Amey) body. The bias in the questionnaire may be one reason why the response to the second consultation of December 2017 was below 50%. The responses to the first consultation in Area B were as a majority against parking restrictions. It was poorly managed that the second consultation pack was sent on 18th December and had to be returned no later than the 29th December. This of course is the busiest time of year, there are 2 public holidays and 2 weekend days in that 12 day stretch. The timing does not suggest a genuine intent to involve the public in the consultation.</p> <p>3 The proposal does not meet the purported aim the scheme is proposed to be implemented due to parking problems in Area A and that if implemented in Area A there would be potential displacement onto Areas B and C. The current proposal reduces parking availability in Lyons Fold and therefore does not alleviate parking problems as; a) there is NO current parking problem, b) by implementation of parking restrictions in Area A it will potentially CAUSE an increase displacement to Areas B & C and so parking problems and c) it CREATES an immediate parking problem by reduction (greater than 50%) of parking in Lyons Fold and across the areas of B and C and therefore, creates follow on displacement.</p> <p>Whilst understanding we have 'no right' to park outside our own homes, we are sure residents of adjacent roads don't want our cars parked outside their homes during the day (or night) when the scheme is imposed. By proposing to allow non-residents to park on the South side for free for a number of hours (worst case from 3pm to 11am the following morning), when we will have had to have paid for a permit, is not fair and is</p>	<p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

		<p>going to displace resident's cars onto other roads if we are prohibited from parking on the North side. It's a lose-lose situation for the residents and makes no sense at all. No one voted for this.</p> <p>4 There is no evidence that a physical site survey has been carried out. A question raised from a neighbour regarding this remains un-answered. Question "Has anyone from Trafford Traffic visited this road to see what it looks like during the day or enquired as to which car belongs to which resident?"</p> <p>Answer" Residents from a number of roads in and around this area have requested that parking restrictions be investigated and implemented. As a result, it is likely that parking will be displaced and it is therefore necessary to look beyond those roads that currently experience parking problems from non-residential vehicles and include neighbouring roads where parking is likely to displace to." The answer appears to distil as "No". A site visit would make many of the objection points raised here relating to Lyons Fold understandable enabling a workable proposal to be developed.</p> <p>5 The current proposal takes no consideration of the highway characteristics Lyons Fold is as its name a short fold (of circa 130m), it is not named as a road. The primary vehicular use (by observing traffic flow) is by the residents of Lyons Fold, either directly or service vehicles to the properties. It is fully understood that Lyons Fold is a Public Highway but non-resident vehicular traffic at present is minimal due to a) the fixed narrow width of the Fold, b) the 90 degree bend or 'fold' approximately halfway along and c) as there is a better and wider route along Mersey Road for traffic going from Southern Road/Mersey Road to Glebelands Road rather than along Lyons Fold. See also O6 and O7.</p> <p>6 There will be an increase in traffic flow Following a question from a resident of Lyons Fold it was answered that: "It was considered more appropriate to locate the on-street parking bay directly adjacent to the residential properties on this section of Lyons Fold. Subsequently due to the width of the road, it would be necessary to restrict parking on the opposite side to allow safe passage of 2 opposing vehicles."</p> <p>The result would be to encourage increased traffic flow along Lyons Fold. The width of Lyons Fold would not safely accommodate two moving vehicles in opposing directions with parked vehicles on one side. This is based on empirical evidence of driving/observing one moving car passing along with parked vehicles on either side. This works well with considerate driving, two opposing vehicles each allowing a variable safety margin at their sides would likely lead to vehicle collisions.</p> <p>There is no issue with traffic congestion in the near vicinity, so we don't believe Lyons Fold needs to become a 'rat run' to free up traffic elsewhere. Waverley Road (off Dane Rd) and Dargle Road (off Cross Street) both have resident's schemes on both sides (photos available), with no single yellow lines, as does Wolseley Rd. Whilst slightly wider than Lyons Fold, should cars be parked in bays on both those roads, it is not possible for 2 opposing cars to pass, which we know from experience. These are much longer roads and busier thoroughfares than Lyons Fold. Trafford have set a precedent there, so, we don't accept Lyons Fold needs to allow the passage of 2 opposing vehicles.</p> <p>7 There will be an increase in traffic speed This will be a logical follow-on consequence of point O6. A number of residents have small children who are currently allowed supervised play on the Fold. This will be impinged and safety of same impacted by the proposed scheme.</p> <p>8 The current proposal for Lyons Fold is flawed Following a question from a resident of Lyons Fold it was answered that: "Whilst the proposed restrictions will restrict parking during the day, vehicles could in effect be parked on the single yellow line from 6pm till 8am the following morning, or within the on-street parking bay without having to display a valid permit from 3pm to 11am Monday to Friday." If double sided parking is to be permitted during these times, then it negates the reason made (see Point O6) as to why double-sided permit parking could not be implemented fulltime.</p> <p>9 There is no evidence that the proposal has been sufficiently peer reviewed or that the parking proposals have been modelled by software or otherwise Following a question it was answered that: "It is expected that if the scheme is implemented as advertised, there will be sufficient on-street parking available within all of Lyons Fold to accommodate all Lyons Fold residential parking."</p> <p>Expected is a word that implies the proposal is not based on a full and proper evaluation. An approx. measure of the proposed residents parking bay on the side indicated for Lyons Fold gives a measure of 50m and 70m = 120m total (abating for the three sections of proposed double yellow lines).</p> <p>The double yellow lines at the junctions with Mersey Rd are welcome, to improve lines of sight and safety, however this will displace at least 4 vehicles. This change will therefore</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>create fewer spaces than currently available in the immediate area. Coupled with the proposals on adjacent roads, there will be far fewer spaces for all the existing resident's cars. The two other sections will displace further vehicles.</p> <p>Lyons Fold has 15 properties (with direct frontage onto Lyons Fold). Taking an abstract of all the properties based on bedroom sizes (abated for any off-road availability) and by reference to the 'Trafford Strategic Planning – Appendix J' gives an assessed minimum parking length of 175m. This exceeds the maximum possible of 120m.</p> <p>Most of the properties on Lyons Fold are large with corresponding large families (including adult multi-generational) living in them, with the majority having at least 2 cars and in line with any reasonable expectation of car ownership as per the 'Trafford Strategic Planning – Appendix J'.</p> <p>Without parking on both sides of the road, we do not agree that there will be sufficient space in the area to park during the day when many work from home, are stay at home mums/dads, on maternity leave, on holiday or retired. You are reducing the available, currently unrestricted spaces as previously stated, in a massive area and are penalising the residents, not the out of town commuters.</p> <p>At present and based on 11 years of ownership parking on both sides of Lyons Fold allows accommodation of all resident's vehicles, visitors and any other occasional non-resident parking. Reducing parking availability to less than 50% will not accommodate the requirements.</p> <p>10 The proposed system does not displace parking during the day</p> <p>Online reviewing of schemes indicates that a parking scheme only works if it displaces non-resident parking during the day. From own observation and from residents meeting there is little or no impact from non-resident day-time parking.</p> <p>We suggest for your consideration below our proposals for a scheme that would be workable on Lyons Fold and fit within the wider proposal for Area B and C. These are based on eleven years (of a combined twenty-two years' joint experience) of living on Lyons Fold and direct observation of traffic and parking on a real-life day to day basis.</p> <p>P1 We propose that the South side of Lyons Fold be Resident's Permits Only.</p> <p>P2 We propose that the North side of Lyons Fold be Limited Waiting 2 hours - No Return 2 hours - Mon-Fri 9am-5pm Except Permit holders. That would allow non-residents to park there for a limited time. Visitors could park there for an extended time with a valid permit. Residents are therefore not penalised. This would also allow carers of school children, immediately after school for example, to park from 3pm without the need for a permit and therefore at no extra cost to the residents.</p> <p>P3 If the only way that we were able to retain parking on both sides of the road is to put in a one-way system then we would also support that.</p> <p>Post receipt of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order Amendment No. 212 and during the current consultation period we both signed a petition for the scheme not to be implemented and parking to remain as is. Following further consideration including discussions with our fellow neighbours we retract under this letter that first petition signing in preference to the proposals P1 to P3 above. Our objection to the current proposals of the TROA remains.</p> <p>Following a number of direct Lyons Fold neighbour discussions (held as the proposed scheme would impact so an aversely on the residents) we anticipate that a majority of these residents will be objecting to the Traffic Regulation Order Amendment as proposed. We sincerely trust that 'One Trafford' is more than a slogan and involves including the needs of and points made by its residents. The amendments you make will impact on real people, their lives and homes. Please at the very least consider their views.</p>	
Lyons Fold	192	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I was opposed to the introduction of any parking restrictions for Area 2 (including both Lyons Fold and Mersey Road) when the proposals were first issued on the grounds that there was no parking problem in the area and therefore no need for restrictive parking being implemented. My opinion has not changed. • 71% of Area 2 residents who replied to the initial proposal felt the same, to my mind a democratic majority yet the council thought it necessary to ask us again...wording the questions differently this time and warning us about the likelihood of what would happen when the scheme was implemented in Area 1. Very few residents responded to this second questionnaire, possibly due to it arriving over Christmas, so the council seemed to take that as our approval of their plans which it wasn't. • If we think back to when this started had the council not proposed it would we have been asking the council to implement any such scheme? As residents we are honestly never worried about parking our cars? 	<p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

- Introducing permits won't guarantee being able to park near our house, in fact it could make it more difficult as anyone with an AJ area permit will be able to park in any resident permit parking bay. In view of the increasing level of car thefts in the Sale area parking further away from our house would be detrimental.
- Feedback from residents who already have the scheme in the Sale area shows it can create a parking issue and cause bad feeling among neighbours with some even resorting to putting cones out to prevent "legal" parking! I note there was also an interesting article on the front of The Messenger in May last year showing protesting Southern/Mersey Road residents, they didn't want it then and I'm not so sure they do now!
- With regard to the visitor permits it would be so easy to forget to put one in a friend/relative's car or, as many residents work from home, a client comes around and stays longer than intended and they end up with a parking ticket. Not a risk I want to take.
- I have 2 grown up daughters living at home who both own cars, myself and my husband have a car each and, as a family, also own a motorhome which we park on the drive. If resident permits are introduced our best choice would be to park the Motorhome on the road (with our one permit) so as to allow 2 cars to be parked on the drive however, we would still require 2 additional permits...I question whether this would be the best solution for the area or just additional annual revenue for the council?
- The extra cost involved to us of £77:20 (£38:60 per car) per year (at current rates although the charge seems to go up each year) on top of our road tax and council tax.
- Proposing one side only parking on both Lyons Fold and Mersey Road will in effect reduce the number of parking spaces available which would be counterproductive for all residents.
- It will have a detrimental effect on the environment. More residents will be forced to convert their front gardens into paved parking spaces which not only results in the loss of vital habitats for insects and other wildlife, but it also reduces natural water drainage.
- Local small businesses struggle to survive as it is with high rates and rent without their clients having to worry about where they can park and for how long without risking an expensive parking fine...this scheme could have an adverse effect on trade leading to yet more empty premises.
- The majority of the cars parked on both Lyons Fold and Mersey Road belong to residents. We are not near enough to the Metrolink stations or the town centre for people to want to park here all day whilst they go to work.
- Many residents work from home, are retired, work shifts or use public transport meaning that their vehicles are parked at home during the day. This said there are still plenty of places to park therefore the scheme is unnecessary. (see attached photos taken on a typical weekday afternoon)
- The cost to the council of the proposed scheme. At a time when all councils are shutting down essential community services to save money I do not want my council tax to be used for an unwanted, unnecessary parking permit scheme.
- I do not believe that the introduction of the proposed scheme in Area 1 will, as suggested by the council, adversely affect the parking in Area 2. No proof of this happening has been put forward by the council.
- If the proposed scheme was implemented with parking on only one side of Mersey Road (from Glebelands Road to Southern Road) I would be concerned that drivers would drive at increased speed on that section creating a danger to local children.
- If the proposed scheme was implemented with parking on only one side of Lyons Fold more cars would use it as a cut through to Southern Road again creating a danger to local children.

We have lived at number 1 for 34 years and have obviously seen a big rise in the number of cars, for both residents and local businesses in the area however, the vast majority of people are considerate when parking and finding a space has never been an issue. Our little Fold has also always been a very friendly, neighbourly place to live which is ideal for bringing up a family and I worry that some of this spirit would be lost through a parking scheme the council seem to want to impose on us. I fear that some residents feel they have no choice now but to accept that the scheme will go ahead regardless and so are trying to compromise on a better way to implement your plans. I'm not sure if you have visited the roads concerned in person but if you haven't I would respectfully suggest that you do before taking a final decision, they are not just roads on a map but people's homes and communities that will be affected.

I still firmly believe that for the benefit of all local residents the scheme should not be implemented at all.

			<p>Please confirm receipt of my email. Please also confirm that my objections will be duly considered, as noted in the letter dated 30th August 2018 from One Trafford Traffic and Transportation Department, in the consultation process.</p>	
Lyons Fold	196	Y	<p>Duplicate of objection/comments submitted under reference 178.</p>	<p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Lyons Fold	202	Y	<p>Our neighbour is an elderly resident of Lyons Fold and doesn't have access to email. He has therefore asked me to submit this objection on his behalf. We will print this email and give him a copy, so he has sight of the contents. If you require anything more than this in order for this to count as an objection, please let me know.</p> <p>'I object to the current proposal for the North and South of Lyons Fold, Sale which was detailed in your letter dated 30 August 2018.</p> <p>I wish to propose instead that Lyons Fold remains permit free and without any parking restrictions except for the Fold being changed to a one-way system'</p>	<p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Lyons Fold	207	Y	<p>With reference to the above and as long-term residents of Lyons Fold (48 years). I would like it formally noted that we strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions which you are endeavouring to put into place in Lyons Fold.</p> <p>In all the years we have lived in Lyons Fold, we have never had any issues with parking and don't feel this scheme will benefit us in any way. In fact, putting these restrictions in place is more likely to create problems with the parking. The knock-on effect will be that residents of Lyons Fold who have more than one vehicle will have to park on other roads nearby which will then mean taking someone else's parking space which means they will have to park elsewhere etc etc. Why try to fix something that isn't broken, surely it is best left well alone.</p> <p>My husband and I are both retired and not in very good health and rely on family and friends who call on a regular basis to help us out. Any parking restrictions will make it very difficult for visitors of any kind to park or stay for any length of time. The threat of a heavy parking fine will surely put people off visiting.</p> <p>We do not have the garden space at the front of our property to create any off-street parking nor do we have any vehicular access to the rear and therefore feel that we are between a rock and a very hard place.</p> <p>We would also like to suggest that before the council gives permission for yet another office block/block of flats to be built in Sale, it would be a good idea to make sure that adequate parking facilities are also included in the plans. Had this been the case in the past then the residents of Lyons Fold and surrounding streets would not now be paying for the mistakes made by the council in the past with regards to lack of/inadequate parking facilities in Sale. Surely it is not rocket science!!!</p> <p>Once again, I would like to make it clear that we strongly object to your proposed plans and firmly believe that for the benefit of all local residents the scheme should not be implemented at all.</p>	<p>The proposal for Lyons Fold has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Mersey Road	16 24 31 32 36 77 98	Y	<p>I STRONGLY object to the proposed parking scheme due to the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The car ownership in the area is far greater than the number of spaces available, meaning that residents will not be able to park close to their home. This is especially problematic for Mersey Road/Lyons Fold as the residents with terraced housing often are a two-car ownership. Also, the flats on Glebelands Road (who will be eligible for permits) also park on these roads. - the timings of the waiting restriction are not resident friendly. The above point would be less problematic if the scheme was 9.30-4.30 (or less favourably 9-5). Restricted waiting from 8-6 will result in regular fines for residents, hardly the aim of the scheme 	<p>The proposal for Mersey Road (between Glebelands Road and Southern Road) has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

		<p>- residents parking only zones on Mersey Road/Lyons Fold would be far more suited than halving the parking as proposed.</p> <p>-the implications will be catastrophic, paying more to not be able to park, the inconvenience outlined above, and forcing non-resident workers to park just outside of the permit zone will exacerbate the problem. I foresee that the scheme will have to be reversed. Certainly not ideal given this is costly to implement.</p> <p>At each stage I have offered suggestions of how this could be improved/eased for residents. Sadly, I was asked to offer these in at this stage, which feels too late to have any chance of influencing the proposals.</p> <p>Each local councillor I have had surgeries with has agreed with my concerns, which indicates the reality of these. Please also refer to the correspondence of Graham Brady.</p> <p>Thank you for specifying the number of spaces. I'd imagine by the time the scheme was implemented those 8 would be reduced to 6 maximum. I have calculated that the residents along that portion of road would be entitled to 19? permits (circled in the image) plus visitors with visitor permits. I have attached the image to evidence this showing the buildings and whether they can have 1 or 2 permits (due to their off-road parking or lack of). Hopefully this can also be submitted to indicate how problematic this will be for residents who are also paying for this reduction in parking. Lyons Fold is equally as high in resident car ownership, being close in proximity there is currently insufficient places for those residents with both sides parking. I have previously provided photographic evidence of this, taken on a Sunday night but am happy to provide this again if required. This is why I oppose the scheme. This is also why I have suggested the residents only parking if the scheme is implemented, such as Doveston.</p> <p>Residents are questioning if all of the comments have been taken into account, looking at the current plans this suggests not. There has been mention of possibly using the freedom of information act to ensure this. I am sorry to inform you of this, it may not happen, but this is the unfortunate result of residents who have often felt insufficiently aware of the situation and received limited responses/information to their queries and concerns.</p> <p>I shall encourage those residents on Lyons fold and other problematic areas to contact you in order that the figures can be calculated.</p> <p>I continue to be unclear of the number of spaces directly outside of my property (57 Mersey Road, taking into account the lowering of the curb scheduled to take place in front of the land adjacent to [redacted] Mersey Road) and on Lyons Fold. I would appreciate the estimations for those sections please.</p> <p>From my estimations there is large discrepancy between residents' car ownership and the proposed spaces in bays, hence requesting residents only (not bays on both sides given there is insufficient space). Like Doveston Road.</p> <p>If you could provide the number of spaces which will be available, as previously requested, this would be gratefully appreciated. Please include the land adjacent to no61 Mersey Road which is lowering the pavement. As this is double fronted, a further 2 spaces are lost. I shall ascertain the exact number of residents' cars.</p> <p>Please could you specify where a permit will allow you to park? Given my previously outlined concerns.</p> <p>Thank you for putting these comments forward. Many residents do not feel that their suggestions have been taken into account, nor are they aware of the full details about permits, such as number available per household (I have forwarded the information you provided to me about 2 per household without off road parking and 1 per household with off road parking). Also, where you can park with a permit (is this only on your street? Adjoining streets or anywhere within the permit area.</p> <p>I would be very grateful if you'd provide me with the information for this.</p>	
--	--	--	--

			<p>We have over 50 names on a petition, those residents will also send objection emails and offer suggestions (which they feel have not been taken into consideration in response to their previous comments). We will forward this information to you by 12th sept.</p> <p>Again, I'd like to stress that the solution to a problem not only moves (not solves) the problem and will cause catastrophic problems for residents who will be out of pocket, will be competing for too few spaces and be affected when they hope to sell their property. I am hoping that resident's suggestions will be taken into consideration. For example, making the section of Mersey Road in front of my property (and Lyons fold) residents only (like Doveston) would mean the approx. 20 residents cars would have around that many spaces rather than 10 (the result of this shocking proposal).</p> <p>I would also like to know how the people without permits who care for my children will park to drop off my son to school (Park Road).</p> <p>After seeing another Facebook discussion of the permit parking I'd like to question (again) having a 'residents only' section on Mersey road (near Glebelands) and Lyons fold. The residents on Doveston and Heywood are lucky in that they'll have a permit and spaces to park. We will most likely have a permit but 50% shortage of spaces.</p> <p>Failing this scheme being overturned, please could you specify if a resident only' area will be considered given the ratio of up to 19 permits for the eventual 6 spaces?</p> <p>Failing that, the timings of the single yellow line to be 9.30-3?</p>	
Mersey Road	40	Y	<p>We firmly object to the proposal of 'no waiting Monday – Friday, 8am to 6pm' at the front of our house and down Lyons Fold, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the contents of the email sent by [REDACTED] 31st August, which we whole heartedly agree with. • The consequences of introducing this proposal will result in everyone with a parking permit, parking wherever they can in and around the area. Why should we have to search for parking when returning from a day at work? • Where do you propose residents should park when they have no spaces available to them? <p>Please see attached photographic evidence taken this morning (Mersey Road & Lyons Fold) at 11.45am, showing there are absolutely no issues with office workers parking in this area. All cars currently parked there are residents or workmen!! (if necessary registration plates can be checked to verify this).</p> <p>We trust serious consideration will be made in changing the current proposed plan. We are at a loss to understand why parking restrictions are being brought into an area where there is no pressure from office workers.</p> <p>We will send daily photographic evidence of parking in this area, so you can understand the resident's frustration at this proposal.</p>	<p>The proposal for Mersey Road (between Glebelands Road and Southern Road) has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Mersey Road	47	N	<p>We reside at [REDACTED] Mersey Rd and believe that we are disadvantaged by this proposal as it removes the ability for us to park directly outside our front door. We have an unusual situation whereby our front door is not actually on Mersey Rd, but on the side of the house on Lyons Fold (opposite no. [REDACTED]) and I feel this may have been overlooked. From looking at the plans it would appear that permit parking has been introduced outside all houses that do not have driveways so that residents are able to park outside their house. As a new mother with a 4-month-old baby I am concerned about the fact I will no longer be able to do this during the day – it will make carrying the baby to and from the car more difficult and hazardous.</p> <p>At the point of the original consultation we did not believe there to be an issue with parking in the vicinity of Mersey Rd and Lyons Fold, and am therefore surprised that this scheme is going ahead. I understand that this is now in the final stages and the TRO has been published, however ask that consideration is given to extending the area of proposed limited waiting to include the section of Lyons Fold where the entrance to our house is.</p>	<p>The proposal for Mersey Road (between Glebelands Road and Southern Road) has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p>

Mersey Road	76	N	<p>I am emailing not in objection to the proposed scheme, which I fully support, but to make my feelings known about why I think this should go ahead as some residents have started up a petition against the scheme.</p> <p>I am fully aware of the sensitive nature of such a scheme and that it may not be favourable to some, but it has come to the point that something needs to be done on Mersey Road and I cannot see any other way around it.</p> <p>I am a stay at home Mum with 2 young children, for myself I see the full impact of office workers parking on our street. This isn't about not having space for residents and their visitors to park, for me it's a simple safety issue. Daily I have to take my children who are 5 and 3 onto the road due to cars parking on pavements (it is not possible for cars to park opposite each other on our narrow street, so pavement parking happens), this simply is not acceptable and puts my children (and those walking to park road school) at risk. I also see elderly patrons of the social services club on southern road having to walk in the road, some of which are unsteady on their feet. Along with this I have seen lorries and even a fire engine gets stuck.</p> <p>Not only do we have to contend with office workers, but we also have Sale Dojo and The Manchester Model Railway who park their vehicles on our street. Over the past few months the area opposite my house has become a hot spot for airport parking, only 2 weeks ago I witnessed 3 cars pull up, the occupants take suitcases out and then jump into taxis. The cars were parked up for a week. I understand that it is perfectly legal for people to park on a street, they are doing nothing wrong, but Mersey Road is too narrow a street, too busy a street for all of this to continue and there is plenty of parking available to office workers in car parks in Sale town centre, therefore I fully support this proposal.</p>	<p>The proposal for Mersey Road (between Glebelands Road and Southern Road) has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p>
Mersey Road	80	Y	<p>Our ground for objection are simple - although this scheme would likely reduce the long-stay parking from non-residents, the weekday waiting restriction will dramatically reduce the parking capacity available for residents. Both Southern Road and Park Avenue are heavily used for residential parking rather than commercial use, as can be evidenced by the weekend patterns - these roads are both full on the weekend, whereas Mersey Road (lower numbered-portion) is very quiet. During the week, these residents will now be forced to park their cars on Mersey Road instead of on Southern/Park.</p> <p>The weekday waiting restriction is presumably not aimed at commercial parking, but rather to enable the flow of traffic, particularly One Trafford's own refuse vehicles. We think this restriction is overkill - although I can imagine it is challenging for the operatives to get through the street at time, I can only recall one incident in two years where they were physically unable to get through. If we presume 2 collections/week over 52 weeks, that's 0.009% of the time that they've been affected - and, frankly, they could have just driven around.</p> <p>Thank you again for the clear way in which this project has been consulted, and for the replies to our communications.</p>	<p>The proposal for Mersey Road (between Glebelands Road and Southern Road) has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Mersey Road	89	Y	<p>With reference to your information letter delivered on Thursday 30th August 2018. Please see the following questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have 5 cars one of which is parked on the drive. How many parking permits can we have? • We already pay council tax and road licence tax to park on the road. Why should we have to pay for a permit to park outside our property? <p>I look forward to your prompted reply</p> <p>As we have more the 2 vehicles we are told we will only be able to purchase permits for 2 cars within the stated times of restricted parking. What are we supposed to do? Park the cars miles away? We pay our rates and car tax and we cannot park outside our house? This is not acceptable.</p> <p>Therefore, we would like to object to the proposed parking scheme in its present form.</p>	<p>The proposal for Mersey Road (between Glebelands Road and Southern Road) has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

<p>Mersey Road</p>	<p>173</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>May I first say that I have lived at my property on Mersey Road for nearly 30 years and have been campaigning to have something sorted with the parking issues for nearly 20 years now. I am so glad that you are now in a position to implement the changes.</p> <p>Secondly, I am fully in favour with the scheme although I wish to propose a slight amendment.</p> <p>You propose to retain the existing unrestricted long stay parking between the Irish Club (101 Washway Road) and the entrance to Richmond House. The stretch of unrestricted long stay parking causes tremendous issues first thing in the morning during the rush hour (between 8 – 9am) when dozens of motorists use Southern Road & Mersey Road as a short cut to enter Washway Road as north as possible without using the traffic lights at the junction with Glebelands Road. Most mornings the traffic trying to access Washway Road is double parked along this unrestricted stretch which makes it very difficult and dangerous for the vehicles leaving Washway Road trying to access Mersey Road. They often have to drive along the pavement as there is not room for them to drive on the road due to the double-parked vehicles.</p> <p>My initial suggestion is to restrict this stretch (as marked yellow on your plan) to be unrestricted from say 9.30am onwards to make the access onto Washway Road safer for all vehicular uses during this rush hour period.</p> <p>My alternative suggestion is to make this stretch 'limited waiting parking bay' of 2 hours only between 9am to 5pm with no return within 2 hours. I know this will upset the all-day office works but they can park in their own office car park!</p> <p>For many years now, I have asked vehicle users how and why they park outside my house all day. The common answer is that they work in the nearby office building of Crossgate House, Marshall House, Chester House, etc, all of which have their own car parks. However, the employees are told that the office car park is for 'visitors only', who probably only stay for an hour or so whereas the all-day office workers park outside my house 'all day'.</p> <p>As an Architect, who works from home (at Mersey Road) I am fully aware of planning requirements for office developments, etc and to have the office car park just for visitors and not staff is not acceptable.</p> <p>May I also comment that here at this end of Mersey Road we get a double whammy. As soon as the all-day office workers leave at 5.30 ish we get for the next 3 hours the Sale DOJO karate vehicles up to 9pm during the week and all day at weekends. Again, they have no respect for us who live here and park anywhere, even over my drive, etc.</p> <p>It is not easy living here. Within 5 minutes of leaving in my car the space is filled by an all-day office worker, so I end up parking 300m away just because they are not prepared to walk a bit further.</p> <p>Finally, are you going to introduce 'I' beams over all driveways along Mersey Road as again drivers seem to think it acceptable to park in front of my drive? The attached photos are the junction with Mersey Road & Doveston Road. This is a regular problem.</p> <p>I hope my suggestion will be given due consideration in your final proposals.</p>	<p>The proposal for Mersey Road (between Glebelands Road and Southern Road) has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
<p>Mersey Road</p>	<p>177</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I am a resident at no [redacted] Mersey Road, Sale, and I am writing to object to the proposed plans to Mersey Road, Sale. I believe this scheme will severely impact on the residents that park outside their houses on our part of Mersey Road and also Lyons Fold. We (the top part of Mersey Road (between Southern Road and Glebelands Road) do not have any issues with non-residents/office workers, and if you impose the waiting restrictions on the one side of Mersey Road (Proposed waiting restriction Mon to Fri, 8am to 6pm), the residents won't have enough space to park their cars (we are nose to tail now) and our visitors will have nowhere to park at any time.</p> <p>I personally have my mother who comes to look after my young children often at our house and, if this scheme goes ahead, she will not ever have anywhere to park - let alone any other visitors we might have. They would not park outside our neighbours</p>	<p>The proposal for Mersey Road (between Glebelands Road and Southern Road) has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>houses out of courtesy, so that would leave nowhere left to park. We get along very well with our neighbours, but this scheme will cause lots of problems with everyone fighting for limited spaces. The 8am to 6pm restrictions will not work, as most residents are still at home at 8am and are home before 6pm.</p> <p>There is absolutely no reason to impose this scheme on our part of Mersey Road, (between Southern Road and Glebelands Road) and will only cause huge parking issues with the residents.</p>	
Mersey Road	194	Y	<p>I wish to record my strong objection to the proposed new parking scheme as it applies to the section of Mersey Road between Lyons fold and Glebelands Road, and Lyons Fold itself.</p> <p>This area is currently under increasing pressure for parking by genuine residents. The proposed scheme will effectively reduce the available spaces by over half especially in Lyons Fold. This in turn will expose residents to the risk of being fined for parking where they live and is completely unacceptable as it stands.</p> <p>If a scheme has to be implemented then the only fair approach would be to extend the limited waiting sections to use by permit holders, or to change the sections of street described above to permit holders only, as is proposed for Dovestone Road. These points have been made before and have clearly been completely ignored. It is high time people involved in these decisions, working in remote offices, took notice of those whose lives are directly and, in this case, adversely affected.</p>	<p>The proposal for Mersey Road (between Glebelands Road and Southern Road) has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Merton Road	28 105	Y	<p>Following receipt of your letter dated 30th August 2018 in respect of the above proposals we confirm our objection to the scheme as currently proposed. Specifically, as residents of Merton Road for 20 years this year. There is currently ample unrestricted parking for residents on Merton road to service local households. The one issue has always been the lack of available parking for residents during weekdays due to parking by people who work in some of the local commercial premises. The currently proposed solution of creating circa 3 spaces of unrestricted parking, circa 4 spaces of residents parking and one complete side of the road with no parking between 8am and 6pm does not address the problem whatsoever. In fact, it creates 2 issues: A reduction in available parking space for residents, particularly between 8am and 6pm, noting local residents have varied working patterns so the 8-6 restriction is restrictive for residents Safety. Merton Road is used extensively as a cut-through, with vehicles already travelling at speed despite parking on both sides of the road. Creating more space by restricting parking along one side runs the risk of traffic traveling at greater speed which, given the densely populated area, adjacency to local primary school and number of young families along the road, presents an increased safety risk In light of the fact the current proposal does not resolve Merton Road parking issues, reduces parking options for local residents and creates a significant safety issue I object unreservedly. Furthermore, if the plans cannot be amended to provide Residents' Parking to both sides of Merton Road then Merton Road should be removed from the proposed scheme altogether. Following local consultation and as you state in your correspondence, it is clear other residents across neighbouring roads have successfully opted out of this parking scheme having reviewed the proposed plans. This would appear to suggest the proposed plan does not work nor does it take account of the issues being raised by the residents the scheme is attempting to resolve.</p> <p>I would question why the unrestricted parking has been removed from outside ■ Merton Road, when it is still available at the side of ■ ark Road?</p> <p>The plan to allow parking on both sides of York Avenue at the junction of Atkinson Road is also ludicrous - has anyone from Amey actually walked or driven this route?!</p> <p>Thank you for your standardised reply. I understand all residents if Merton Road that have been in contact have received, fundamentally an identical email.</p> <p>We find it quite frankly dangerous that you are suggesting making Merton Road free flowing 2-way traffic. The traffic is frequently in excess of 30mph now, and I would suggest that one of your team spend a 12 hours on Merton Road assessing the traffic flow. This would need to</p>	<p>The proposal for Mersey Road (between Glebelands Road and Southern Road) has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>incorporate both rush hours and both the start and end to the school day. You will then observe, first hand, the lunatics that are currently driving down Merton Road as a cut-through.</p> <p>Residents parking on both sides of Merton Road would give parking 'obstacles' to traffic, allowing natural slowing of the traffic. We have parking on both sides currently, and this does not restrict the access for larger vehicles such as fire engines and bin lorries.</p> <p>Many of the residents of Merton Road have young children, and what you are proposing is a dangerous hazard to these families. The scheme in its current state is short sighted and has not been risk analysed sufficiently. Therefore, the scheme in its current state is rejected by us.</p>	
Merton Road	75	Y	<p>I would like to further object to the amended scheme. The blue lines on the map indicating all-day parking restrictions worsen the current problem of not being able to park residents' cars during the day. They also worsen the problem of drivers passing through the area at speed, as they will now have two clear lanes rather than proceeding with caution and using gaps.</p> <p>If the scheme is implemented, there will be too few permanent resident bays for many of the roads. I give the example of Merton Road, where I live. Merton Road should have a resident permit bay on both sides for the scheme to be useful, otherwise it would be better to scrap it altogether for Merton Road.</p> <p>Several other residents nearby park at least one car on the road during at least part of the day as well as overnight. The proposed arrangement will not allow for the current number of vehicles, especially not with additional displaced vehicles from nearby roads. I counted five vehicles at 8pm this evening on the odd-numbered side, with only 3 spare spaces opposite. This will create potential conflict between residents for available spaces.</p> <p>An additional problem that would be created by the proposed scheme, is that this deficiency of spaces will lead to more houses choosing to remove front garden space for extra parking. This brings additional environmental concerns: increased run-off, contributing to flood risk; degradation of the air quality because of fewer plants; similarly, temperature radiation will increase; visually the area is degraded.</p> <p>So, to summarise my objections to the scheme:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Worsens current space problem in the day and mandates moving of cars to one side of the road every weekday, regardless of planned use. 2. Safety concerns as double lane promotes excessive speed by drivers passing through - already an issue. 3. Potential conflict between residents created as too few permit spaces for nearby houses. 4. Encouragement of garden-to-drive conversions, which degrade the area in multiple ways. <p>I am very keen that the scheme be scrapped, or at least reconsidered, with a permit bay on both sides of Merton Road, and, I suggest, other roads, such as Atkinson Road and Park Avenue.</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to effectively remove Merton Road from the proposal all together as a result of the significant level of objection received from residents of that road. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Merton Road	111	Y	<p>We are residents of Merton Road and have received your letter dated 30th August 2018 detailing the Proposed Residents' Permit Parking scheme. We would like to confirm our objection to the scheme as it currently stands. We have no problem whatsoever with the current parking situation on Merton Road- yes, we do get office workers parking outside our houses during the week but for the vast majority of the time they park sensibly, not blocking access and move their cars at the end of office hours.</p> <p>The proposed new scheme gives us about 3 spaces of unrestricted parking, 4 spaces of residents parking and no parking at all, just restricted waiting, one side of the road between 8am & 6pm. This scheme has 2 major problems.</p> <p>The first is that residents on the side of the road that has the restricted waiting will have to park cars they can't fit on their own drives on the other side, thus completely reducing available parking spaces for residents already on the permit parking side. This will lead to major issues between neighbours especially at times when vehicles belonging to trades-people, who are working at particular houses, need to park there. The trades</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to effectively remove Merton Road from the proposal all together as a result of the significant level of objection received from residents of that road. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

		<p>people's vehicles are often there way before the office workers turn up to park, therefore limiting the original office worker perceived 'problem' even more.</p> <p>The second problem is around road safety and speeding. Merton Road is already used as a cut-through with some vehicles travelling at a ridiculously high speed even though there are cars parked on both sides of the road. By removing cars completely from one side of the road drivers will be able to travel even faster leading, I'm sure at some point, to a road traffic fatality. Given that this is a densely populated area, exceptionally close to a Primary School, with young families all along the road I strongly believe this proposed scheme is far too high risk.</p> <p>In light of our objection to the current scheme we can see only 2 possible solutions. Firstly, both sides of the road allow for Resident Permit Parking. If this cannot be achieved, then Merton Road should be removed from the proposed scheme altogether. It is clear from talking to a number of our neighbours that many of them do not agree with your proposed plans and we hope that you will listen to our concerns.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Merton Road	123 130	Y	<p>I enclose a petition from the residents of Merton Road and properties with drive access onto Merton Road, which rejects the implementation of the parking scheme dated 30th August 2018. The grounds for rejecting the scheme are listed on the petition. Of the 21 affected properties, 19 have signed, which is over 90% of households. It is worth noting that one of those not signing is a rental property.</p> <p>I hope that you agree that the scheme in its current form has been overwhelmingly rejected by the residents and strong feelings have been expressed against the proposal.</p> <p>It is also noteworthy that the original advocate of parking permits for Merton Road has now moved away.</p> <p>I have sent you a paper copy of this covering letter and the original petition in the post. When is the report to Mr Adshead due?</p> <p>Reduction of available on street parking for residents. The inconvenience and cost of permits for resident, visitors and trades people.</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to effectively remove Merton Road from the proposal all together as a result of the significant level of objection received from residents of that road. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Merton Road	166	Y	<p>I believe that introducing waiting restrictions to the whole of one side of Merton Road would clearly reduce available parking for the actual residents. Residents would then be competing for space on the few 'parking bays' which are not even restricted to residents only. I believe any such changes will have a significant impact on me and other residents by making the parking situation for residents for, far worse than it is now. There are at least 20 households that park on Merton Road. Many of these have more than one car. Where are these cars going to park?</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to effectively remove Merton Road from the proposal all together as a result of the significant level of objection received from residents of that road. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Merton Road	181	Y	<p>The only reason why parking has ever been an issue on our road, based on discussion with my neighbours, was because people were and still are parking on the corners making it unsafe for people to cross the roads and causing traffic blockages at the junctions. There are double/single yellow lines which already exist on the corners but ideally, they need extending a bit in certain areas and policing or there is no point in them being there.</p> <p>The school run times are ridiculous for traffic, but this hasn't changed and will not change with the introduction of your new scheme as you have already stated that you do not plan to hire any more parking wardens. Considering the current double and single yellow lines aren't policed why should there be a change if even more areas that need policing are added?</p> <p>The route of Park Road, Merton Road, Atkinson Road, York Avenue and Park Avenue forms a faster route during the rush hour periods to beat the traffic lights and traffic on Washway Road/Cross Street. This means cars are speeding everyday down residential areas as well as in a school area. Again, this is not being policed and I feel that with the implementation of the new scheme, therefore having one side of the road clear of parked cars, this will allow for even more reckless/speeding traffic. I feel this is something you seriously need to investigate before proceeding with your plans.</p> <p>Based on our understandings of the proposed street parking, for Merton Road there will be the 'odds' side of the street completely clear of parked cars, the 'evens' side of the street with permit parking only, but then the corners of the street where the problems lie is now to be unrestricted parking. We feel this is just creating a more accessible through road, allowing for faster speeds and still causing the previous problems on the corners. This completely defeats the object of the scheme and creates worries for our children who are often crossing the street.</p> <p>I feel that if you insist on these road marking changes, regardless of the views of residents, then you should also strongly consider speed bumps throughout the area. If you genuinely believe this matter to be in the interest of the residents I would like to see in writing that every resident will be given one permit to park free of charge with no expiry date.</p> <p>Another concern I would like to note, your most recent letter states that in the areas where the majority of the neighbours declined change you have no longer included these roads, well from speaking to the residents of Merton Road the majority of us rejected your proposal and wanted to leave the street as it was. Therefore, why have we still been included? I feel none of our questions or concerns have been properly addressed, explained or justified by yourselves.</p> <p>Our street has conducted its own petition and found 19 of 21 houses have rejected this proposal. This was carried out by the residents at number [redacted] and has been forwarded</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to effectively remove Merton Road from the proposal all together as a result of the significant level of objection received from residents of that road. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>along with their own rejection letter. One of the 2 remaining houses is a rented property, so they didn't respond to the petition.</p> <p>Until this matter is properly investigated and a proper plan is thought through and put forward I feel it is a danger to the public to implement this scheme.</p> <p>I expect to hear back from you in regards to my many concerns, as your letter dictates this is the process to complain and will be followed up in full.</p>	
<p>Park Avenue</p>	<p>25 37 56 57</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I think the concern we have is that, in refusing to allow residents parking on both sides, you make the number of residents parking spaces very small and in allowing traffic to flow in both directions you will encourage faster speeds. The fact that traffic cannot flow in both directions today actually serves to limit speed. Park Avenue is, after all, a side road which runs to a primary school. The safety of the children attending that school has to be more of a priority than one which allows traffic to flow safely in both directions.</p> <p>I have copied this email to Councillor Lamb and would appreciate if the concerns outlined could be impressed upon Councillor Adshead prior to any approval.</p> <p>Thank you for your email. I just want to pick up on your point and reinforce our objection to the refusal to allow resident parking on both sides of the road on Park Avenue, between York Avenue and Southern Road ("the Location") In particular, when you refer to the "remaining available carriageway width to below an acceptable, safe, level to permit traffic to flow in opposing directions". This is a side road and even when there is parking today on both sides, services, such as refuse, can easily and safely navigate the road as can other road users. Accordingly, please confirm what you consider a safe width as it seems to me that the width you consider safe "to permit traffic to flow in opposing directions" does not exist on most roads in and around Sale and there is no particular problem today with cars, emergency or other services using the road at the Location. Is there any evidence you have or can provide to show or support your argument that it would be unsafe at the Location? I am not aware, in the ten years of my residence, of any accidents on the road caused or occasioned by traffic flowing in opposite directions even when cars are parked on both sides at the Location. In fact, by limiting parking to one side of the road, you may actually encourage more unsafe and excessive speed on a road that leads to Park Road, School. This is already a problem as people use the Location as a cut through and could be made worse and more unsafe by your proposal. I have children at the school and at least at the moment, the parking acts to slow drivers down and take more care.</p> <p>On the consultation responses and having spoken to many residents myself (some of whom are copied to this email) it occurs to me that some of those that responded saying that there was a problem and that supported also made the point that they support on the basis that residents parking would be on both sides of the road at the Location. This is only conditional acceptance and should be treated as such and it seems to me that the interests of the residents of having an appropriate number of permit spaces is being ignored for reasons of safety which have not been properly tested and proven and may be made worse by the new scheme.</p> <p>In the circumstances, please register this email as an objection to the plans as proposed.</p> <p>I am writing to object about the proposal on the basis that the proposals fail to take into account or fully into account the responses from residents. In particular, the use of parking restrictions on Park Avenue in no way makes the situation for residents easier and if that was the intent, then permit holder parking would be allowed on both sides of the road. Park Avenue is more than wide enough particularly between York Avenue and Southern Road to accommodate this and it would at least provide more help to residents. Further, when new properties were constructed on Atkinson Road the parking restrictions were not extended across the driveways of the properties (see attached photographs). This effectively means those new build properties on Atkinson Road can have visitors and workman attend at their property and park across their drive without any restriction. If this is the Council policy, then residents affected by the scheme should be afforded the same opportunity as the new build properties. Specifically, if a resident wants to pay to have their kerb dropped and have H bars across their drive then they can do this, and it will take precedence over the yellow lines. This could and should</p>	<p>The proposal for Park Avenue has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>

			<p>be offered as a chargeable service under the proposal. I accept that parking in this way on a regular basis could lead to the H bars being removed but the same principle and policy should apply to both new and old properties particularly where residents are being impacted by the changes.</p> <p>I have copied this email to Councillor John Lamb.</p> <p>We are in the process of placing an order to have our curb dropped and have T bars placed across our drive. We are also aware that you are about to introduce new parking controls on our road the details of which are set out below. Please confirm that if we pay for our kerb to be dropped and have T bars placed across our drive the T bars won't then be removed to replace with the yellow lines now being proposed. We note that a similar arrangement was put in place for the developer on Atkinson Road in Sale where the yellow lines do not go across the drive where there are T bars. I just want to check that the same will apply to the new restrictions being brought in at our address.</p>	
Park Avenue	50	Y	<p>Whilst I am all for something to be done about the shocking parking situation in the above locations, I disagree with the proposal that down one side of Park Avenue where I live will be "proposed waiting restriction Mon to Fri 8am to 6pm".</p> <p>We are a 3-car family. Both myself and my wife work at home and there is only one space available on the drive. My son also has a car and with the varied hours he works, he could be home 2 or 3 times during the working day. I appreciate that we will need an extra permit but to have a restriction on parking outside our own property seems draconian. By all means make it limited parking time except for permit holders on both sides of the road and not just one.</p> <p>Whilst writing TBC working with AMEY may display their Investors in People awards but they certainly will not be able to display Plain English Award! Once again, the correspondence is not clear and concise. The correspondence needs reading a few times before you can disseminate the relevant information. Having asked others in the vicinity regarding their interpretation, they had a different view of the proposals to myself! The cost of the visitor permits/extra household permits has also not been conveyed leading to many horrific tales of woe and scaremongering on social media! Please accept this email as an objection to the "proposed waiting restriction Mon to Fri 8am to 6pm" on what appears to be the North side of Park Avenue in Sale.</p>	<p>The proposal for Park Avenue has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Business)	163	Y	<p>I write with regards to the proposals put forward by yourself of parking restrictions within the Sale area. I understand there is a final consultation on the 18th September and wish for express my concerns.</p> <p>As an employee of Arch Hall Limited (Marshall House, Park Avenue) I would like to express again my opposition to the proposals of parking restrictions in the Sale area. I have little choice but to use my personal vehicle to commute to and from work. Using public transport is impractical, time consuming and not cost effective. My journey time to work is no more than 25 minutes by car but by public transport (using the buses and trams) my commute would be in excess of 2 hours each way.</p> <p>The council has been in consultation with only a minority of local residents with regards to these parking restrictions. Whilst I appreciate the views of some residents, I do not believe the 'bigger picture' has been considered. For example, the majority of parking in the Sale area is limited to a 2-hour maximum stay and is not necessarily close to my place of work.</p> <p>Furthermore, I suffer from bi-polar disorder and anxiety. Paranoia is also an issue I contend with and having to walk to my vehicle which is 5-10 minute away from the office I believe would exasperate my conditions. A number of colleagues have also expressed that it may put them at more risk of attack, robbery and anti-social behaviour. The council has in my opinion spoken with only a minority of residents and as such are suggesting restrictions in a knee-jerk fashion with little to no research having taken place. I also note that out of approximately 1200 residential properties contacted, less than 200 have responded? I believe the data speaks for itself (in that the proposals are not representative of the majority of residents)</p> <p>I hope that the council will reconsider the proposal taking into account the above.</p>	<p>The proposal for Park Avenue has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>

<p>Park Avenue</p>	<p>12</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I note that end of York Avenue that meets Atkinson Road now has a solid yellow line on both sides, signifying unrestricted road space/ long stay parking. I cannot see how this can be physically possible. That part of York Ave is only just wide enough for two cars. If there was parking on both sides it would obstruct the entire road. Surely the parking is for one side only?</p> <p>In addition, I walk down that road many times each day, often with my young children. When cars are parked in the existing parking bay near that junction it makes it very hard for cars using that junction- especially with the tree that bulges into the road too. If that is one of a very few unrestricted parking spaces in the area, then I would imagine it is likely to be occupied on a much more regular basis than it is now.</p> <p>Surely the proposed plans would effectively encourage them to park at a particularly dangerous spot on York Avenue.</p> <p>In addition, we live on Park Ave. During the day we are constantly bothered by the office workers parking right up to our drive/ partly across it making it hard/ impossible to get our cars on and off our drive, so I do support the parking scheme.</p> <p>However, the saving grace to the current parking problem, is that when the road is full of cars the passing traffic tends to slow down. Outside of office hours when the road has minimal cars parked on it the traffic races up and down.</p> <p>I have some concerns that the average speed on Park Ave will increase if there are fewer parked cars, and as a mother of two young children that causes me some concern. Has any thought be given to speed control measures?</p>	<p>The proposal for Park Avenue has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
<p>Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)</p>	<p>93</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I strongly object to this as it will affect my lively hood by ability to park anywhere near where I work which will in turn increase my travel expenses, on a regular basis I contribute to local business's in the area as this is where I will typically by my lunch, drinks, petrol etc. I feel parking in the surround areas should be available to business's in the area even if it means being able to apply for a permit myself.</p> <p>In addition, whilst I am parking the area during typical working hours the residents are typically out at work themselves therefore I am not sure how this would cause any obstruction for the surrounding residents.</p> <p>I feel there should be a middle ground measures taken as currently I feel there has been no consideration for those of us working in the area and contributing to the local business's like everyone else, whether I am a resident here or not I am still contributing to the area.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove much of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
<p>Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)</p>	<p>94</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>One reason, is that a number of parking spaces have been removed with no alternative provision being provided. Why is there no alternative areas in the same number been provided? This will surely only create more of the same issues again around the area, as employees of Essential will have to find other places to park.</p> <p>A second valid reason is that a lot of houses down Park Avenue already have their own driveways to drive onto. What is the need to be using the front of their house too, which they don't even own? As a commercial occupier, it appears there are no permits being provided to us even for just week day 9-5.30pm working hours. This seems completely unfair to me, as we are residents and paying business rates which Trafford council receive to contribute to the local economy. Therefore, why do residential residents have a priority over what is essentially the highway and ourselves completely disregarded in the proposed scheme?</p> <p>I do hope you take my concerns into consideration when deciding on these restrictions.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
<p>Park Avenue</p>	<p>95</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I am writing in regard to the proposed changes to parking outside my place of work. It would appear a number of parking spaces have been removed with no alternative provision being provided. Why is there no alternative areas in the same number been provided? This will surely only create more issues. On the roads where there are drive ways the proposal is to virtually remove any parking, save for short stay. Surely this can</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single</p>

(Marshall House - Business)			<p>be controlled with white lines across the drive ways so as to keep available full unrestricted parking on both sides of the road.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to the wider economic impact of this scheme which either gives a complete restriction to parking or only provides parking largely for residential occupiers. The agenda appears clear to make this a residential only area and thus commuter belt for people to work in Manchester, who will in turn not be working and contributing towards the Trafford economy.</p> <p>I understand and sympathise with the local residents' point of view, but there simply isn't a feasible alternative – if there was, myself and my colleagues would gladly have taken it by now.</p>	<p>yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	96	Y	<p>I have recently heard about the proposed parking plans. The roads in question, Mersey road and Southern road are the only places within reasonable walking distance to park outside my work.</p> <p>If these proposed plans go into action the only place myself and my colleagues would be able to park is Sainsbury's. This car park only allows customers to park two hours at a time plus you have to pay. So not only will it be expensive to pay daily but we will also have to continuously go back and forth to our car to renew our tickets, which is highly disruptive. I understand how busy the roads get for local residents but without an alternative option for us I don't see how this plan is fair.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	97	Y	<p>I am writing in regard to the proposed changes to parking outside my place of work. Were these changes to go ahead, the only other options that myself and my colleagues would be left with would be to park at Sainsbury's or other main car parks, which are quite a walking distance from our workplace and they only allow parking there for up to two hours, we would have to leave the office to return to our cars throughout the day to move them or renew our tickets. This is obviously highly disruptive to our working day, as well as being extremely expensive and is therefore just not a reasonable or fair thing for us to be expected to do.</p> <p>I completely understand the local residents' frustration but unfortunately, without any other decent alternative – I will object to these proposals.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	99 156	Y	<p>Just for your awareness following the circulation of the revised scheme and consultation we have since received notification that the NHS Trafford CCG who have previously expressed their fears of the implication of this parking scheme to your fellow Councillors and directly to AMEY will be relocating away from the area. This will take effect on or before April next year. The CCG occupy a whole floor in Crossgate House accommodating over circa 100 staff. Similarly, another company based on Park Avenue again with concerns over the scheme have also given notice to leave the area following the recirculation.</p> <p>This is precisely the effect myself and Terry anticipated (albeit has come far sooner than we expected) and it is these economic factors which are not seemingly being considered or at least listened too. Perhaps given this news some thought can finally be made in this regard given that already whilst the consultation hasn't even finished there will already be over 100 people less in the area on a day to day basis being employed and contributing to the local economy based on the news above alone. We've already informed yourself and AMEY of the application to convert CAP Gemini House into apartments which will also serve to change the demographics/use of the subject area which also we believe throws up another reason to review the strategy. However, the overwhelming point really is and as put to all parties before: - one cannot remove a</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>Levels of off-street parking for commercial developments are established through the planning process; other than in relation to planning applications the Council has no control over the amount of off-street parking provided (even then it is very limited), but in any event the Council would wish to see a limit on the provision of off-street parking for commuters in order to encourage more sustainable travel.</p>

			<p>provision that has been readily available for a considerable amount of time and (whilst not replacing it) expect there to be a consequence – indeed we are already witnessing this.</p> <p>We fully anticipate more will make the movement away from the area as a result of the parking proposals currently out for consultation and we will have to make serious considerations about what we do with our assets there as we can't leave them sat vacant which indeed will blight the area in itself. Perhaps another factor to consider as the proposals are weighted in favour of the residential occupiers is how they would feel living next door to empty office buildings or in time converted office buildings which will then in turn put more burden on the schools, Dr's and other general infrastructure with the area potentially overly developed into housing.</p> <p>I appreciate you will obviously need to wait for the consultation to run its course and digest the eventual report. However, I thought it important you were informed of the implications already being seen as part of this process.</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed scheme as a representative of the owner of several buildings within the subject area. My objection is based upon the following grounds: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is removal of a large supply of freely available parking spaces with no alternative supply provided within the scheme whether free or paid parking. • There is no plan to provide permits to the commercial occupiers within the subject area, an obvious prejudice of the scheme. Commercial occupiers pay Business rates just as occupiers of the dwellings do, an indeed create jobs and contribute to the daytime economy of the area. Thus, a strange demographic to penalise in this scheme. • The intention of this scheme was to promote more conscientious parking practice; however, the scheme sets out to primarily remove the possibility of parking at all unless a permit is available. • The scheme is too heavy handed with restrictions. In a lot of cases there are restrictions on both sides of roads. Alternatives should be considered that do not render both sides unable to be parked upon – if this means not creating hatched or bayed spaces and there is no alternative to this then the road layout should stay as it is until such time a suitable alternative can be thought of / agreed rather than progress with an overly oppressive and economic casualty of a scheme as is the one proposed. It would be mindless to put bayed spaces on one side of a road to effectively render the other side incapable of having spaces. • This scheme will eventually have the effect of driving commercial occupiers away from the subject area. What is the proposal to deal with this inevitable impact of this scheme? A simple solution is to ensure whatever number of car spaces have been removed are made available somewhere else within the subject area. • Due to the severe parking restrictions proposed, the scheme will only push parking issues into other neighbouring areas. A more balanced scheme with less restrictions will lessen this impact and should as a result not push the inevitable issue into the periphery of the subject area. • On roads which are primarily fronted by driveways the proposal should have white lines indicating no obstruction of drive entrances and otherwise leave the roads clear to be used for parking. I fail to see how this stance would affect any party negatively as the driveway owner has off road parking and the ability to utilise the road, and still maintains an availability of street parking for general road users and residents. • Perhaps some clarification can be given by Trafford Council / AMEY upon if the intention is to drive away completely commercial occupiers and employers (many of whom take on apprentices) from the subject area as there is little to no consideration being given to these types of occupiers. It seems short sighted of the council that there is obviously demand for car parking and the council could even generate income with either general pay and display parking or generally available permits not exclusive to residential occupiers. 	<p>Whilst there may be an amount of proposed alternative use (re)development ear marked in this area, it is not practical to place on hold the potential introduction of a scheme such as this until all these types of matters can be resolved. Developers' plans regularly change and can go through several iterations before and even after a formal planning application is submitted which may or may not eventually be approved with or without additional conditions. This is only likely to extend the timeframe for the potential introduction of a scheme, whilst the inconvenience and difficulties being experienced by residents is set to continue.</p> <p>The objective/purpose of the proposal is NOT intended to drive away commercial occupiers or employers from the subject area, rather it is to address instances of inconsiderate long-stay on-street parking that the Council and Ward Members have received complaints regarding over an extended period of time.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue	100	Y	<p>I feel as though not much thought has gone into this and on top of this, only the residents have been taken into account when proposing these parking restrictions – although there are a number of offices in this area. This seems very unfair seeing as most of the houses down (especially Park avenue) have off road parking on their private drives.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single drives).</p>

(Marshall House - Business)			<p>The reason I stopped working in Manchester centre, was due to the fact Sale was much more convenient as I am able to drive here. If this parking is taken away then I would be forced to get public transport which is unaffordable for me due to buying a car when I started working in Sale.</p> <p>I do hope you take these concerns into account when deciding on these restrictions.</p>	<p>yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	104	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of parking spaces have been removed with no alternative provision being provided. Why is there no alternative areas in the same number been provided? This will surely only create more issues. • On roads where there are drive ways the proposal is to virtually remove any parking, save for short stay. Surely this can be controlled with white lines across the drive ways so as to keep available full unrestricted parking on both sides of the road. • As a commercial occupier it appears there are no permits being provided to us even for just week day 9-5.30pm times. This seems completely inconstant and unfair. We are residents and paying business rates which Trafford council receive and employing people / contributing to the local economy. Therefore, why do residential residents have a priority over what is essentially the highway, and ourselves completely disenfranchised in the proposed scheme? • The proposed "Residents Permit Parking" scheme has not appreciated the mixed use of the subject area and has only sought to protect 1 demographic occupier (residential dwellings as the name of the scheme clearly dictates), and with no alternatives provided. There will be a consequence to this which will either produce a parking issue in the surrounding areas or indeed drive commercial occupiers and visitors away from the area thus having a greater long-term economic impact. • No consideration has been given to the wider economic impact of this scheme which either gives a complete restriction to parking or only provides parking largely for residential occupiers. The agenda appears clear to make this a residential only area and thus commuter belt for people to work in Manchester, who will in turn not be working and contributing towards the Trafford economy. • The proposal appears to remove the majority of the parking, which its reasoning is cited due to parking issues in the area. Surely, that shows there is a demand for parking therefore the scheme should seek to for instance provide parking on a pay and display basis so that the supply is still there and provide more conscientious parking practice. The net effect of this poorly planned scheme can only be to create issues on the periphery of the subject area. A more balanced scheme would be far more sensible. • The proposed scheme appears to be an extreme over reaction to resolve the presented issue. There are middle ground measures which should be undertaken for instance protecting the entrances to drive ways and allowing parking on both sides of roads, whereas this restricts parking on both sides. There appears to be no thought other than absolute restrictions, which is mindless and will have knock on consequences. • Scheme doesn't make sense from an economical point of view. Removing something that has been available for a long period of time which there is obviously a demand for and not providing alternatives. There has been too many spaces and restrictions proposed and not enough availability on either a free or paid for basis. • The scheme shouldn't use Bay marked spaces as this renders opposite sides of the road unusable for parking based on highways guidance on allowances for road width's etc. As the area is so densely populated to produce a scheme with bayed spaces seems remarkably short-sited as there are a lot of vehicle movements to cater for. • Noting that Cap Gemini House has been ear marked for Residential use is the plan to force a solely residential use/agenda upon the subject area which has long term been a mixed-use site, with this parking strategy being the first step very much in line with that agenda. This is not a balanced proposal given the mixed nature of the occupiers in the subject area. • As a long term commercial occupier employing local people including apprentices my view is that the proposal is to solely remove any type of parking which is not related to a residential dwelling. My business and indeed the building we occupy has been here for a 	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>Levels of off-street parking for commercial developments are established through the planning process; other than in relation to planning applications the Council has no control over the amount of off-street parking provided (even then it is very limited), but in any event the Council would wish to see a limit on the provision of off-street parking for commuters in order to encourage more sustainable travel.</p> <p>Whilst there may be an amount of proposed alternative use (re)development ear marked in this area, it is not practical to place on hold the potential introduction of a scheme such as this until all these types of matters can be resolved. Developers' plans regularly change and can go through several iterations before and even after a formal planning application is submitted which may or may not eventually be approved with or without additional conditions. This is only likely to extend the timeframe for the potential introduction of a scheme, whilst the inconvenience and difficulties being experienced by residents is set to continue.</p> <p>The objective/purpose of the proposal is NOT intended to drive away commercial occupiers or employers from the subject area, rather it is to address instances of inconsiderate long-stay on-street parking that the Council and Ward Members have received complaints regarding for an extended period of time.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>

			<p>number of years and it is peculiar to pick this moment in time to effectly take a stance against employers and employees who on a daily basis utilise the retail and other local services in the area, when the residential occupiers are no doubt out of the area during the week days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large areas of the scheme especially Park Avenue are characterised by semi-detached dwellings with substantial off-road parking. Restricting all road parking to short term seems overzealous when most occupiers would likely be at work. In areas where there are large numbers of private drives why can't the restrictions be lifted? • While we object to the proposals as they stand we would possibly be open to working with the Council if our employers could have access to permits. This would enable parking to be controlled but offer scope to reflect the balance of needs. • There is a large amount of proposed alternative use development earmarked in the vicinity. I would object on the grounds that this scheme can't be properly considered until the outcome of these is known and the impact it will have on parking demand. • Why do the proposals allow effective unrestricted use of both sides of the road at a weekend, but it is deemed not suitable in the week? On Park Avenue for example there is a proposed waiting restriction Mon to Fri 8-6 but not on a weekend on the right-hand side of the road. • We object because this scheme will just push anti-social parking over the boundaries of the scheme to other areas, when we have an opportunity to consider a balanced scheme here. • We object because the response rate to these proposals has been extremely low. 217 people confirmed an agreement to the scheme from a distribution to 1200 properties. 	
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	115	Y	<p>I suffer from anxiety and depression due to family issues I have going on at home in which I'm taking tablets for (I can prove this). Even reading this information gives me anxiety.</p> <p>Getting up in the morning is hard enough as I know I need to pay my bills that I can barely afford as it is, never mind worrying about trying to park and maybe having to pay for it.</p> <p>I understand if people park in front of people's drives but that's not the case, I have never seen someone become an inconvenience to them. They then have the cheek to vandalise cars – I say this from personal experience!!!</p> <p>If the cars parked are an inconvenience – can they prove why they are? Unless we are stopping them from getting in and out of their house? When most of them have driveways. I understand if they didn't have a drive.</p> <p>If it's shoppers or other people that are the ones that are taking advantage of this, then give us parking permits.</p> <p>I feel you need to consider other people's situations and bear in mind the disadvantaged people that work in our building which your putting under great stress!</p> <p>Another point being – we do pay our car tax to park on a public road this should be taken in to consideration also.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing back from you.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area (subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Additionally, the shared use bays will allow non-permit holders to park for up to 2 hours during hours of operation which may assist workers who are not office based for the duration of their working day.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re-advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	116	Y	<p>I would like to strongly object to the proposed restricted parking plans for the area around my workplace. Most of the properties here have a private drive and there are always plenty of parking spaces on the roads when I go home so it does not look as if local residents are unable to park?</p> <p>Myself and my colleagues all contribute to the local economy daily and these proposals make me feel very unwelcome.</p> <p>I have to come to work and I need to drive to do so, if the parking is restricted here I will just be forced to park further away and thereby just moving the issue to another place.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area (subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

				Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	117	Y	<p>I am emailing in regards to the proposed changes in parking in and around the Park Avenue / Mersey Road / Southern Road area of Sale...</p> <p>These proposed changes would massively hinder my ability to safely & securely park my car whilst I work in the local area, I work for a business that employs 50+ staff, the majority of who drive to work.</p> <p>We all contribute to the local businesses in this area on lunch breaks, socialising after work etc. and feel it's important our views and needs are taking into account</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	118	Y	<p>I totally disagree with this. The amount of parking available in the current area is very slim as it is. If you work in the area it finds a place to park is a task in its self. If the proposal becomes enforced it will make the situation even more difficult for people to find an appropriate parking space.</p> <p>I also unfortunately do not live in a place where transport to sale is easily Done. Driving from Partington is my only real way to get to and from work in an efficient time and manner.</p> <p>I also have a small child and the reason I moved jobs to Sale is being closer if he needs me and also the ease of getting to work. Also, financially this made me and my family better off. I originally worked in town, which was very expensive and also only enabled me to work part time because I couldn't afford to put my child into nursery.</p> <p>Moving to Sale to work and has made things better for me and my child, however if you enforce the new parking restrictions will not only make my commute to work probably hours longer, will probably not allow me to spend time with my child or inevitably make working full time difficult because of the cost and time.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety. Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	119	Y	<p>I want to formally object to the parking proposals, this proposition is putting non-residents who work in the area in a very difficult situation.</p> <p>Paying for parking is not a viable option and commuting by public transport would be both costly and difficult due to the area I live in. It would add over 2 hours to my already long day it currently only takes me 20 minutes each way. I appreciate people want to be able to park outside their homes but as Sale town is both a residential and work district consideration needs to be given to us to.</p> <p>Restricting parking for workers would not be economical as you want to encourage business not hinder it.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	120	Y	<p>I would like to formally object to the new parking proposals. I drive to work from the other side of Manchester and work till 8 o'clock in the evening at times. The on-road parking in very handy and safe for me to get to and from my car when I am starting and leaving work.</p> <p>With parking restrictions in place, I would then have to use a paid parking scheme, which with an already tight budget, leave me very little or no money left each month to</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p>

			<p>live on.</p> <p>I am very courteous with my parking and ensure that I am not blocking anybody's driveway as I would be frustrated if somebody was to do the same outside my own house.</p> <p>I also feel that with a number of young ladies working in our offices, then leaving them having to walk to their cars late at night and sometimes alone, could be unsafe, especially if they are having to walk a long distance and they are parking in multi-story car parks.</p>	<p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	122	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of parking spaces have been removed with no alternative provision being provided. Why is there no alternative areas in the same number been provided? This will surely only create more issues. • On roads where there are drive ways the proposal is to virtually remove any parking, save for short stay. Surely this can be controlled with white lines across the drive ways so as to keep available full unrestricted parking on both sides of the road. • As a commercial occupier it appears there are no permits being provided to us even for just week day 9-5.30pm times. This seems completely inconstant and unfair. We are residents and paying business rates which Trafford council receive and employing people / contributing to the local economy. Therefore, why do residential residents have a priority over what is essentially the highway, and ourselves completely disenfranchised in the proposed scheme? • The proposed "Residents Permit Parking" scheme has not appreciated the mixed use of the subject area and has only sought to protect 1 demographic occupier (residential dwellings as the name of the scheme clearly dictates), and with no alternatives provided. There will be a consequence to this which will either produce a parking issue in the surrounding areas or indeed drive commercial occupiers and visitors away from the area thus having a greater long-term economic impact. 	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	124	Y	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed plan to reduce the number of none restricted parking in the Sale area.</p> <p>As part of a business employing nearly 100 staff members, we provide economic support for the local businesses in Sale. I personally choose to work in Sale rather than Manchester because of the ease of free parking in the area. If there becomes a lack of free parking in the area, the impact of working here would mean I would have to seek employment elsewhere potentially.</p> <p>The roads you are looking to restrict parking are all large houses with adequate driveways. I am always conscious of people's houses and ensure there is sufficient room for home owners/tenants to use their driveway. Placing white lines outside driveways is a much fairer way rather than taking away all spaces. There are very little unrestricted spaces available in the area and I strongly wish you to reconsider your plans to restrict these.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	125	Y	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the proposals made in the attached as I currently work in Marshall House on Park Avenue and these proposals will affect a number of colleagues and myself.</p> <p>As you know parking in the Sale area is limited or has restrictions in many areas already and we are able to park currently near our work conveniently, whilst leaving space for residents to get on their drives.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>

<p>Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)</p>	<p>126</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Regards to the proposed parking changes I object to these as the local residents especially in Park road have off substantial road parking and these proposals seem to only protect them without thought for commercial occupiers. The consequence of this is that people who work for me and with me may have to seek alternative parking further away from their place of work which could impact other areas or alternatively may drive staff and ultimately commercial occupiers away from Sale if there is not efficient parking allowed in the local vicinity. As you can imagine there would lead to an economic impact on the local businesses in the vicinity around Park Rd and in also in Sale centre itself, which could be long lasting.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
<p>Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)</p>	<p>127</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed parking changes being considered for Sale and the surrounding area.</p> <p>Costs for parking on the street will mean I need to consider changing employment and going further afield, which would be of great inconvenience to me as well as my family. I feel I spend a lot of money in Sale, adding to the local economy, and I'm not the only person whose business would be taken elsewhere as result of these changes.</p> <p>If the reaction is to comments from residents, then it is incredibly heavy-handed as the vast majority of residents nearby have driveways and parking bays available to them – and these people don't even work in Sale, they drive out and to elsewhere for the working day.</p> <p>Please reconsider this needless action that will no doubt negatively impact local businesses and workers.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
<p>Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)</p>	<p>128</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the proposals made in the attached as I currently work in Marshall House on Park Avenue and these proposals will affect a number of colleagues and myself.</p> <p>As you know parking in the Sale area is limited or has restrictions in many areas already and we are able to park currently near our work conveniently, whilst leaving space for residents to get on their drives.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
<p>Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)</p>	<p>147</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed parking changes In and around the area of Park Avenue Sale.</p> <p>I have worked in Sale for over 4 years and spend a lot of time and money in the area from using the gym to the local shops. I feel that removing the ability to park would not only prevent me from driving in to work (I travel 40 miles per day) , as If I can't park I would struggle to use public transport meaning eventually likely looking for other jobs.</p> <p>It would mean my stopping using the gym as I wouldn't get here early enough and wouldn't be able to stay later, this in turn means I won't use the local amenities.</p> <p>Moves like this will slowly drain the life and economy out of Sale and surely drive business and people away.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			I really can't understand why we are even discussing this as its already difficult for business to recruit in sale.	Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	148	Y	I object to the parking proposal. I work in the area and park here every day and put a lot of money into the area through local businesses.	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	149	Y	I strongly object to the planned parking restrictions being introduced in the Trafford area. This was hugely affect myself in parking close to my current workplace, I need my car to travel as using public transport from where I live will double my travel time to work.	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	151	Y	<p>I would strongly like to object to the new parking restrictions because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Been able to park near work is one of the reasons I took the job, I would have to reconsider my employment if this comes into play. • I have a budget per month and cannot afford to pay for parking. • There is an extremely low agreement rate to this which seems that there isn't a need for such a drastic change. • A lot of residents have their own private drive way and work out of the area 	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	152	Y	<p>As the director of Essential insurance, I would like to strongly object to the proposed new parking. Please see below my reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We moved here to be close to the motorway enabling us to be more commutable to staff. Restricting parking will cause staff to leave and effect my recruitment of staff, affecting my business. • The safety of my staff is imperative, now the darker nights are coming in I wouldn't want any of my staff to be walking too far back to their car, a few staff members are pregnant too. 	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not allowing my staff to park close to work will only cause further issues somewhere else as they still need to park somewhere. • Majority of residents close to Marshall House have their own private driveways, my staff park courteously on the side streets not affecting any residents. <p>If this is progressed with I will not be renewing my lease when it is due in 18 months. I would look to move out of Trafford and into Manchester as there is little benefit to staying in this area if you remove the very reason we chose to locate here.</p> <p>Whilst I am sure the losing a business of 70+ staff may not seem an issue I believe the local economy would suffer as a result and I suspect the landlords would struggle to attract new tenants.</p>	<p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	154	Y	<p>I am writing with regards to the parking proposal for the Mersey Road area in Sale, Trafford.</p> <p>I currently work at Marshall House on Park Avenue and am objecting to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal is looking at removing all parking in the area apart from residential, as an area with a large commuter population due to multiple office buildings surely this would cause more problems. - The "Residents Permit Parking" scheme has not taken into account the mixed use of the area and has only included one demographic – again this will surely lead to more parking issues in this area. - No alternative parking has been provided. - As a long term commercial occupier employing local people including apprentices my view is that the proposal is to solely remove any type of parking which is not related to a residential dwelling. My business and indeed the building we occupy has been here for a number of years and it is peculiar to pick this moment in time to effectly take a stance against employers and employees who on a daily basis utilise the retail and other local services in the area, when the residential occupiers are no doubt out of the area during the week days. - Whilst I do object, if employers/employees could have access to permits we would be open to working with the council. - The rate of response to the scheme has been very low – 217 people out of 1200 properties. 	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	158	Y	<p>I would like to register my petition against the proposed parking permit restrictions coming into place concerning Park Avenue for these reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I work in Marshall House where we have 40+ staff that it will cause disruption to • Parking in the area is already limited without the permit in place • There is no other all day parking available in the area • We bring business into the local area shopping in the high street • We pay our road tax to park <p>I would greatly appreciate it if you would take my points into consideration.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)	159	Y	<p>I would like to register my petition against the proposed parking permit restrictions coming into place concerning Park Avenue for these reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I work in Marshall House where we have 40+ staff that it will cause disruption to • Parking in the area is already limited without the permit in place • There is no other all day parking available in the area • We work long hours into the evening that would mean having to walk back to our cars alone in the hours of darkness putting us at risk • We pay our road tax to park 	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p>

			<p>I would greatly appreciate it if you would take my points into consideration.</p>	<p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
<p>Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)</p>	<p>160</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I am writing with regards to your intention to apply parking restrictions within the Sale area, in advance of the proposal's final consultation.</p> <p>As an employee of Arch Hall Limited at Marshall House, I would like to reiterate my disagreement with the proposal due to my own requirement for parking within the selected area. My working hours and home location mean that my only option is to drive to work, unless I am to add substantial time and inconvenience to both my morning and evening journeys.</p> <p>Whilst rushing to address some residents' concerns, the council has still not offered meaningful suggestions for me and other colleagues, especially in the form of alternative parking arrangements/facilities. From the alternatives I have personally researched, car parks are limited in spaces, often allowing a max stay of two hours and also being a significant distance from the office. A number of female colleagues have also expressed anxiety at their safety if required to walk this distance alone in the evening, a concern I am sure you will not ignore.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate the views of some residents (which I have recently been informed was a minority of those to whom these changes were proposed), my colleagues and I are considerate when parking in the area, always cautious so as not to block access or driveways. If parking etiquette is the primary concern, it appears that the council has overreacted with their proposal for absolute restrictions where protection of driveways and allowing parking on both sides of the road would suffice.</p> <p>Furthermore, I feel that the council has not considered the views of myself and my colleagues, which appears negligent given Arch Hall's contribution to the community/council as a business and my own (and colleagues) in the form of custom at local businesses.</p> <p>In conclusion, I hope you reconsider this proposal, taking into account the above. If you require any further details or information, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
<p>Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)</p>	<p>164</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of Arch Hall Limited (based in Marshall House, 2 Park Avenue, Sale) with regards to the Permit Parking Scheme Proposal ahead of its final consultation.</p> <p>As an employer of 40+ individuals, many of whom drive to work and so require parking facilities, we strongly object to the proposal for parking restrictions within the vicinity. Many of our employees are concerned that the council has failed to provide suitable alternative arrangements in the event that the proposed parking restrictions are put into effect. Their complaints include the fact that other parking facilities within the area have high fees, limited spaces and maximum stay limits of only a few hours. Certain parking facilities are also a further distance from the office. Arch Hall's primary concern is the safety of our employees and as the days become darker with the approach of spring/winter, some of our staff are anxious walking to their vehicles alone in the dark following previous negative experiences and criminal incidents. Admittedly the full address of this concern is outside the scope of your consultation, we only hope you take these issues on board.</p> <p>As a company, Arch Hall is a stable contributor to the local economy through the payment of business rates, which we have done for a significant number of years. We conduct business with other companies within the area in their supply of office equipment, IT support, paper disposal etc. Our employees are also contributors through their continuous custom at local businesses, many of whom rely on the commercial presence in the area (such as small businesses providing meals for office workers).</p> <p>The commercial occupiers in this area have existed alongside the residential occupiers</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>

			<p>for a substantial amount of time and whilst we do understand that this proposal needs to be considered, we feel strongly that the commercial points of view and considerations need to be taken into account before a final decision is made. We are happy to reach a compromise where necessary, and are welcome to discussions on, for example, permit systems for a number of employees.</p> <p>In the event that this absolute restriction is brought into effect, we feel as a business we would lose valuable members of staff. Although Sale is ideally situated for our business, the enactment of the proposal may require Arch Hall to look for an alternative out of town office, potentially leading to negative economic consequences to our current vicinity due to our absence.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you would consider our points raised on behalf of our business and our staff.</p>	
<p>Park Avenue (Marshall House - Business)</p>	<p>187</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Further to your notice dated the 30th of August in relation to the above proposals I would like to log my objections to the scheme put forward.</p> <p>I am a Management Surveyor with responsibilities for the day to day operation for a number of Commercial Buildings within the boundary of the proposed scheme area.</p> <p>The Buildings I look after are long established in the area and while it is acknowledged that some on street parking restrictions may be required following an increased amount of nuisance parking, the scheme which is put forward I believe is unbalanced and does not reflect the initial reasons for its consideration. I outline my objections specifically below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following discussion with Councillors, I understand the proposals initially came about, as a consequence of complaints from residents regarding nuisance parking. Complaints for example regarding drives being blocked and people parking on corners etc. We supported tackling of such behaviour and have worked with local residents to tackle and identify such drivers where possible. However, what the scheme has evolved into, is effectively the removal of all longer stay parking which is not residential. To my mind, a person who may work in an office or visiting one of the local businesses and parks on the street in a responsible manner, is not nuisance parking, regardless of how long they stay. I therefore object on the bases that to push forward the scheme as it stands ignores the long standing mixed-use area and does not reflect the initial reason for the consultations. • We have highlighted the above point to Councillors and they have suggested that there would be instruction to open up as much unrestricted parking as possible. While this has been tweaked slightly since the start, I object because this has been done as paper exercise and local residents and interested parties have not been consulted on the process like I understand they have on previous schemes. At one point (at the suggestion of Councillors) we were looking to meet Amey to walk the streets to look at areas together so we could effectively reach mutual agreement so could advise our commercial occupiers that a fair compromise had been reached. The meeting was in the end refused. • Pushing ahead the scheme will have an adverse effect on business wanting to be located in this area and indeed some occupiers I work with are already reviewing their needs in light of these proposals. If staff and visitors to these businesses park responsibility in an area which is of a mixed-use nature I can't understand why the council has objections and is effectively pushing business away. I object on the basis therefore, that the large contribution the commercial occupiers provide to the local economy and the large amounts of business rates the occupiers pay are being ignored in these proposals. • Having looked in detail at the proposals I don't believe they are consistent or fair. Taking Park Avenue as one example, during the working week there will effectively be no parking on the right-hand side of the street and only short stay on the opposite. However, after 6pm and at weekends either side of the road can be utilised. As such clearly there is not an issue with the roads width, therefore we must conclude these restrictions are therefore purely to appease residential who may not like having cars parked along the street all day when they may be away at work. The majority of the houses on this street have a drive for example, therefore so long as people park 	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>

			<p>responsibility (i.e. not blocking drives) the restrictions are too heavy handed, why does the street need to be empty? I therefore object on the basis that other measures could be put in place to stop nuisance parking rather than just blanking off whole road as this example shows. It seems none sensible that the both sides of the road can be used at the weekend but not during the week. Why not one side restricted but the other unrestricted all the time. I.e. a compromise been the uses sort not just focus on the residential? It is detail like this we hoped we could review on a site walk around with Amey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I object to the proposals because they are being introduced at a time when there are a number of proposed use changes in the vicinity. To push forward now when the outcome of these schemes is not fully known will mean they will be quickly out of date. The large-scale proposal for changing the commercial building on Arkle Avenue to Residential being a major example. • Lastly, during the previous rounds of consultation I have raised the point that notification regarding this scheme has not been consistent. One copy of the scheme letter and plan are posted through the letter box of a multi occupied commercial building is not the same as posting one copy through a residential property's letter box. I was assured that in the next rounds of consultation that this would be addressed with perhaps letters going to individual business the occupiers easily found on royal mail website, building signage or even via agents such as myself, as I outlined at various meetings. However, again the letter and plan of the 30th have been dropped as one copy to each of the commercial buildings. This often just sitting on an unmanned reception desk being ignored by everyone as its not appropriately addressed. This is unacceptable and I have found many occupiers were just not aware of the proposals. I have had to take it upon myself to copy and distribute to try and notify as many of my contacts as possible so they have opportunity to put forward their thoughts if they desired. While I may have been able to assist my occupiers, I object to the proposals on the basis there are likely to others (particularly commercial occupiers whom will be most affected) who have not had chance to present their views. Especially bearing in mean the small window of 20 days to reply. <p>In conclusion, I understand the need to tackle nuisance parking but the council have failed to look at options to address this which reflect the needs of all the established users in the scheme area.</p> <p>To put the current scheme in place is to push forward the regards of a small minority of residential users only.</p>	
Park Avenue (Business)	205	Y	<p>I write on behalf of The Emerson Group, who own and manage a number of significant commercial buildings in the nearby vicinity, including Crossgate House and Marshall House, and have done so for over 30 years.</p> <p>Our serious concern is that the current proposals, in their current form, which provide extensive waiting restrictions and permit holders only areas, will have the net effect of driving businesses out of the surrounding area and thus our buildings. The local economy (and indeed the backbone of any sustainable community) includes a mix of uses and it would very unfortunate indeed if the existing commercial premises became vacant, or changed use to residential under permitted development rights, as a result of becoming less attractive as office / commercial space or indeed vacant.</p> <p>This area would then become a place simply to out-commute, which would lead to its own parking and congestion problems. Currently office / commercial staff travel to the area at a time when residents are going in the opposite direction, this has the following advantages;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ° Traffic flows are in both directions ° When residents leave to go to work in their car, this ties in well with office staff arriving and needing to park in the area. <p>If the Council drive out businesses, then the only commercial future for the buildings would be residential, unless they are to sit there vacant (which is clearly not productive or beneficial to either ourselves, the local economy, or the Council). This would have the effect of everyone needing to park in the area all at the same time and people all leaving the area in cars at similar times in directions away, rather than towards, Sale.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>

			<p>We strongly oppose the proposals in their current form and request this is re-visited, and a better balance of unrestricted and restricted parking areas adopted. The proposals in their current format would create a dramatic change and one that does not provide sufficient compromise for others who offer much to the surrounding and wider economy of Trafford.</p> <p>The Councils proposed approach seems startlingly blinkered at the moment and we urge you to re-consider.</p> <p>The Emerson Group, its tenants, and the local economy will all suffer as a result of these proposals in their current form, and indeed so will the Council who receive significant business rates from the properties.</p>	
Park Avenue (Business)	209	Y	<p>I write on behalf of The Emerson Group, who own and manage a number of significant commercial buildings in the nearby vicinity, including Crossgate House and Marshall House, and have done so for over 30 years.</p> <p>Our serious concern is that the current proposals, in their current form, which provide extensive waiting restrictions and permit holders only areas, will have the net effect of driving businesses out of the surrounding area and thus our buildings. The local economy (and indeed the backbone of any sustainable community) includes a mix of uses and it would very unfortunate indeed if the existing commercial premises became vacant, or changed use to residential under permitted development rights, as a result of becoming less attractive as office / commercial space or indeed vacant. This area would then become a place simply to out-commute, which would lead to its own parking and congestion problems. Currently office / commercial staff travel to the area at a time when residents are going in the opposite direction, this has the following advantages;</p> <p>Traffic flows are in both directions When residents leave to go to work in their car, this ties in well with office staff arriving and needing to park in the area. If the Council drive out businesses, then the only commercial future for the buildings would be residential, unless they are to sit there vacant (which is clearly not productive or beneficial to either ourselves, the local economy, or the Council). This would have the effect of everyone needing to park in the area all at the same time and people all leaving the area in cars at similar times in directions away, rather than towards, Sale.</p> <p>We strongly oppose the proposals in their current form and request this is re-visited, and a better balance of unrestricted and restricted parking areas adopted. The proposals in their current format would create a dramatic change and one that does not provide sufficient compromise for others who offer much to the surrounding and wider economy of Trafford. The Councils proposed approach seems startlingly blinkered at the moment and we urge you to re-consider.</p> <p>The Emerson Group, its tenants, and the local economy will all suffer as a result of these proposals in their current form, and indeed so will the Council who receive significant business rates from the properties.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p> <p>Some of the proposed restrictions for Park Avenue were omitted from the original advert in error, therefore they will be re advertised and any objections relating to the stretch between Belmont Road and Abbey Road will need to be reconsidered at that time.</p>
Park Road (Business)	162	Y	<p>In response to the recent update on the purposed residential parking to be imposed on Park Road, Sale; I am writing to bring my personal points as to why this restriction should be prohibited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This restriction will inhibit the ability to locally and safely park for work, causing great difficulty to attend my place of work during the hours of 9am and 5pm. • During winter daylight hours, it would be unsafe to walk a great distance to possible parking places for an alone person. • Local parking is extremely expensive (average £6.00 per day for on street) with limited roads this is available, meaning it would not be financially viable. <p>In conclusion, the purposed parking restriction would cause greater upset and difficulty in a highly business populated area, which could result in businesses moving area and working people having to leave/move places of work. This in turn, would reduce the productivity of Sale as an area, especially in an area of Sale, such as; Park Road and surrounding roads, which has a high density of office-based employment.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>Alternative off-street parking is also available in the immediate area; Q-Park Waterside is approximately 10 minutes walking distance away and provides 440 standard vehicle parking spaces. Discounted season tickets are also available should commuters regularly wish to use this facility.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>Furthermore, I feel that the council has not considered the views of myself and my colleagues, which appears negligent given Arch Hall's contribution to the community/council as a business and my own (and colleagues) in the form of custom at local businesses.</p> <p>I sincere hope the above points will be taken on board and the proposal is reconsidered</p> <p>Should you require any additional input, please do not hesitate to contact me and I look forward to your reply.</p>	
Park Road	19 39	Y	<p>I notice in the plans that whilst the majority of Southern Road is designated as proposed 2hr limited waiting (9am-5pm Monday-Friday) (dashed green) the last stretch of the road (i.e. after our driveway access) is still unrestricted road space (solid yellow). As per my previous emails, this area consistently causes problems at the moment as the space is bigger than one vehicle, but not big enough for two, leading to vehicles partially blocking our entrance or making entry/exit problematic.</p> <p>I would like to propose that the proposed limited waiting (dashed green) is extended until such point as the double yellow road markings.</p> <p>Just to clarify. Our driveway access is on Atkinson Road, not Merton Road.</p> <p>Can you confirm the reason the restriction can't be extended the full length of the road?</p> <p>I wish to lodge a very strong objection to the proposed changes to the current arrangements on Merton Road.</p> <p>I believe that introducing waiting restrictions to the whole of one side of Merton Road would clearly reduce available parking for the actual residents. Residents would then be competing for space in the few "parking bays" which are not even restricted to residents only.</p> <p>I believe any such changes will have a significant impact on me and other residents by making the parking situation for residents far, far worse than it is now. There are at least 20 households that park on Merton Road. Many of these have more than one car. Where are these cars going to go?</p>	<p>The shared use limited waiting bay will be extended to 'over' the driveway on Atkinson Road. However, as per the published proposed Traffic Regulation Order, it will not be possible to extend it all the way to the existing double yellow line restriction that is currently in place as this is outside the extent of the published TRO and beyond the tolerance limits.</p> <p>The extents and/or lengths of the parking bay and other restrictions are defined in the published proposed Traffic Regulation Order, within that here is a tolerance permitted when implementing the markings on site. It doesn't allow for the parking bay to be extended all the way to the existing double yellow line restriction.</p> <p>In Trafford, the general practice is for road space adjacent to the gable end of properties to remain unrestricted as far as possible. In this case the bay could have been extended to cover your driveway – fortunately the tolerance allowed to implement the TRO will permit this without having to re-advertise the TRO.</p> <p>The proposed TRO has been revised, effectively removing Merton Road completely from the proposed resident permit parking scheme subject to the approval of the recommendation of this report.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Park Road	58	Y	<p>It is a shame that the scheme could not be put in place for the beginning of the school term. It is total chaos outside today and someone has park partially across my drive making it almost impossible to get in and out. However, I received my paperwork last week so at least the scheme is still going ahead.</p> <p>I live at ■ Park Road and the proposal is for a 2-hour free and permit holder bay outside my house. This is fine however I think people will still park all day in the hope of getting away with it and what is to stop people parking over peoples drives as there will be no parking restrictions there? Also, may I request that any signage is not put up right outside the house or we will not be able to cut our hedge? Hopefully signs will be placed at the boundaries between adjacent properties?</p>	<p>The practise in Trafford is for a single extended on-street parking bay to be marked out on the carriageway over/incorporating existing vehicular crossings/driveways. Additionally, an access protection 'H' bar marking is also installed to highlight the presence of the dropped kerb, permitting the resident to park, effectively blocking their own driveway, within the marked bay, providing a valid permit is displayed.</p> <p>The risk of not marking the bay across the driveway is that it effectively renders that section of carriageway as un-restricted and liable to a non-resident parking there. Trafford's own Civil Enforcement Officers (the old traffic wardens) would therefore be unable to issue a Penalty Change Notice as no parking contravention would have occurred. It is presumed that a resident permit holder, not associated with that property, would be considerate enough to not block a fellow resident's access.</p> <p>Wherever possible signs are placed to avoid their intrusiveness to residents as far as possible, although in some circumstances, to ensure the parking bay is signed and marked appropriately in accordance with the regulations, signs can't always be placed in locations that are preferable to residents.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Somerset Place	92	Y	<p>I wish to state my objection to the parking restrictions on my street, Somerset Place, and I do not wish them to be implemented. I wanted to make comment as well as say no. My opinion is based on my local knowledge and my observations of the traffic flows. I conclude that we do not actually need the restrictions in the broadest sense and I, along with 10 of my neighbours do not wish it to be implemented on our street.</p> <p>However I must add that in the event that it is rolled out on Somerset Place there absolutely must be changes made to the restrictions or else it will be a catastrophe for me and my neighbours, most of which own two or more cars (due to the inability of children to afford their own housing, but still with a need to travel to work) and few, if any</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to effectively remove Somerset Place from the proposal all together as a result of the significant level of objection received from residents of that road. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

			<p>of us, that work a 9 to 5 day. I work as a general surgeon and my hours are very variable with on calls and unscheduled emergency work etc.</p> <p>Firstly, in the initial application it was stated that only one car can be registered to an address. This is understandable where households have off street parking, but we along with Heywood Grove behind us are terraced houses with no front gardens. This is clearly a ridiculous proposal and must be revised.</p> <p>Secondly, and this applies equally to Heywood Grove also, the proposal to have the south east side of the street that adjoins Mersey Road as only proposed waiting (marked blue on the plans) is a disaster. We (the residents) use 100% of our street throughout the whole day. This blue-line proposal immediately cuts our parking capacity down by 25% and it is also over a very large time span.</p> <p>This must be revised so that at the very least it is limited waiting or permit holders. We cannot accept such a severe reduction in the parking capacity. Additionally, many of the residents, myself included, do not work hours that align with the 8 to 6-time range. We couldn't help but fall foul of these times if we want to park on our own street, which I do.</p>	
Somerset Place	103	Y	<p>I wish to state my objection to the parking restrictions on my street, Somerset Place, and I do not wish them to be implemented. I stated as such in both the first and second consultations, but I think that due to the nature of the form layout in the second my objection was recorded as with-changes. I wanted to make comment as well as say no. I, along with some of my neighbours, have been in discussion with Cllr Mike Whetton over the proposed scheme and he came to visit us on Tuesday 4 Sept. During this conversation he disclosed how many households had objected, made comment and wished to accept the proposal. As we know the residents of our cull de sac the numbers he gave us did not make sense; hence my first comment about my opinion being mis-recorded.</p> <p>My opinion is based on my local knowledge and my observations of the traffic flows. I conclude that we do not actually need the restrictions in the broadest sense and I, along with 10 of my neighbours do not wish it to be implemented on our street.</p> <p>However I must add that in the event that it is rolled out on Somerset Place there absolutely must be changes made to the restrictions or else it will be a catastrophe for me and my neighbours, most of which own two or more cars (due to the inability of children to afford their own housing, but still with a need to travel to work) and few, if any of us, that work a 9 to 5 day.</p> <p>Firstly in the initial application it was stated that only one car can be registered to an address. This is understandable where households have off street parking, but we along with Heywood Grove behind us are terraced houses with no front gardens. This is clearly a ridiculous proposal and must be revised.</p> <p>Secondly, and this applies equally to Heywood Grove also, the proposal to have the south east side of the street that adjoins Mersey Road as only proposed waiting (marked blue on the plans) is a disaster. We (the residents) use 100% of our street throughout the whole day. This blue-line proposal immediately cuts our parking capacity down by 25% and it is also over a very large time span.</p> <p>This must be revised so that at the very least it is limited waiting or permit holders. We cannot accept such a severe reduction in the parking capacity. Additionally, many of the residents, myself included, do not work hours that align with the 8 to 6-time range. We couldn't help but fall foul of these times if we want to park on our own street, which I do.</p> <p>Please accept this letter as my objections to the scheme and my proposed amendments as described above.</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to effectively remove Somerset Place from the proposal all together as a result of the significant level of objection received from residents of that road. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Somerset Place	180	Y	<p>I replied to the original first and second consultations, however due to the poor format the form took, it was impossible to reject the proposals and make comment. Since the original consultation process, I and several of my neighbours have spoken to Cllr Mike Whetton on the proposed scheme on the 4th September 2018. Comparing the number of objections given by the residents of Somerset place and Heywood Road, to those figures that Cllr M.Whetton had were concerning. At least 11, including myself, objections to the proposal, yet only 6 were recorded.</p> <p>I recognise that parking on residential streets in the Trafford area is always going to be scarce due to the increasing numbers of cars. However, surely you agree that priority</p>	<p>The proposal has been suitably revised to effectively remove Somerset Place from the proposal all together as a result of the significant level of objection received from residents of that road. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p>

			<p>should be for residents. Somerset place has 20 houses and is has 32m of usable parking space along each side (allowing for dropped curbs). The average car requires 6.1m length to safely park (As per British Parking Association guidelines). So, the total number of cars able to park on the road is 22 at any given time (if in ideal conditions). Now my Mathematics is a little rusty but even I can see that there is not currently even space for all the correct residents, never mind losing ~50% of the daytime parking. In this modern age, most residents do not work the out dated 9-5 work patterns; therefore, require parking at their residential addresses during the day. Most residents have 2 or more cars due to offspring not able to leave the family home due to ever increasing house price crisis. Add to this that Somerset place is the access point to Red Rose gardens that means it has a heavy through fare of visiting people, it leaves very little room for residents to actually park during the day.</p> <p>I myself, am an aging resident (71 years young), and often I am forced to park several roads away when I return from shopping mid-afternoon. There are several residents of Somerset place that have mobility issues and as a street, the residents tend to park in the same places to reduce the distance these less mobile residents have to walk to their own or family vehicles.</p> <p>All these issues above are why I fully reject the proposed parking scheme, as I did to the first and second consultations.</p> <p>Above are all objections to the proposed scheme, but I always like to offer a potential solution to something I object to, however "out the box" the suggestion may be. The old church "Dean Hall" has its own land that the users of the model railway club use to park. This is fenced off private area. If approached correctly I am sure an official parking solution could be agreed with this area of land that would be beneficial to all parties and increase overall parking by 40%.</p> <p>Please accept this letter as my whole-hearted objections to the proposed scheme.</p>	
Somerset Place	183	Y	<p>If the scheme is still to go ahead on Somerset Place, (i.e. that it is not now voted down by residents) I believe that it should be amended to change the Blue Line section FROM - Proposed waiting restriction (Mon to Fri, 8am to 6pm) TO - Proposed limited waiting parking bay (Mon to Fri, 9am to 5pm 2 hours, no return within 2 hours, except permit holders) I believe that the road with is sufficient to handle that level of parking.</p>	The proposal has been suitably revised to effectively remove Somerset Place from the proposal all together as a result of the significant level of objection received from residents of that road. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).
Somerset Place	189	Y	<p>We have never had any parking problems on Somerset place and it seems absurd to make residents pay to park outside their own houses that they have paid for. The residents are all angry about this only 2 permits per household is unacceptable and will make peoples life a misery and force people to move house.</p> <p>It seems that the houses with driveways will gain from this and the property's with no driveways will lose and suffer an adverse valuation if we want to sell our property. The plans that have been laid out mean that even if we pay for parking permits we will lose 25% of the parking spaces on our road as it is marked as proposed waiting restriction with no residents parking.</p> <p>We have been in discussions with Cllr Mike Whetton over the proposed scheme and he came to visit us on Tuesday 4 Sept. During this conversation he disclosed how many households had objected, made comment and wished to accept the proposal. As we know all of the residents of our cul de sac the numbers he gave us did not make sense. The confusion seems to have come from the last letter that was sent out asking if residents objected fully or wanted any changes made to the scheme. After discussing this with residents every person who I have spoken to objects to the scheme and would prefer that things stay as they are with no parking scheme.</p> <p>If however our requests to scrap the parking scheme are ignored the least the council can do is to make the whole of the road residents parking so that we do not suffer from having reduced parking spaces.</p>	The proposal has been suitably revised to effectively remove Somerset Place from the proposal all together as a result of the significant level of objection received from residents of that road. The result of which is that parking in the area should remain unaffected and will effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).
Southern Road	150	Y	<p>I live at ■ Southern Road, Sale M33 ■ which is in a row of a terraced houses with no driveway and so have no choice but to park in the road. At present, there is no issue as there are sufficient spaces for the resident's cars and we all work together to accommodate each other so we can fit our cars in. However, with the proposed scheme you will be creating a problem where none previously existed.</p> <p>I object to and oppose the Mersey Road/Southern Road Area, Sale Proposed Residents' Permit Parking Scheme and Associated New and Amended Waiting and Loading/Unloading Restrictions as detailed in your letter of 30 August 2018, for the</p>	<p>Permits are issued on an area/scheme basis as opposed to road by road. In this specific case, residents of Southern Road could park in any of the surrounding restricted roads providing a valid permit was displayed.</p> <p>The blue line on the submitted plans indicate a single yellow line waiting restriction. As per the letter recently delivered to residents, parking on a single yellow line, during the times specified (in this case Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm), or on double yellow lines (at any time) is not allowed whatsoever, irrespective of whether a resident or visitor permit is displayed.</p>

		<p>following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scheme unfairly discriminates against less well-off terraced house owners with no driveway and therefore, have no alternative but to buy a permit and park in the road. Conversely, those householders who are better off and own a large house with a driveway may not need to buy a permit. This unfairly places the burden of cost onto those residents who live in smaller homes. 2. This scheme will make the parking situation worse for residents as there will be a reduction in the total amount of car parking spaces. Currently, residents can park anywhere on Southern Road during the day and night, however, with the introduction of the proposed Blue Restricted parking areas, the number of spaces will be reduced during the day. 3. I work shifts and regularly return home late at night. There is often no space outside my house or in the proposed Southern Road bay areas at that time of night, so I park elsewhere on the street, which is currently not an issue. I often have to park in the proposed Blue Restricted parking areas. If this scheme goes ahead, I will now have to get up before 8am to move my car to a bay or receive a ticket. This situation is unacceptable for shift workers. After a few hours' sleep, I will be forced to get out of bed, get dressed, move my car and then try to get back to sleep! And as there will be fewer car spaces overall, there may still be no bay available! 4. I have safety concerns if I have to park in another street late at night to avoid the Blue Restricted Parking areas and walk the rest of the way home late at night. 5. I find it unacceptable that a vocal minority (maybe 10 households?) can complain about a location specific issue, and the "solution" is to inconvenience and charge many hundreds of residents who do not have a parking issue. If the people who complained do not like workers parking outside of their house, they should not have bought a house next door to an office. There is no "right" to the stretch of road outside your house. It is a public area and therefore anyone can park there. Most people understand this and are not precious about "their" stretch of pavement. 6. The letter dated 18th Dec 2017 stated that "Area 3 did not support the introduction of parking controls whatsoever" 71% of responses from Area 3 were against the proposal (This information is not present in the letter). However, the same letter also stated that "Area 2 did not generally support the introduction of parking controls" 71% of responses from Area 2 were against the proposal. This is the same response as Area 3. I object to the misleading wording in the letter that would lead people to believe that there was a greater difference between the responses of Area 2 & 3. This could therefore lead people in Area 2 to believe there was less chance of achieving the same result as Area 3, i.e. rejecting the proposal. I believe this wording helped suppress the votes of those opposed to the scheme as evidenced by the reduction in the number of responses and the change in the percentage of those opposed from 71% to 29% in Area 2. 7. I also object to the timing of the letter dated 18th Dec 2017. The letter stated that a response was needed by 29th Dec 2017. This only allows 11 days to respond at most. This is also at the busiest time of year as it coincides with Christmas and New Year. I believe that the extremely inconvenient timing of the letter also contributed to the suppression of people's right to oppose or support the proposed scheme. 8. I object to the way the proposal was structured. People are much more likely to vote for change as they are for keeping the status quo. Those in favour of change will generally be more passionate, while those opposed to change will generally be more apathetic. It's difficult to energise people around "keep things the same". The Proposal should have had a minimum response and % threshold to ensure that the majority of residents were actually in favour of the proposal rather than assuming the 	<p>Parking on a yellow line restriction is only allowed for a limited time by those vehicles displaying a valid disabled persons blue badge.</p> <p>The results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>vast majority of people who did not respond have no opinion.</p> <p>9. I am aware that there is a petition opposed to the scheme that has been conducted by a local resident in the Mersey Road, Southern Road & Lyons Fold area. The number of signatures on the petition who are against the scheme, greatly outnumber the responses in favour that you received from the 18th December 2017 survey.</p> <p>I feel that you have no option but to cancel this proposed scheme as the majority of residents in Area 2 & Area 3 are opposed, and rather than help local residents, it will create expense, inconvenience and issues where none previously existed.</p>	
<p>Southern Road</p>	<p>13 22 67 73 114 155</p>	<p>We have received the proposal for the Mersey Road area parking scheme. Our home address is [redacted] Southern Road, Sale, M33 [redacted]. We have a driveway with lowered pavement and park a second car on the outside road across our driveway. Looking at the proposals there would be parking bays along our terraced row. Please confirm that there will not be a parking bay over our driveway. Additionally, please advise if it would still be possible under the proposals to park our 2nd car on the street outside over our driveway with a resident permit.</p> <p>We would appreciate a prompt response due to time limit in opportunity to lodge objections to the scheme.</p> <p>Thank you for your response.</p> <p>Could you please advise the number of respondents to the December 2017 questionnaire you received and the resulting outcome of for/against the proposed resident parking scheme?</p> <p>We need an urgent response to make a definitive decision.</p> <p>Further to our email last week have you had an opportunity to look at our query?</p> <p>We would appreciate a prompt response due to time limit in opportunity to lodge objections to the scheme.</p> <p>Further to your letters dated 18/12/2017 & 30/08/2018, I would be grateful if you could supply the full results to the initial survey or indicate where these can have obtained.</p> <p>You have provided the following results for Area 2 in your letter dated 18 December 2017 - 71% (30) against the introduction of parking controls with 29% (12) for them. Please provide the results for Areas 1 & 3.</p> <p>Also could you provide the results from the consultation in Area 2 undertaken in December 2017. Many thanks for your assistance in this matter.</p> <p>Firstly, we wanted to thank you for the previous information you sent by email which has been useful in our decision-making process.</p> <p>We jointly oppose the overall proposal for the residents parking permit scheme for a number of reasons.</p> <p>We do not agree with any residents having to pay for parking. The burden of such a parking charge falls on residents who live in terrace houses or those with no access to off-road parking.</p> <p>With regards to office workers and shoppers parking in the area we have not been provided with any evidence as to how many of these exist and where they park. The proposal received at the end of 2017 allowed only 11 days to reply over the busy festive period. This may have had some bearing on the results you received, especially since the initial results of areas 2 & 3 were so similar.</p> <p>There are several areas we note would have no parking restrictions at all, particularly around the busy junction for both vehicles and pedestrians between Southern Road and Park Avenue. Parents and children walking to/from the local primary school cross the road at this point. Also, the same applies to the busy junction of Mersey Road and Cross Street with a large number of vehicles turning in and out of the road all day. These areas also provide an opportunity for non-residents to park free of charge which contradicts a payable resident parking scheme.</p> <p>Southern Road and Mersey Road are used as a cut through to/from the A56. The</p>	<p>In Trafford the standard procedure when marking out resident permit or shared use on-street parking bays is to mark them as a continuous parking bay across individual vehicular driveways. Also provided within the bay itself and adjacent to the dropped kerb/vehicular driveway is an access protection 'H' bar marking to highlight the presence of the dropped kerb.</p> <p>By marking out the bay in this fashion it negates the need for several much smaller bays being marked out, each requiring its own traffic sign(s) and sign post(s).</p> <p>Providing your vehicle was displaying a valid resident or visitor's permit (during the hours of operation of the permit scheme) you would be perfectly entitled to park adjacent to your driveway as described.</p> <p>The result of the second consultation that was completed with regard to Area 2 residents, including Southern Road, are as follows;</p> <p>Consultation packs containing a letter detailing the proposal, a questionnaire and plan were distributed to 118 properties in your immediate area. Of the 118 consultation packs that were delivered, a total of 39 responses were received (a response rate of 33%). Of these, 69% (27) indicated that they thought parking would migrate to your area if measures were introduced in neighbouring roads and 71% (25) indicated that they supported the introduction of resident permit parking controls in this area.</p> <p>The initial consultation was completed in May 2017 and encompassed the roads that would eventually be considered as Areas 1, 2 and 3.</p> <p>The results from the May 2017 consultation are as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation packs containing a letter detailing the proposed scheme, a questionnaire and plan showing the proposal were distributed to 1200 properties in the immediate area. Of the 1200 consultation packs that were delivered, a total of 371 responses were received. Of these, 57% (217) indicated a preference for the introduction of parking controls and 43% (158) indicated that they did not support the proposal at all. <p>Having considered the consultation responses in more detail and a road by road basis, this led to the formation of Area's 1, 2 and 3 and the results of the May 2017 consultation revealed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifically, considering the responses received from residents in Area 1, 77% (168) were supportive of the introduction of parking controls, whilst 23% (52) did not support them. Additionally, it is proposed to introduce a shared use parking bay on Park Road (odd number side) between Lansdowne Road and Merton Road further to comments received during the consultation. • Specifically, considering the responses received from residents in Area 2, 29% (12) were supportive of the introduction of parking controls, whilst 71% (30) did not support them. • Specifically, considering the responses received from residents in Area 3, 29% (30) were supportive of the introduction of parking controls, whilst 71% (71) did not support them. <p>A second consultation of Area 2 residents was completed in December 2017, the results of this round of consultation are as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation packs containing a letter detailing the proposal, a questionnaire and plan were distributed to 118 properties in Area 2. Of the 118 consultation packs that were delivered, a total of 39 responses were received (a response rate of 33%). • 69% (27) indicated that they thought parking would migrate to this area if measures were introduced in neighbouring roads. • 71% (25) indicated that they supported the introduction of some form of resident permit parking controls in this area.

			proposal to limit parking to mainly one side of the road can only have the effect of increasing the speed of this traffic flow.	<p>The results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Southern Road	49	Y	<p>With regards to the parking scheme around Mersey Road we would like to make a suggestion that the proposed waiting restriction (mon- fri 8am-6pm) on Lyons Fold be changed to the hours 9am-5pm.</p> <p>We feel this would better suit the residents as most households have 2 cars and the majority of people will leave for work later than 8am. It will also serve the purpose of preventing office workers from parking there during the restricted hours.</p>	<p>The results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Southern Road	82	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I live at number 82 Southern Road. I have serious concerns about the proposed unrestricted parking spaces in a small area opposite number 3, 5 and 7 Southern Road. It is my belief that when cars are parked on the proposed limited time/permit holder (house/south) side of the road should cars park in the unrestricted area (north) ON the road it will be almost impossible for vehicles to pass in between. Particularly emergency/refuse/removal and delivery vehicles. This would then result in chaos/ potential damage to vehicles/ vehicles parking ON the pavements/ potential injury to pedestrians and danger to mobility scooter and pushchair/pram users. I would urge a practical investigation of this situation and observation rather than just an 'on paper' approach and would heartily encourage you to reconsider this specific proposal REMOVING it completely and imposing a waiting restriction (at any time). Interestingly, currently vehicles very rarely park on this unrestricted area of the road because of the impracticalities and dangers outlined above...if they do, usually the pavement is blocked. • I note that a parking restriction area (at any time) is suggested for outside number 11 Southern Road. The end of our terrace. Aside from making parking difficult for these neighbours this will have a knock-on effect for residents of numbers 1-9...reducing the area we have to park. Could the dotted green permit line be extended by a few feet to alleviate this potential problem? • In my May response I expressed my concerns about the junction of Southern Road with Park Road and the parking on Park Road directly opposite the junction. I note that limited/permit parking is still an option here. This junction is dangerous. Parking forces Park Road traffic on to the wrong side of the road...it is an 'accident waiting to happen' especially since it is so close to Park Road Primary School and there are no protective pedestrian barriers on the corners of this junction. PLEASE ADDRESS THIS. • I have worries about the unrestricted area of parking on the north side of Mersey Road very close to the junction with Cross Street...turning into Mersey road from the main road can often be a problem with exiting traffic (from Mersey Road) often backed up on the 'wrong side' of the road. Again an 'accident waiting to happen' . <p>More generally I foresee problems arising created by other limited unrestricted areas and their specific locations.</p> <p>I have a query regarding residents permits: Once 'live' will our permits be useable in the whole Mersey Road Zone i.e. should a space not be free outside my home could I park in a nearby/neighbouring area?</p> <p>I also note the timings of consultation letters two of which have coincided with holiday periods having the possible effect of limiting responses. I wonder if this is just a coincidence?</p>	<p>The results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area (subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The scheme is area wide and permit holders can park on any road within the scheme – subject to Highway Code parking rules and ensuring a permit is displayed.</p> <p>The issues associated with parking near junctions has been investigated but it is considered that the balance of restricted/unrestricted parking is suitable for the areas concerned.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Southern Road	91 107	Y	<p>As a resident of Southern Road, Sale there is some information on social media I believe saying that tomorrow night there is a meeting re the above. Is this correct? Is this a public meeting? As I was unaware and as an affected resident have not been informed of this.</p> <p>I completed the initial forms sent out last year stating I did not agree with or want the scheme. After some time, we were then sent a further form to complete asking again if we wanted this scheme. Again, I completed the form stating the same that I did not</p>	<p>The meeting referred to was an internal meeting between members of the project delivery team, ward councillors and the Executive Member for Environment, Air Quality & Climate Chang to discuss the results of the supplementary consultation and comments received to the feedback information delivered to residents in December 2017.</p> <p>All residents previously consulted were notified of the TRO advertisement date and provided all necessary details should they wish to formally support or object to the proposed TRO.</p> <p>Comments received during the initial informal consultation do not count as formal objections to a proposed TRO and residents were advised of this</p>

			<p>want the scheme and I also wrote some detailed comments on the form with questions to be answered. I have heard nothing from this?</p> <p>I would very much appreciate a reply to my questions above in this email asap and also a response to my written comments and queries on my completed form.</p> <p>It is reassuring that a report with comments received included in it will be published and available to view online. Please can you confirm if the report will state the percentage of support per road that will be implemented by the proposal?</p> <p>I do understand opinions change and maybe twice of asking could be explained. After all we have only been asked once if we want to leave the EU!!</p> <p>I understand that I do not have to buy this permit but for the few weeks I go away on holiday and need to leave my car parked up on a road in the vicinity I do need to buy one. Being a considerate driver / parker, I would not want to inconvenience other residents; unlike others. Being across the road from a services club as residents we already do not have an expectation to park outside our houses and deal with parking challenges on a daily basis. We all know we have no right to this but, as previously said, being considerate we are morally conscious not to cause inconvenience to others. We would not be able to park in the vicinity of our houses if the proposed parking scheme is implemented and so yes, we would still need to buy a permit.</p> <p>I thank you again for taking the time to read my emails and for considering my comments. I would appreciate if my additional comments above are added to the initial ones to be put forward for the report.</p> <p>I would also like to note in this email that this will be the third time of formally objecting - I am not quite sure why this is so? It feels very much like we are being worn down by Trafford Council until Trafford Council get the response they want to hear!</p> <p>Please can you explain what the criteria is for a road to be removed from the proposal as I am aware of many residents objecting on Southern Road?</p> <p>Please can someone have the courtesy to respond to my queries / comments below having formally submitted them in writing on the 2nd objection in December and once again in the email below - this will be the 3rd time of asking.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why do we the residents have to pay for this scheme when it is not our actions that is causing the problem? 2. Why do I personally have to pay for a space to be kept free outside my house whilst I am at work all day where I already pay daily to park? This would mean paying double for parking. The proposed scheme would not guarantee I could park outside my house on my return from work. Please explain / justify how this is fair? 3. Paying for my empty space and for visitor permits the policing of the scheme also concerns me. Would it be policed regularly and effectively; can Amey and Trafford Council formally make a promise to guarantee this? How are Amey and Trafford Council going to alleviate these concerns? 	<p>Previously, (in May and December 2017) the Council sought the opinions of residents to determine the level of support for or against the proposed Traffic Regulation Order. This is an entirely voluntary part of the process and does not form part of the legislative procedure required to implement the legal Traffic Regulation Order. Also, opinions do change, and it is not uncommon for a resident to be unsupportive during the consultation but to then decide to support the proposed TRO and visa versa. Also, final details of the published TRO may have changed from that previously consulted on, hence the need for 'formal' objections to be sent in direct response to the published proposed TRO.</p> <p>When considering whether to proceed with the publication of a proposed TRO the Council takes into account all of response received during the consultation and this forms the basis on whether or not approval is given to proceed with the publication or otherwise.</p> <p>From the initial consultation, several roads voted overwhelmingly against the introduction of any form of resident permit parking controls and were subsequently removed from the proposed TRO. Should a majority of residents from a given road object to the introduction of the proposed TRO in their road, then it is entirely possible for that road to be removed all together should.</p> <p>The current practice in Trafford is to charge for the issuing of residential and visitor parking permits. The money the Council receives in this respect contributes to the ongoing management and administration of the scheme so as to be as far as possible cost neutral to the Council. Purchase of a permit is not mandatory, there will be some residents who park their cars away from the restricted area during the proposed hours of operation and as a result do not require a resident's permit.</p> <p>No person has a right to park outside their property on the public highway, however with the introduction of a scheme such as this, most residents should be able to park within the close vicinity of their property.</p> <p>Enforcement of schemes like this is carried out by Trafford's Civil Enforcement Officers and is done so commensurate with their duties and other requests for enforcement received. Should you be aware of a contravention regularly taking place, you may also request that additional enforcement take place at a specific location, providing details of the regular contravention that you have observed.</p> <p>The results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
<p>Southern Road</p>	<p>21 29 106</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>I was wondering if you could please answer a few questions for me regarding the proposed Mersey Road parking scheme?</p> <p>What are the dimensions of the proposed parking bays? Would I be able to park in the restricted parking areas during the day (the blue zones on the map)? How many visitor permits can we buy? Are we restricted to one book of 25 per year? How many complaints did the council receive from residents that led to this scheme being proposed? Regarding the letter dated 18th December 2017, what was the response</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the dimensions of the proposed parking bays? Depending on the road in question, typically 1.8m or 2.0m wide. 2. Would I be able to park in the restricted parking areas during the day (the blue zones on the map)? The blue line on the submitted plans indicate a single yellow line waiting restriction. As per the letter recently delivered to residents, parking on a single yellow line, during the times specified (in this case Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm), or on double yellow lines (at any time) is not allowed whatsoever, irrespective of whether a resident or visitor permit is displayed.

		<p>from Area 1 that accepted the proposal? How many responded and what were the percentages for/against?</p> <p>In the letter dated 18th December 2017, it was stated that 71% of Area 2 did not support the scheme, 29% approved.</p> <p>Area 2 was then asked if they would like to reconsider as there may be a knock-on effect from Area 1 that had accepted the scheme.</p> <p>What was the response to this second vote? How many responded and what were the percentages for/against? Regarding the letter dated 18th December 2017, what was the response from Area 3 that rejected the proposal?</p> <p>How many responded and what were the percentages for/against? What assurances or guarantees do we have regarding the future pricing of the permits?</p> <p>For example: A guarantee that the price will not increase for 2 years? Any future price increases will be in line with inflation?</p> <p>Would the parking permits be issued per 'road' or 'area'? E.g. I live in Southern Road and have a parking permit and return to find there are no available parking spaces in Southern Road. Would my permit be valid in nearby roads such as Park Avenue/Heywood Grove/Mersey Road where there are spaces?</p> <p>Could you please clarify the parking bay dimensions further? As well as the width, I would like to know the length of each bay. Or, will it be one long bay for the entire road, i.e. not one bay per car, but one bay for all cars?</p>	<p>Parking on a yellow line restriction is only allowed for a limited time by those vehicles displaying a valid disabled persons blue badge.</p> <p>3. How many visitor permits can we buy? Are we restricted to one book of 25 per year? As many as you wish.</p> <p>4. How many complaints did the council receive from residents that led to this scheme being proposed? From November 2006 to March 2015 the Council typically received, on average 2 to 3, complaints per year from various roads within the area of the proposed scheme. A further 9 complaints were received in the period March 2016 to August 2016. I am also aware that Ward Members have regularly received complaints and requests for permit parking but I am unable to comment on how exact numbers.</p> <p>5. Regarding the letter dated 18th December 2017, what was the response from Area 1 that accepted the proposal? How many responded and what were the percentages for/against? Specifically, considering the responses received from residents in Area 1, 77% (168) were supportive of the introduction of parking controls, whilst 23% (52) did not support them. Additionally, it is proposed to introduce a shared use parking bay on Park Road (odd number side) between Lansdowne Road and Merton Road further to comments received during the consultation.</p> <p>6. In the letter dated 18th December 2017, it was stated that 71% of Area 2 did not support the scheme, 29% approved. Area 2 was then asked if they would like to reconsider as there may be a knock-on effect from Area 1 that had accepted the scheme.</p> <p>What was the response to this second vote? How many responded and what were the percentages for/against?</p> <p>A second consultation of Area 2 residents was completed in December 2017, the results of this round of consultation are as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation packs containing a letter detailing the proposal, a questionnaire and plan were distributed to 118 properties in Area 2. Of the 118 consultation packs that were delivered, a total of 39 responses were received (a response rate of 33%). • 69% (27) indicated that they thought parking would migrate to this area if measures were introduced in neighbouring roads. • 71% (25) indicated that they supported the introduction of some form of resident permit parking controls in this area. <p>7. Regarding the letter dated 18th December 2017, what was the response from Area 3 that rejected the proposal? How many responded and what were the percentages for/against? Specifically, considering the responses received from residents in Area 3, 29% (30) were supportive of the introduction of parking controls, whilst 71% (71) did not support them.</p> <p>8. What assurances or guarantees do we have regarding the future pricing of the permits? The current practice in Trafford is to mark out the permit bay on street as a single unbroken parking bay. This will extend and encompass dropped kerb vehicular crossings/driveways. Where driveways are present, an access protection 'H' bar marking will be installed to highlight the presence of the dropped kerb.</p> <p>Typically this would mean that parking in the bay, directly adjacent to the dropped kerb is restricted to the exclusive use of residents of that property (useful if more than one vehicle is owned with limited driveway space), although there is no reason why a neighbour couldn't park there having discussed whether access across the driveway would be required before or after the vehicle parked blocking the driveway would be driven away, i.e. if a neighbour returned home later and was expected to leave earlier.</p> <p>The risk of not marking the bay across the driveway is that it effectively renders that section of carriageway as un-restricted and liable to a non-resident parking there. Trafford's own Civil Enforcement Officers (the old traffic wardens) would therefore be unable to issue a Penalty Change Notice as no parking contravention would have occurred. It is presumed that a resident permit holder, not associated with that property, would be considerate enough to not block a fellow resident's access.</p>
--	--	---	--

				<p>No assurances regarding permit prices can be provided. Council charges are considered on a yearly basis and are the subject of an Executive Member Report which is considered by the Council. The reports for the last 6 years can be viewed here: http://www.trafford.gov.uk/about-your-council/budgets-and-accounts/Fees-charges-and-allowances.aspx Typically, factors including the cost to produce the physical permits and administer all existing schemes as well as those schemes anticipated to be implemented that financial year are taken into consideration when proposing the level of charge to levied. Briefly I can confirm that the annual cost of a resident's permit has increased from £31 (2011/2012) to £40.00 (2019/20).</p> <p>The results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Southern Road	190	Y	<p>We object to the current parking scheme without further consultation. The second notification came during the Christmas period and went unnoticed by numerous residents.</p> <p>We require further information on the implications of the parking permits. Will our drop kerb zone be marked? Will this prevent others from parking in front of our drive? Will we need to purchase a visitor permit to allow our friends and family only to park in front of our drive/drop kerb zone.</p> <p>The consultation to date via mail hasn't clarified these issues.</p>	<p>Where shared use bays are proposed to be marked on the carriageway, the practice in Trafford is for a single elongated bay to be marked out, covering all driveways with an access protection marking ('H' bar) to be laid within the bay, adjacent to each dropped kerb vehicular crossing.</p> <p>Typically this would mean that parking in the bay, directly adjacent to the dropped kerb is restricted to the exclusive use of residents of that property (useful if more than one vehicle is owned with limited driveway space), although there is no reason why a neighbour couldn't park there having discussed whether access across the driveway would be required before or after the vehicle parked blocking the driveway would be driven away, i.e. if a neighbour returned home later and was expected to leave earlier.</p> <p>All vehicles parked within the bay must display a valid resident or visitor's permit to park, whether that's directly in front of/adjacent to a dropped kerb driveway or otherwise, including residents of the driveway property.</p> <p>The risk of not marking the bay across the driveway is that it effectively renders that section of carriageway as un-restricted and liable to a non-resident parking there. Trafford's own Civil Enforcement Officers (the old traffic wardens) would therefore be unable to issue a Penalty Change Notice as no parking contravention would have occurred. It is presumed that a resident permit holder, not associated with that property, would be considerate enough to not block a fellow resident's access.</p> <p>The results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Southern Road	203	Y	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We live at ■ Southern Road. The current proposal is for no parking on the corner outside our property. The restricted parking along Heywood Grove runs alongside our garden boundary along Heywood Grove so we will be unable to park outside our own property either in front or alongside the property. This impacts on unloading shopping, loading luggage into our car and of course, having our car within sight of property for security concern. Returning home late we would prefer to be able to have shortest walk to front door from a personal safety perspective. 2. We regularly work from home and utilise the parking space outside our property. Current proposals are that we will need to park further up Southern Road (and impacting on our neighbours' parking) or will need to keep moving our car to be close to our property 3. The residents of number ■, ■, ■, ■, ■ and ■ regularly work from home and resident's cars are therefore parked outside this stretch of terrace all day. We are extremely concerned about the proposal for an area of unrestricted parking on Southern Road opposite numbers 3 and 7 Southern Road does not make sense. 4. In the 11 years we have lived at this property, cars do not park on the stretch between 	<p>The results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area (subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

		<p>Lyons Fold and Mersey Road because it causes an obstruction. Even when I have seen a single vehicle parking on that side of the road – it usually parks on the pavement which causes difficulty for people with prams, mobility vehicles and pedestrians generally. Any vehicles we have seen parking are usually there for deliveries and are there for a few minutes. Cars parked on both side of the road along this point would severely impede access to emergency vehicles as well as the refuse collection vehicles. It does not make sense to encourage any car to be parked there all day/night.</p> <p>5. The proposed no parking restriction at the top of Lyons Fold does not make sense. The widening of Lyons Fold at its approach to Southern Road accommodates safe parking at the back of the property known as Fred's Villa (which fronts on to Mersey Road and backs on to Lyons Fold and adjacent to a sub-station)</p> <p>6. Please can you explain why there is no proposal for a no parking restriction on the corner outside the property at 2 Southern Road and Lyons Fold? The property at 2 Southern Road has off road parking with access at this point (as well as parking access from Lyons Fold) and given the curve in Southern Road at this point, vehicles parked outside number 2 Southern Road gives rise to congestion etc...</p> <p>7. It would be safer for there to be any no parking restrictions to be on the corner of Southern Road and Lyons Fold (outside no 2 Southern Road) and have unrestricted parking between the substation and top of Lyons Fold and a no parking restriction on the corner of 11 Southern Road (of, say 2 feet on Southern Road) and Heywood Gove (of, say 5 feet).</p> <p>8. The proposed scheme does not appear to address parking problems which give rise to several safety concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rush hour congestion at the top of Mersey Road the junction at Cross Street/A56 (outside Garvey's Club and Dunham House). • Unrestricted road parking/long stay at the top of Mersey Road at its junction with Cross Street/A56 outside Garveys Club. <p>a. Cars parking on this stretch regularly represent a hazard, particularly during rush hour periods, for traffic queuing to turn left (or right) on to Cross Street/A56 and for traffic turning into Mersey Road from the A56. The parked cars take up over half the road causing those queuing to turn into Cross Street/A56 to cross the middle white line. Traffic turning into Mersey Road from the A56 are either forced to come to an abrupt stop when meeting oncoming traffic and where traffic is backing up behind them, drivers take the option of mounting the pavement on Mersey Road (Dunham House side) to prevent a collision and make progress out of the way of oncoming traffic. Vehicles mounting and driving on the pavement impacts and puts at risk pedestrians, people walking children to school, people with children in prams, the elderly, infirm and those using mobility scooters.</p> <p>b. An alternative solution would be that this particular stretch of Mersey Road be either no parking: double yellow lines or restricted parking : no parking 6:00 am to 9:30 am and no parking 4:00 pm to 6:30 pm (to cover the rush morning and evening rush hour periods). It is the cars parked (particularly during the morning rush hour period) which cause traffic congestion, pavement hazards and heighten accident risks during rush hour periods.</p> <p>c. Park Avenue currently does not appear to have the same rush hour traffic issues and concerns with queuing traffic in the mornings but the proposal for unrestricted parking (outside Cap Gemini's offices) towards the junction with Cross Street/A56, opposite the waiting restrictions 8 am to 6 pm could give rise to similar problems currently experienced on Mersey Road.</p> <p>d. Please can you explain why you are allowing unrestricted parking alongside Cap Gemini's offices as well as limited parking outside Marshall House (office building) and yet penalising residents of Park Avenue with resident parking charges? (Notwithstanding that most residential properties on both sides of Park Avenue have driveways and off-road parking – please can you explain the reasoning/logic for the current proposal because this aspect seems like a purely revenue raising scheme????)</p> <p>Other Concerns</p> <p>1. Paragraph 4 of your letter states that "... A majority of residents who responded to the consultation from certain roads clearly indicated that they did not support the introduction of resident permit parking controls. Subsequently these roads were removed from the proposal."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please define what proportion constitutes "a majority" • Please confirm which roads were removed from the proposal. <p>2. We are aware that some local residents have worked for Amey and Trafford Council</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>and we are concerned that this consultation process will be compromised. It would be understandable if they felt unable or reluctant to sign a petition objecting to any proposed residents parking scheme if they feel it will jeopardise their future work/working relationships. Likewise, if they are involved with the current proposal scheme, then their interest should be declared.</p> <p>3. Can you confirm that this proposed scheme is not a revenue generating scheme and, should a residents parking scheme go ahead, all revenue will be ring fenced to be used in administering the costs of the scheme and easing traffic congestion. Any revenue is not to be used for other purposes.</p> <p>4. Southern Road junction with Park Road and the area around Park Road Primary school. The proposed restricted parking does not address the congestion and dangerous parking around the school area during morning rush hour and school finishing time.</p> <p>The second stage of the consultation process was a communication sent out in mid-December 2017. This was in the run up to Christmas and had a short response time. This does seem to have been circulated in a particularly busy period and when it might be lost in post, seasonal activities. Was that timed to reduce the likelihood of responses?</p> <p>Likewise, this third stage of the revised proposal scheme has been sent out at where it might get lost in the return to school/work rush. Those without children may also miss this as they go away at the end of the school holiday period. For this particular round of consultation, in particular, the communication being sent out about this time (third week in September) to be returned mid-October would feel more transparent.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing from you with a response to our objections and concerns but we note from speaking to other residents and our initial objections, that we are not alone that you fail to acknowledge or address resident's objections' and concerns'.</p> <p>We would urge you to dispense with the proposed residents parking scheme in favour of addressing potential danger spots in the area. This scheme proposal only shifts problems a bit further along and does not address the issues.</p>	
Southern Road	206	Y	<p>1. Don't agree with the scheme being implemented in this area; and</p> <p>2. If the scheme is to be implemented, then the proposal of a "unrestricted road space" on the bend of Southern Rd (opposite number 5 & 7 Southern Rd) should be reconsidered as a "proposed waiting restriction" space. This is a blind bend that people speed along when there is only space for one car traffic given that the residents of 1- 11 Southern Rd park outside their properties i.e. it's dangerous for cars to be parked on both sides of the bend.</p>	<p>The results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area (subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Whitefield Road	198	Y	<p>Dear sirs, I wish to object to parking restrictions/permits on the Park road area as this will only worsen the already chaotic situation of parking where I live on Whitefield Road, it's a nightmare most days with inconsiderate and selfish parking, blocking drives and narrowing access for emergency vehicles, refuse collection etc.</p>	<p>Whitefield Road extends beyond the identified scheme boundary and does not have a history of indiscriminate and inconsiderate parking associated with long-stay non-residential vehicles.</p> <p>A strong majority of residents from Park Road (between Merton Road and Ashton Lane) indicated that they regularly experienced problems with long-stay on-street parking and that they supported the introduction of parking controls in their road.</p> <p>Subject to the approval of the recommendation of this report and subsequent implementation of the proposal, should any parking migration be identified on roads in the immediate locality of the scheme, further measures will be considered and progressed if justified.</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Whitefield Road	197	Y	<p>I'm writing to object to the proposed parking scheme for the Mersey Rd/Southern Rd area in Sale.</p> <p>I live at ■ Whitefield Rd, Sale on the border of the proposed parking scheme area. Why was Whitefield Rd not included in the scheme?</p> <p>It's poor that we weren't even informed of this scheme formally, never mind consulted, as we will be impacted by the volume of cars moving from Park Rd/Merton Rd/Atkinson Rd etc on to our road. Whitefield Rd is already full of office workers and Sale town centre user's cars every week day, making it very difficult for residents to park.</p> <p>We would have benefitted greatly from being included in the scheme, and many of my neighbours also agree.</p>	<p>Whitefield Road extends beyond the identified scheme boundary and does not have a history of indiscriminate and inconsiderate parking associated with long-stay non-residential vehicles.</p> <p>Residents/properties outside of the area immediately affected by a proposed TRO wouldn't normally be considered for inclusion in the initial consultation; ultimately a boundary must be drawn to limit the size/scale of a consultation for it to be both meaningful and cost effective. However, this does not preclude any resident or member of the public from submitting comments/objections on a published TRO for due consideration.</p> <p>Subject to the approval of the recommendation of this report and subsequent implementation of the proposal, should any parking migration be identified on roads in the immediate locality of the scheme, further measures will be considered and progressed if justified.</p>

			I duly await to your response. Please formally note my objections and feedback re lack of consultation with my neighbours and I.	The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.
York Avenue	86	Y	<p>I am writing with regard to the above proposal of parking restrictions for York Road verses York Avenue. The council are desiring to have more parking spaces available in the Sale area and are proposing to increase both the waiting/parking time and extend the parking areas on York Avenue, a narrow two-way avenue. However, York Road, a full width one-way road has no parking bays of any sort. Traffic flows for both roads are similar so I fail to see why parking on our avenue is increased yet York Road remains free of parking bays. This would seem to me to be a disproportional imposition of parking bays.</p> <p>Can someone please explain the rational for this disparity between York Avenue and York Road in the proposal?</p>	<p>It is agreed to leave York Avenue to operate as it currently does and no changes to the existing restrictions are to be proposed.</p> <p>The objection is therefore mitigated and not acceded to.</p>
York Avenue	87	Y	<p>I am writing to object to the proposal of the addition of unrestricted parking areas on both sides of York Avenue close to the junction of Atkinson road (marked in yellow on your map). York avenue is not wide enough to allow two vehicles parked opposite to each other. If two normal cars are parked opposite to one another then the remaining space between the cars would be significantly less than the width of a car effectively blocking the avenue to all traffic in both directions. There is also a tree that extends into the avenue on the north side of the avenue, decreasing the space for parking. I would suggest that the tree side of the avenue should have the same restriction as is currently in place, i.e. waiting restriction Mon-Fri 8am to 6pm, or no waiting at all.</p> <p>I am also disappointed that a 2hr limit is being suggested for the limited waiting parking bays as the current 1 hr limit is abused and causes disruption to traffic flow on York Avenue, which is heavily used as a short cut to the Ashton-on-Mersey area.</p>	<p>It is agreed to leave York Avenue to operate as it currently does and no changes to the existing restrictions are to be proposed.</p> <p>The objection is therefore mitigated and not acceded to.</p>
None identified	30	Y	<p>Please accept this email as a formal "objection" to the proposed parking scheme which is currently under consultation for the Mersey Road, Southern Road area of Sale, Cheshire.</p> <p>The reason for my objection is in favour of the Trafford economy as I believe that the scheme has not considered those who work in Trafford and contribute to the borough. It only considers the people who reside in that area. The area around Sale Town Centre is slowly becoming a "no parking" zone which will push people away from working in Sale and contributing to the area. There are no alternative arrangements i.e.: free car parks, proposed as part of the plans which is unfair to people who have to use a car for work and park close by so this proposal is unfair to the wider users.</p> <p>I agree that people should park using consideration and not blocking drives etc., but to make the area a complete "no free parking" zone is not the answer, without alternative arrangements the proposal should not be allowed. I also believe the response rate you have received in favour of the proposals is too low at only 18%?? It would be absolutely wrong and unjust to go ahead on that ratio</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
Dunham House (Business)	34	Y	<p>Hi, I wish to object to the changes in parking arrangements around Dunham house (Amendment no 212)</p> <p>I have a small business operating from Dunham House and after looking at the proposals I believe that there is insufficient short stay parking provision. I typically have around 6-8 separate visitors per day who travel by car to come to my business. They typically stay an hour. Under the new proposals there will be very little non-resident parking available. Unfortunately, there is only one visitor car parking space on site at Dunham House and this is nearly always taken, so my clients have to park on the road. This will impact my business. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area (subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The limited waiting bays (except permit holders) will actually increase the short stay availability referred to</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>

None identified	121	Y	I object to this as it will just push anti-social parking over the boundaries of the scheme to other areas when we have an opportunity to consider a balanced scheme here.	<p>Whilst the Council does not provide dedicated on-street parking for individual businesses or their employees, the results of consultation and comments and objections received to the published proposed TRO have been fully considered and taken into account. Subsequently, the scheme has been suitably revised to remove extensive sections of the originally proposed No Waiting 8am to 6pm restriction (single yellow line). The result of which will be to effectively provide additional un-restricted parking in the immediate area(subject to normal Highway Code parking rules).</p> <p>The objection is therefore not acceded to in the interests of traffic flow and highway safety.</p>
-----------------	-----	---	--	--