

**HALE VILLAGE EAST PARKING SCHEME PROPOSALS: OBJECTIONS REPORT**  
**APPENDIX A: PROPOSED PARKING AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS SCHEME - SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS AND COUNCIL'S RESPONSE**

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
ALBERT ROAD	ALR1			The respondent commented on the original proposals to the effect that they did not support comments made by others that residents' permit parking or working day waiting restrictions should be introduced to the frontage of 2-14 Albert Road. Due to a change of circumstances, the respondent is now supportive of such a proposal and therefore objects to the current proposals in that they leave the frontage of 2-14 Albert Road unrestricted and requests permit holder parking or limited waiting to be extended to the frontage of their property.	<p>The objections to the proposal to leave the frontage of numbers 2-14 largely unrestricted were dealt with in the earlier consultation and (other than a short length of No Waiting At Any Time, NWAAT, restrictions to the frontage of number 14) the proposals for this length are unchanged; the objector has, however, changed their stance due to a subsequent change of circumstances. The Council's response remains principally the same: this length of Albert Road is relatively narrow and parking on both sides of the road, wholly within the carriageway, would unduly restrict traffic flow, which leads to undesirable pavement parking, and the introduction of working day waiting restrictions on the westerly side of Albert Road to prevent parking on both sides of the road at these times will facilitate manoeuvring into and out of the drives of properties on the easterly side, of which the objector's is one.</p> <p>The majority of properties numbered 2-14 have off-street parking facilities, some with frontage-wide dropped crossings and there are few legitimate non-resident parking spaces on-street as a result. Introducing any restrictions to this frontage would, in the Council's opinion, unnecessarily penalise the residents (who can legitimately park across their own drives at all times) especially if any form of permit parking was introduced as they would need to purchase a permit to park on-street during the operational hours for longer than any period of limited waiting that might be allowed. The Council therefore considers the current proposals to be the most appropriate. The Council routinely monitors the effects of schemes of this kind following their introduction and further proposals would be considered if necessary. The Council therefore considers that the objection should be over-ruled.</p>
	ALR2			The respondent writes to support and endorse the proposals for Albert Road. In the absence of the proposals, the respondent refers to the following problems continuing: cars parked on both sides of Albert Road outside their, and neighbours, houses frequently blocking access to delivery and service vehicles; obstruction of driveways to their, and neighbours, houses; large vehicles parked outside their, and neighbours, houses blocking drivers' view when exiting driveways and parked vehicles restricting use of the footway for pedestrians with pushchairs or children.	The respondent's supportive comments are welcomed.

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
ALBERT ROAD	ALR3			<p>The respondents wish to maintain their objection to the proposals for Albert Road to the frontage of their property. They previously indicated a preference for a residents' permit scheme as proposed for other nearby roads. Their concerns as previously expressed are:</p> <p>No parking available for carers, workmen or visitors. Elderly/disabled neighbour relies on being picked up/dropped off by others. The current proposals merely relocate the parking to a smaller area and the respondents state that Albert Road is the only road with unrestricted parking on one side and people tend to leave their vehicles for many weeks leaving residents with nowhere to park. Permits, as proposed on other roads, would be fairer. The respondents stated in 2016 that they had spoken to a number of neighbours who agreed with their objection [names provided]. Their 2017 correspondence adds a concern with regards to the ability of removals vans to park near the house.</p>	<p>The objections to the proposal to introduce working day waiting restrictions on the westerly side of Albert Road were dealt with in the earlier consultation. Having considered this latest objection, the Council's response remains the same. This length of Albert Road is too narrow to allow parking on both sides of the carriageway and this leads currently to undesirable pavement parking. To introduce parking bays to allow limited waiting with an exemption for permit holders would require vehicles to be parked wholly on the carriageway, which on this relatively narrow length of road could only be provided on one side (with waiting restrictions on the other), and would unduly restrict traffic flow and potentially further impede access to/egress from private driveways on either side of the road, about which complaints have been received. The majority of the houses numbered 3 - 37 benefit from off-street parking for more than one car, several with frontage-wide accesses, and the proposed restrictions, in the Council's view, should not unduly inconvenience residents whilst protecting access to/egress from driveways during the operational hours.</p> <p>Picking up and setting down passengers is permitted on yellow lines and this might actually assist the transport provision for the objectors' disabled neighbour. Similarly, loading and unloading activities would not be prevented during the operational hours. The Council concludes that the proposed restrictions are necessary in the interests of maintaining traffic flow and considers, therefore, that the objection should be over-ruled. However, the latest proposals leave the frontage of number 37, where the road is wider, unrestricted, where a vehicle could reasonably be parked without interfering with traffic flow.</p>
	ALR4			<p>The respondent objects to the proposed provision of No Waiting At Any Time (NWAAT) restrictions across the driveway of number 16 Albert Road on the grounds that: an access highlight marking is already in place, which they consider sufficient to prevent a vehicle being parked there and a small part of the marking (away from Thorn Grove) is often used by carers as a 'drop-off' point when returning their children home. They suggest that the proposed NWAAT should apply from the corner with Thorn Grove to the start of the access highlight marking, that the access highlight marking is renewed and that the NWAAT does not apply across the driveway of 16 Albert Road.</p>	<p>The Council is of the view that the proposed NWAAT restriction is necessary in the interests of highway safety, to prohibit parking close to the junction with Thorn Grove in order to promote visibility to the right for drivers emerging onto Albert Road at this junction. The proposed restriction would continue to allow vehicles to stop on the yellow lines to allow passengers to be picked up and set down and would not, therefore, prevent the current practice to which the objector refers. The Council considers that the best interests of highway safety are served by the introduction of this short length of NWAAT restriction and therefore that the objection should be over-ruled.</p>

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
ALBERT ROAD EAST	ARE1			<p>Whilst in favour of the scheme overall, the respondent objects to the proposed reduction in length of the waiting restrictions on the north west side of Albert Road East, on the grounds of safety, as this is where he crosses the road on a daily basis and the presence of parked cars makes it a dangerous exercise. The respondent states that cars (belonging to employees of businesses in Hale Village) are parked in this location for more than eight hours each day and believes that, with good public transport, there is no need for people to have to drive to work in Hale.</p> <p>The respondent also considers that the reduction in length of the restrictions should not be implemented in order to allow on-street parking for residents with second cars and only one off-street parking space; this will generate the above safety concerns, which will be exacerbated as a result of increased numbers of crossings by residents crossing to and from their parked cars. The respondent suggests that the originally proposed waiting restriction on the north west side of Albert Road East be retained or that, if an unrestricted length needs to be provided on Albert Road East, it is relocated from the currently shown location.</p>	<p><b>Objections to the previously proposed working day restrictions on the north-westerly side of Albert Road East, on the grounds that these would not leave enough on-street parking space for residents and visitors, were considered in the earlier consultation, as a result of which the proposals were amended to leave four unrestricted parking spaces. The Council viewed this as a compromise, a not-ideal balance between residents' needs for on-street parking and the need to prevent undesirable pavement parking and promote traffic flow. In response to this objection, the Council believes that the proposals would continue to offer opportunities for pedestrians to find a suitable place to cross the road, if not in this precise location, that would be better than at present, and the removal of pavement parking would enhance pedestrian safety overall.</b></p> <p><b>The Council agrees that workers should be encouraged to commute by public transport and the scheme therefore seeks to favour residents' and short-stay parking during the daytime, including with the proposed waiting restrictions on the north-westerly side of Albert Road E; residents would tend to occupy the small number of unrestricted spaces now proposed in the evening and would be able to leave their vehicle there during the following daytime period. Whilst the Council has no responsibility or duty to provide parking for residents' vehicles, and there is no fundamental right for residents to park their vehicles on the public highway, the Council has previously acknowledged that parking for residents of 2-20 Albert Road East and their visitors is at a premium and believes, having regard to the need to promote traffic flow and prevent obstructive parking, that the revised proposals represent the best compromise that can be achieved. The Council therefore considers that the objection should be over-ruled.</b></p>
	ARE2			<p>The respondent is concerned about the lack of residents' parking proposed on Albert Road East. They state that the proposed restrictions on non-resident parking in the scheme will undoubtedly increase pressure on the remaining available space on Albert Road East. They say that, from previous objections, the Council will already be aware of the extreme pressure on parking for residents on Albert Road East due to all-day parking by commuters and employees of nearby businesses. To illustrate their point, they indicate that four residences on Albert Road East have no drives and 7 cars which have to be parked on-street; four residences on Hale Road have no drives and seek parking on Albert Road East; residents' parking on Thorn Grove will not accommodate all residents' cars so they will look to park elsewhere; a number of residents are at home during the day and need parking; 2-car households with drives are already forced to juggle cars, blocking one car in; it is impossible for visitors and tradesmen to park.</p> <p>The respondent concludes that the proposed changes will intensify pressure on the available parking spaces on Albert Road East, making the situation intolerable, and would welcome an extension of residents' parking to include Albert Road East.</p>	<p><b>There is no fundamental right for anyone, including residents, to park their vehicle on the public highway; it is the responsibility of anyone who drives a vehicle to ensure that it is parked, when not in use, safely and securely (preferably off the highway) and without causing a danger or obstruction to highway users. It is the Council's duty, as highway authority, to protect and assert the rights of highway users. The Council has previously acknowledged that parking for residents of 2-20 Albert Road East and their visitors is at a premium and as a result of considering earlier objections the proposals were amended to leave four unrestricted parking spaces on the north-westerly side of Albert Road East. The Council viewed this as a compromise, a not-ideal balance between residents' needs for on-street parking and the need to prevent undesirable pavement parking and promote traffic flow. Due to the narrowness of the road, permit parking would not provide additional on-street residents' parking space whilst addressing the current issues of bilateral and pavement parking that impede traffic flow and compromise pedestrian movement and safety.</b></p> <p><b>The Council believes, having regard to the need to promote traffic flow and prevent obstructive parking, that the revised proposals represent the best compromise that can be achieved in this location. The Council therefore considers that the objection should be over-ruled.</b></p>

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
ALBERT ROAD EAST	ARE3			The respondent submits an e-mail, the text of which is identical to ARE2. The respondent submits a second e-mail with which is enclosed a letter (comprising essentially the same text as ARE2) signed by 10 residents (including one resident of Thorn Grove), which requests residents' parking for the small length at the Hale Road end of Albert Road East. The current plans, they say, would make parking for residents even more difficult and have an environmental impact as the few remaining gardens are converted to off-road parking spaces.	The Council's response is set out above in respect of ARE2. The Council believes, having regard to the need to promote traffic flow and prevent obstructive parking, that the revised proposals represent the best compromise that can be achieved in this location. The Council therefore considers that the objection should be over-ruled.
	ARE4			The respondent submits an e-mail, the text of which is identical to ARE2.	The Council's response is set out above in respect of ARE2. The Council believes, having regard to the need to promote traffic flow and prevent obstructive parking, that the revised proposals represent the best compromise that can be achieved in this location. The Council therefore considers that the objection should be over-ruled.
ASHLEY ROAD	AR1			The respondent runs a local business and strongly believes that the proposals are not to the benefit of the continued prosperity of the village and asks that the plans be reconsidered. They state that, whereas hitherto village workers have taken up the parking, during the business day, vacated by residents as they depart for work, the combined effect of the increased off-street parking charges, which they consider to be substantial, and the proposed introduction of 1-hour limited waiting and permit parking will lead to increased on-street parking and a displacement of long-stay parking to roads further out from the village. They strongly object to the proposals.	<p>The Council's proposals are designed to promote the continued prosperity of the village, by seeking to balance the recognised competing demands for on-street parking in the area for the benefit of residents and businesses, by providing short-stay parking opportunities for customers and visitors of businesses, to promote the vitality and viability of the village, whilst providing opportunities for residents who need on-street parking during the daytime to find a convenient space close to their homes. The scheme intentionally does not give priority to on-street parking for local workers and commuters (about which the Council has received many long-standing complaints), in line with national sustainable transport policies. The Council acknowledges that the scheme may displace long-stay daytime parking to unrestricted roads further from the village, but believes that it is necessary, for the prosperity of the village, to ensure that there are short-stay parking opportunities for business customers and visitors close to the village centre, and that residents in these areas are able to find convenient on-street parking spaces in the daytime.</p> <p>The current charges in Council-owned public car parks were set as part of the overall Council budget review and following the consideration of comments received during a 6-week consultation period; the charges in Hale do not preclude all-day parking but favour short-stay parking, and this together with the principal elements of the proposed scheme help to ensure that customers and visitors of local businesses can find convenient short-stay parking spaces that might otherwise be occupied by commuter parking, thereby promoting the vitality and viability of village businesses. As a result, the Council believes that the currently proposed on-street parking scheme is appropriate and considers that the objection should be over-ruled.</p>
	AR2			Text identical to AR1	The Council's response is set out above in respect of AR1. The Council believes that the currently proposed on-street parking scheme is appropriate and considers that the objection should be over-ruled.

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
ASHLEY ROAD	AR3			<p>The respondent is a business owner, who has witnessed a sharp decline in footfall and business since taking over the business in 2016, which they consider to be in large part due to parking issues. They consider that parking has become more difficult since the opening of M&amp;S and putting more restrictions in place is going to escalate the problem and harm the economy of the village. They object to the proposals, coming as they do on top of increases in off-street parking charges, and ask that the proposals do not go ahead.</p>	<p>The objector identifies a link between parking issues and a drop in trade. The Council considers, based on long-standing complaints received, that long-stay daytime parking by non-residents in roads in and around the village centre is extensive and not only adversely affects residential parking but also denies business customers and visitors the opportunity to find a convenient parking space on-street for short periods. The Council's proposals are designed to promote the continued prosperity of the village, by seeking to balance the recognised competing demands for on-street parking in the area for the benefit of residents and businesses, by providing short-stay parking opportunities for customers and visitors of businesses that help to promote the vitality and viability of the village, whilst providing opportunities for residents who need on-street parking during the daytime to find a convenient space close to their homes. The opening of new retail outlets in the village is likely to increase parking demand, but it is right, in the Council's view, that restrictions are put in place that safeguard residential parking whilst providing short-stay parking opportunities for customers of all village businesses, which is likely therefore to enhance the local economy.</p> <p>Similarly, the regime of current charges in Council-owned public car parks in Hale, whilst not precluding all-day parking, favours short-stay parking in order to support the local economy. These charges were set as part of the overall Council budget review and following the consideration of comments received during a 6-week consultation period. These, together with the principal elements of the proposed scheme, help to ensure that customers and visitors of local businesses can find convenient short-stay parking spaces that might otherwise be occupied by commuter parking, thereby promoting the vitality and viability of village businesses. As a result, the Council believes that the currently proposed on-street parking scheme is appropriate and considers that the objection should be over-ruled.</p>
	AR4			<p>The respondent is the manager of a business, writing on behalf of the staff to express concerns over the planned changes to parking restrictions. They state that their opening hours are extensive and staff arrive or depart at any time of day between 7am and 1am, 7 days per week, many travelling from outside Hale, including Manchester City Centre, North Manchester and Salford. This, they say, makes it not feasible for staff to travel by public transport. They cite the increased charges for off-street parking and the proposed on-street restrictions as reasons why staff's cost of living will rise or they will have to park further away, adding extra time to already fraught and lengthy commutes. Whilst accepting the need for a balanced approach to the proposed restrictions, the respondent feels that the current proposals would serve to damage businesses in and visitors to the village. One staff member has suggested that permits are issued to businesses to enable them to park in certain areas accessible from the workplace.</p>	<p>The objector acknowledges the need for a balanced approach to parking provision, but feels that the current proposals will damage local businesses. The Council agrees with the need to balance parking provision, but disagrees that parking for employees of local businesses should be given priority within the village centre. It would be counter to national sustainable transport policy to give priority to on-street parking for local workers and commuters in the village centre, especially where this is likely to impede traffic flow and pose a hazard. Similarly, charges in Council-owned public car parks, whilst not precluding all-day parking, favour short-stay parking, and this together with the principal elements of the proposed on-street parking scheme are designed to ensure that customers and visitors of local businesses can find convenient short-stay parking spaces that might otherwise be occupied by commuter parking, thereby promoting the vitality and viability of village businesses. It is current Council policy not to issue permits to businesses that would facilitate commuter parking at the expense of residents' or short-stay shoppers' parking. As a result, the Council believes that the currently proposed on-street parking scheme represents an appropriate mix of residents' and short-stay parking to support the local economy and considers that the objection should be over-ruled.</p>

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
ASHLEY ROAD	AR5			<p>The respondent fully supports the introduction of residents' permit parking, which they say will enhance residential amenity and solve an acute parking problem, but cannot understand why the Council will not consider providing permits to certain businesses whose livelihood relies on coming and going from the business premises. They are of the view that the proposals will put at risk the viability of their business and may lead to them relocating from the village. They say that whilst staff are happy to park well away from the village or pay for daytime parking, the nature of the business is such that team members need to come and go from the premises several times a day, parking for short periods in between. They would be happy with 3 permits, which they would be willing to pay for, and recognise that not all businesses should qualify for permits, but thinks that the Council should be flexible in its rules when it comes to businesses with a justifiable case for daytime permits. In the absence of such consideration, the respondent objects to the proposals to restrict parking in the Leigh Road area and to the increase in car park charges.</p>	<p>It is current Council policy not to issue permits to businesses that would facilitate commuter parking at the expense of residents' or short-stay shoppers' parking. Whilst the particular needs of this business for operational (as opposed to commuter) parking are acknowledged, the Council considers that the proposed mix of 1-hour and 2-hour limited waiting bays in and around the village centre would provide sufficient opportunities for this business to manage the parking needs generated by team members who need to come and go from the premises several times per day, parking for short periods in between. As a result, the Council believes that the currently proposed on-street parking scheme is appropriate and considers that the objection should be over-ruled. The current charges in Council-owned public car parks were set as part of the overall Council budget review and following the consideration of comments received during a 6-week consultation period; the charges in Hale do not preclude all-day parking but favour short-stay parking, to ensure that customers and visitors of local businesses can find convenient short-stay parking spaces that might otherwise be occupied by commuter parking, thereby promoting the vitality and viability of village businesses.</p>
	AR6			<p>The respondent states that they are by and large in favour of the proposals. However, they object to the proposals for the corner of Ashley Road and Cecil Road on the grounds that the southerly end of Cecil Road would remain largely unrestricted and long-term parking would be displaced to this part of the road, making it even more congested than it already is (they have experienced cars parked across their driveway, hindering access to/exit from the property). They would welcome a review of this area, proposing that the No Waiting At Any Time restrictions proposed for the northerly side of Cecil Road are extended to fill the gap opposite the side of 254 Ashley Road. They say that this would facilitate vehicle manoeuvring into and out of the driveways to the property. They also suggest an extension of the 2 or 3 hour limited waiting to the southerly end of Cecil Road to deter the blocking of driveways. The respondent believes that this obstruction would become more commonplace and be hazardous.</p>	<p>The respondent's broad support for the scheme is welcomed. The proposed scheme aims to strike a balance between the needs of residents and those of local businesses and their visitors and customers, tailoring the extent of any restrictions to the scale of the evident problems. Inevitably, priority is given to those lengths of road nearest to the village centre, where the greatest competing demands for parking, access, servicing and manoeuvring exist, over lengths of road further away from the centre, where traffic flows tend to be lower, there are fewer or no business premises and where residential off-street parking is generally available. In this instance, on balance, it was considered that restrictions on Cecil Road should be concentrated towards the northerly end where there is a higher proportion of more terraced properties, there is a large number of commercial properties with access to Cecil Road and movements to and from the car park are highest. However, it is the Council's practice, in common with all schemes, to monitor the effects of the scheme once introduced, and further proposals would be considered if necessary, but it is the Council's view that consideration of any additional measures should not delay the introduction of the remainder of the current scheme.</p> <p>NWAAT restrictions are proposed for the southerly end of Cecil Road in locations where parking would be considered hazardous; to restrict parking further would, in the Council's view, be unnecessary in highway safety and traffic flow terms, and would be likely to displace parking onto Ashley Road, which would be less desirable. The Council considered a similar request from the respondent as part of the earlier consultation, and remains of the same view as set out above. As a result, it is recommended that the need for any additional measures in this location be considered in the light of experience of the current scheme in operation.</p>

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
BROOMFIELD LANE	BL1			The respondent comments on the proposals for the westerly end of Broomfield Lane, in the vicinity of the Clinic (which are as originally advertised). The respondent comments that the Clinic is busy on most days and that it therefore seems unfair to reduce the available on-street parking in this area.	This length of Broomfield Lane is relatively narrow and with the parking bay on the south side does not allow for two-way traffic flow. As the length over which the parking bay and narrow carriageway co-exist is approximately 77m, this causes some disruption to traffic flow, vehicle conflicts and may lead to certain drivers to travel at higher than desirable speeds in order to clear the restricted section as quickly as possible. The proposed removal of a short length of bay on the south side to be replaced by a working day waiting restriction would provide a passing place, reducing the length over which the conflict exists and help to manage traffic flows more effectively and safely, as vehicles would be able to pull in to allow another vehicle to pass. The Council believes that this would contribute to highway safety and traffic flow and not to increased speeds. The Council replied to the respondent's comments, indicating that the latest proposals incorporate additional limited waiting on a section of Albert Road to off-set the reduction in spaces on Brommfield Lane. The respondent has made no further submission to the Council in response, and their comments are therefore not treated as an objection to the latest proposals.
BROOM ROAD	BR1			The respondent states that their household fully supports the proposal to introduce 'Past this Point' permit parking for Broom Road, but asks whether the scheme should be extended to include Saturday between 9am and 5pm? The respondent indicates that the road often gets busy with visitors parking on a Staurday and feels it would probably be better for residents if the operating hours were extended to include Saturday.	The Council has replied to the respondent to indicate that it is not possible to add Saturday to the operative hours of the 'Past this Point' proposal at this stage without further delaying the introduction of the scheme, which would not in the Council's view be in the wider public interest. The proposed 'Past this Point' arrangements for Broom Road did not form part of the present round of formal consultation, and the objections received when this proposal was advertised did not seek an extension of the operative hours to Saturday; from which it is concluded that this was not a particular concern or requirement of residents of this road.
CECIL ROAD	CR1			The respondent is an office worker who strongly objects to the 'extreme' proposals for parking restrictions and the 'extortionate' increase in off-street parking charges, which they say will adversely affect all those who work in the village. The respondent states that the proposed restrictions would mean that they would have to park far from their office in order to save the parking charges and believes that the parking charges will mean that people can no longer afford either to work in or visit the village. They believe that the proposals will not benefit the continued success and prosperity of the village and they urge a reconsideration.	<p>The Council's proposals are designed to promote the continued prosperity of the village, by seeking to balance the recognised competing demands for on-street parking in the area for the benefit of residents and businesses, by providing short-stay parking opportunities for customers and visitors of businesses that help to promote the vitality and viability of the village, whilst providing opportunities for residents who need on-street parking during the daytime to find a convenient space close to their homes. The scheme intentionally does not give priority to on-street parking for local workers and commuters (about which the Council has received many long-standing complaints), in line with national sustainable transport policies. The Council acknowledges that the scheme may displace long-stay daytime parking to unrestricted roads further from the village, but believes that it is necessary, for the prosperity of the village, to ensure that there are short-stay parking opportunities for business customers and visitors close to the village centre, and that residents in these areas are able to find convenient on-street parking spaces in the daytime.</p> <p>The current charges in Council-owned public car parks were set as part of the overall Council budget review and following the consideration of comments received during a 6-week consultation period; the charges in Hale do not preclude all-day parking but favour short-stay parking, and this together with the principal elements of the proposed scheme help to ensure that customers and visitors of local businesses can find convenient short-stay parking spaces that might otherwise be occupied by commuter parking, thereby promoting the vitality and viability of village businesses. As a result, the Council believes that the currently proposed on-street parking scheme is appropriate and considers that the objection should be over-ruled.</p>



ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
CECIL ROAD	CR2			The respondents support the proposed permit parking, but are concerned that there would not be enough parking for all residents on Cecil Road. They consider that the best solution would be to keep the square and make that permit parking or give residents access to the Cecil Road car park as well as the on-street permit parking bays. The respondents state that there are 3 traffic entrances to the car park and just one exit; they suggest closing the entrance from Cecil Road, creating 4 more spaces and Cecil Road traffic would flow easier.	The Council acknowledged the concerns expressed by many respondents to the original consultation that additional parking bays on Cecil Road would compromise access for larger vehicles, make entry to the car park more difficult and would potentially lead to increased obstructions of driveways. Having taken account of the objections that were received at that time, the Council amended the scheme, and whilst this will lead to a reduction of the originally advertised parking bays on Cecil Road, it will generally preserve the status quo, with some modest increase in limited waiting and some permit parking for residents. Amendments to the car park accesses, as suggested, would require all vehicles to enter from Ashley Road, increasing traffic flows through the heart of the village, which would be undesirable on a permanent basis. This would also be impracticable if the currently proposed community hub development is completed. As a result, the Council believes that the revised proposals broadly take account of the views of Cecil Road residents who objected initially and it is therefore considered that this objection should be over-ruled.
	CR3			The respondent is concerned that there would not be enough parking spaces for residents to use permit parking after the square (between numbers 62 and 72) is no longer available. Whilst they do not object to having to pay for a permit, they do not consider it to be fair to pay for a permit and then not have an opportunity to use it. Additional double yellow lines proposed on Cecil Road will push parking further up the road and the loss of spaces in the car park, which are well used, will compound the issue. The respondent suggests that the Cecil Road entrance to the main car park is closed and access only allowed from Ashley Road; this would improve traffic flow on Cecil Road and the limited waiting bay could be extended across the entrance creating more spaces. A solution would also be to allow residents to use the Bowling Green Car Park as an overflow.	The Council acknowledged the concerns expressed by many respondents to the original consultation that additional parking bays on Cecil Road would compromise access for larger vehicles, make entry to the car park more difficult and would potentially lead to increased obstructions of driveways. Having taken account of the objections that were received at that time, the Council amended the scheme, and whilst this will lead to a reduction of the originally advertised parking bays on Cecil Road, it will generally preserve the status quo, with some modest increase in limited waiting and some permit parking for residents. Amendments to the car park accesses, as suggested, would require all vehicles to enter from Ashley Road, increasing traffic flows through the heart of the village, which would be undesirable on a permanent basis. This would also be impracticable if the currently proposed community hub development is completed. As a result, the Council believes that the revised proposals broadly take account of the views of Cecil Road residents who objected initially and it is therefore considered that this objection should be over-ruled.



ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
CECIL ROAD	CR4			<p>The respondent lodges a 'serious objection' indicating that the parking issues in Hale village are now hundreds of times worse in the twelve months since the initial proposals and the decision on the latest consultation was based on a situation that has changed significantly since the opening of the M&amp;S store. They say that the parking proposals should now be completely re-thought. The respondent says that their house, and those of their neighbours, are in the busiest, most central location of Hale and the parking is now at breaking point. They state that the proposals do not include any provision for residents parking for the houses 14-76 Cecil Road and ask where the residents' cars are to park? The proposed parking bays, in their view, provide insufficient spaces for the residents, which will cause utter misery to them and their neighbours. They suggest that 4 spaces, rather than 2, should be provided opposite 50-56 Cecil Road and this (together with the spaces opposite 60-62) should be for residents' use. They insist that no pavement width should be reduced and cars must park wholly on the carriageway as there is barely enough room for a wheelchair or double buggy to pass safely.</p> <p>They express grave concerns for everyone's safety as Cecil Road is now 'lethally dangerous', as there has been a vast increase in cars. They say that the number of cars, danger, noise and pollution are now way in excess of the legal limits and the Council should act to limit traffic on Cecil Road, introduce a 20mph speed limit, road humps, speed cameras and child safety signage. Traffic leaving the car park causes 24-hour disturbance and lethal danger to residents; they suggest making the entrance to the car park from Ashley Road (next to Piccolino) into an exit, to divert traffic from Cecil Road. They state that the car park adjacent to number 72 Cecil Road is vital and should be retained; it is extensively used by residents and businesses and should be made into a short-stay Pay and Display car park with an exemption for resident permit holders of numbers 14-76. They say that this is the only option, for the good of the community. The respondent acknowledges that the current proposals have 'rightly abandoned the hideous and dangerous idea' of allowing parking on their side of Cecil Road.</p>	<p>The Council is of the view that the increase in parking demand associated with new retail outlets in the village increases the need for the current on-street parking proposals, which continue to represent the most appropriate mix, in the Council's view, of on-street residential permit parking and short-stay parking opportunities for customers of and visitors to village businesses. The Council acknowledged the concerns expressed by many respondents to the original consultation that additional parking bays on Cecil Road would compromise access for larger vehicles, make entry to the car park more difficult and would potentially lead to increased obstructions of driveways. Having taken account of the objections that were received at that time, including that from this objector, the Council amended the scheme, and whilst this will lead to a reduction of the originally advertised parking bays on Cecil Road, it will generally preserve the status quo, with some modest increase in limited waiting and some permit parking for residents. The objector registers their support for the revisions to the scheme that resulted in the removal of the proposal for a parking bay to the frontage of their property. The length of parking bays now proposed is the greatest that can be achieved whilst maintaining access to premises and without compromising the manoeuvring of larger vehicles servicing adjacent premises.</p> <p>There continues to be no proposal to reduce existing footway widths. The objector's suggestions for traffic calming and associated measures are noted, but would need to be considered separately; they do not affect, nor are affected by, the consideration of the current on-street parking proposals that are the subject of the present consultation. Amendments to the car park access via Crown Passages, to make this an exit as suggested, would, in the Council's view be undesirable, due to restricted driver-pedestrian intervisibility at the Ashley Road end and proximity to a road junction, and would have implications for servicing of adjacent commercial premises, whilst diverting additional traffic into the heart of the village centre, which would be undesirable. The objector's comments regarding the informal car park adjacent to number 72 Cecil Road are noted, but the implications of any change of status of this land for on-street parking would need to be considered at the appropriate time and should not, in the Council's view, delay implementation of the present proposals. The Council believes that the revised proposals broadly take account of the views of Cecil Road residents and it is therefore considered that this objection should be over-ruled.</p>
	CR5			<p>The respondent writes on behalf of a local business, based on Cecil Road, employing 28 people. They express concern over the proposals in the context of recent 'substantial' increases in off-street car parking charges. This has impacted in terms of increased on-street parking and in illegitimate use by shoppers and diners of their private parking area, the latter thus impacting on clients' ability to park. They strongly object to these changes, which they believe will have a significant adverse effect on businesses and recruitment, as parking will become a major problem. Whilst previously staff found adequate on-street parking on Cecil Road and Westgate (as residents left for work), this has changed due to the increase in off-street charges and would be further exacerbated by the current proposals. This, they say, will displace long-stay parking by business people further away. They believe that the proposals will not benefit the continued prosperity of the village and ask that the Council reconsider the plans as they will drive local businesses away and impact the local economy.</p>	<p>The current charges in Council-owned public car parks were set as part of the overall Council budget review and following the consideration of comments received during a 6-week consultation period; the charges in Hale do not preclude all-day parking but favour short-stay parking, to help ensure that there are opportunities for customers and visitors of local businesses to find convenient short-stay parking spaces that might otherwise be occupied by commuter parking, thereby promoting the vitality and viability of village businesses. The management of off-street, private parking is not a matter for the Council. Similarly, the current scheme intentionally does not give priority to on-street parking for local workers and commuters (about which the Council has received many long-standing complaints), in line with national sustainable transport policies. The Council acknowledges that the scheme may displace long-stay daytime parking to unrestricted roads further from the village, but believes that it is necessary, for the prosperity of the village, to ensure that there are short-stay parking opportunities for business customers and visitors close to the village centre. As a result, the Council believes that the currently proposed on-street parking scheme is appropriate and considers that the objection should be over-ruled.</p>

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
HALE ROAD	HR1			Respondent objects on the grounds that the proposals would leave them nowhere to park, which would be challenging with children and shopping, leaving them with no other option but to consider moving house.	The objector's property benefits from off-street parking, but it is acknowledged that this provides only a single parking space and that if more than one car is owned and needs to be parked on-street during the proposed operational hours of the scheme, the ability to find a parking space off Hale Road may become more difficult. There will, however, be areas within the scheme that remain unrestricted and while these may be less convenient and demand for them greater, this is not considered to be sufficient grounds for amendment or abandonment of the present proposals, which the Council considers to have overall benefits for the local business and residential community. The objection is therefore over-ruled. In response to an objection received from the respondent to the earlier consultation, the Council confirmed that the 'tree' roads that are currently unrestricted are on the list of requests for permit parking for future consideration as and when funds become available, and that the specific needs of Hale Road residents could be considered at that time.
LEIGH ROAD	LR1			The respondent has a driveway and access highlight marking, and under the current proposals would be entitled to one permit; however, the household owns two cars that are too large to be parked on the driveway and as a result would cause them severe disruption and distress. Under what they consider to be their unique circumstances, they ask to be allowed two permits in line with the rules for households with no driveway.	The respondent has created a driveway by paving the front garden of the property, which has, necessarily, limited the size of vehicle that can be accommodated off the highway. It is Council policy, applied across the Borough, that residents of properties with a driveway should be entitled to purchase only a single permit, although visitor permits can also be purchased. The policy does not take account of the size of vehicle(s) owned by the household; this is a matter of personal choice and the parking of vehicles, either on a driveway or safely and securely elsewhere, remains the responsibility of the householder, not the Council. For the Council to make exceptions to these rules would set an unwelcome precedent, undermining the principles of permit allocation across all permit schemes and is therefore not acceptable to the Council. The Council therefore considers that the objection should be over-ruled.
	LR2			Respondent is concerned that there will be no restrictions on parking on one side of Leigh Road at the top end. The entire road suffers from parking issues, not just at the village end, throughout the day and into the evening, with a mixture of employees of village businesses, visitors to the village and those collecting children from school. They report that there is rarely parking available for their visitors on a weekday. They also report problems with their driveway being blocked by parked cars. They believe that leaving one area of the road unrestricted will make this area more in demand, especially by those who park all day and will cause increased problems with inconsiderate parking. They would therefore like to see the 2-hour limited waiting extended throughout the road, on both sides. The respondent says that residents would benefit from access highlight markings.	The originally advertised proposals for Leigh Road sought to achieve a balance between the competing demands for short stay parking for visitors and customers of village businesses and for residents' parking, and parking controls were therefore proposed for both sides of the road nearest the village centre where the properties are mostly terraced and the availability of residential off-street parking is restricted as a result, and on only one side (originally with a longer limited waiting period) at the northerly end, where there is greater availability of off-street residential parking. In acknowledgement of comments received, the Council revised the scheme to reduce the previously proposed 3-hour limited waiting period to 2 hours. Inconsiderate parking causing an obstruction/partial obstruction of driveways is not restricted to locations or schemes such as this and access highlight markings can be effective in reducing such practices; markings in locations where, as part of the proposed scheme, parking bays are not proposed, can be purchased via the Council.  The Council believes, therefore, that the current proposals represent an appropriate balance of resident permit and unrestricted parking, but routinely monitors the effects of schemes of this kind following their introduction and further proposals would be considered if necessary. As a result, the Council considers that the current objection should be over-ruled.

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
THORN GROVE	TG1			<p>The respondent submits a letter, in which they welcome the changes that have been made to the proposals in response to comments made by them and fellow Thorn Grove residents during the previous consultation. However, they indicate that there are two areas that still need to be addressed and they make the following suggestions.</p> <p>First, that the proposed junction protection at the end of Thorn Grove, whilst welcome on the actual corner, should not extend across the frontages of 14, 16 and 18 Albert Road, which need to be made into permit parking spaces. Secondly, that proposed restrictions to the frontage of 27 and 29 Albert Road should be replaced by permit only spaces for residents. The respondent considers that these small changes would make the scheme much better for residents of the Thorn Grove and Albert Road area.</p>	<p>The respondent's comments in support of the changes already made to the proposals are welcome. With regards to their suggested further changes, the Council believes parking at the junction of Thorn Grove and Albert Road to be detrimental to highway safety and the proposed restrictions (which extend across part of the frontage of 14 and the driveway of 16 Albert Road, and not across the frontage of 18 Albert Road) are considered to be the shortest length compatible with promoting driver visibility and therefore highway safety at the junction. The Council therefore rejects this suggestion in the interests of highway safety. The length of Albert Road in the vicinity of numbers 27 and 29 is relatively narrow and parking on both sides of the road, wholly within the carriageway (as would be necessary if formal permit parking bays were to be introduced), would unduly restrict traffic flow, leading to undesirable pavement parking. The Council therefore remains of the view that working day waiting restrictions should be introduced on the westerly side of Albert Road to prevent parking on both sides of the road at these times; this will maintain traffic flow and facilitate manoeuvring into and out of the drives of properties on the easterly side. The Council therefore rejects this suggestion in the interests of traffic flow. As a result, the Council considers that the objection should be over-ruled.</p>
	TG2			<p>The respondent, purporting to represent the Thorn Grove residents, points out that there are 9 houses and only 7 parking spaces, so residents have to park on Albert Road and Albert Road East. There is no possibility of creating off-street parking, so parking for the residents of Thorn Grove is a real issue, especially as some houses have more than 1 car and there are visitors and workmen who need to park too. The main problem is all day parking by commuters or employees of businesses in Hale. The respondent submits a plan to illustrate the problem. They state that the present proposals will reduce the number of spaces on-street by 15; the no waiting restrictions will displace parked cars elsewhere, adding to the problem; ending the yellow line at 37 Albert Road loses 3 parking spaces, the same with Albert Road East; the 2-hour limited waiting at the Albert Road/Broomfield Lane end loses a further 6 spaces; the remainder is still available for all day parking, which is the main problem.</p> <p>The respondent offers three suggestions: first, to extend the permit parking on Albert Road and to Albert Road East, allow 1 space at the corner of Thorn Grove/Albert Road and to allow an exemption for permit holders in the 2-hour limited waiting bay; secondly, to make the whole of Albert Road permit holders only or 2-hour limited waiting with an exemption for permit holders; or thirdly, make the whole area for permit holders. The respondent fears that if the situation deteriorates, more people will create off-street parking, reducing the availability of on-street spaces for the use of Thorn Grove residents.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges the particular issues with parking on Thorn Grove and that there is insufficient parking space for residents relative to the numbers of houses. Under the terms of the proposals, Thorn Grove residents would be entitled to permits, which would be for Zone AE; residents would therefore be able to park anywhere within Zone AE including, for example, within the Albert Road Past this Point area. Experience from other similar schemes introduced would suggest that there would be opportunities for permit holders to find a convenient parking space during the operative hours, albeit possibly not directly outside their own property. The Council is therefore of the view that the proposals make adequate provision for the 'overspill' from Thorn Grove. In respect of specific suggestions, the Council comments as follows: Albert Road and Albert Road East are relatively narrow and parking on both sides of the road, wholly within the carriageway as would be necessary to introduce formal permit parking bays, would unduly restrict traffic flow, therefore requiring waiting restrictions to be imposed on at least one side of the road.</p> <p>With the majority of properties numbered 2 -14 Albert Road having off-street parking facilities there are few legitimate non-resident parking spaces on-street as a result. Introducing permit parking to this frontage would, in the Council's opinion, unnecessarily penalise the residents (who can legitimately park across their own drives at all times) as they would need to purchase a permit to park on-street during the operational hours for longer than any period of limited waiting that might be allowed. The Council therefore considers the current proposals for Albert Road/Albert Road East to be the most appropriate. The proposed restrictions at the Thorn Grove junction with Albert Road are considered to be the shortest length compatible with promoting driver visibility and therefore highway safety at the junction and the 2-hour limited waiting at the southerly end of Albert Road is to provide additional short-stay customer and visitor parking for the benefit of businesses located around the Victoria Road/Broomfield Lane junction where waiting is prohibited on safety grounds. However, the Council routinely monitors the effects of schemes of this kind following their introduction and further proposals would be considered if necessary. As a result, the Council considers that the current objection should be over-ruled.</p>

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
VICTORIA ROAD	VR1			<p>The respondent represents a business with 24 staff, 9 of whom are in and out of the office at various times of day. They state that they require all day parking in the village and that the proposed restrictions will have a significant impact on staff, clients and the business, and on other businesses. They strongly object to the proposals which do not tackle the real issue, namely the lack of car parking facilities in the village. They list a number of concerns, including that their office based staff cannot afford £35 per week for parking; the recent price increases have led to previously full car parks having spaces available, meaning that drivers are now adding to the existing residential parking problems, local to the village or further afield; car parking for visitors and customers will be more difficult leading to them going elsewhere, which in turn will have a negative financial impact on local businesses and some may have to close; the proposals will have a negative effect on recruitment; staff and visitors come from all over Cheshire and Greater Manchester and without adequate direct public transport the only option is to drive and park.</p> <p>They state that there are insufficient car parking facilities to support the number of businesses, their employees, customers and visitors, and train passengers, and they believe that providing additional and affordable car parking will help to alleviate the parking problems for residents and that this should be provided before implementing the proposed restrictions. They strongly believe that the proposals are not to the benefit of the continued prosperity of the village and ask the Council to reconsider.</p>	<p><b>On-street and public off-street parking space is finite, and therefore has to be managed so as to best meet the needs of the community that it serves. In the case of Hale village, this means that a balance has to be struck between the needs of businesses for short-stay customer and visitor parking and residents' parking, the latter due to the proximity of residential properties, often with limited or no off-street parking facilities, close to the village centre. As a consequence, the current charges in Council-owned public car parks in Hale, whilst not precluding all-day parking, favour short-stay parking, to help ensure that there are opportunities for customers and visitors of local businesses to find convenient short-stay parking spaces that might otherwise be occupied by commuter parking, thereby promoting the vitality and viability of village businesses. These charges were set as part of the overall Council budget review and following the consideration of comments received during a 6-week consultation period. Similarly, the current on-street parking scheme intentionally does not give priority to on-street parking for local workers and commuters (about which the Council has received many long-standing complaints), in line with national sustainable transport policies.</b></p> <p>The Council acknowledges that the scheme may displace long-stay daytime parking to unrestricted roads further from the village, but believes that it is necessary, for the prosperity of the village, to ensure that there are short-stay parking opportunities for business customers and visitors close to the village centre. The Council considers that the proposed mix of 1-hour and 2-hour limited waiting bays in and around the village centre (including a bay without exemption for permit holders at the southerly end of Albert Road) would provide sufficient opportunities for this business to manage the parking needs generated by members of staff who need to come and go from the premises several times per day. As a result, the Council believes that the currently proposed on-street parking scheme is appropriate and considers that the objection should be over-ruled.</p>
WESTGATE	W1			<p>Respondent refers to parking problems at the northerly end of Westgate, where no restrictions are proposed under the present scheme. Respondent refers to the improvement that the provision of an access highlight marking has had on access to/egress from their driveway but refers to on-going difficulties when exiting the drive due to restricted visibility along the road caused by parked cars and, whilst glad that parking at this end of Westgate is not proposed to be restricted altogether, requests working day waiting restrictions and residents' permit parking (for visitors and tradesmen) on Mondays to Fridays.</p>	<p>In designing the scheme, the Council has endeavoured to strike a balance between the needs of residents and those of local businesses and their visitors and customers, tailoring the extent of any restrictions to the scale of the evident problems. Inevitably, priority has been given to those lengths of road nearest to the village centre, where the greatest demands for short stay parking exist, and in considering the inclusion of lengths of road further away from the centre, the availability or otherwise of residential off-street parking has been a significant factor. In this instance, on balance, it was considered that restrictions on Westgate should be confined to the length nearest the village centre where the properties are mostly terraced and the availability of residential off-street parking is restricted as a result. Whilst the problems reported by the respondent are acknowledged, the promotion of further restrictions at this stage would delay implementation of the scheme, which the Council believes would not be in the best interests of the community at large. However, it is the Council's practice, in common with all schemes, to monitor the effects of the scheme once introduced, and further proposals would be considered if necessary.</p>

ROAD	LOG NO.	OBJECTS	SUPPORT	NATURE OF OBJECTION	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
WESTGATE	W2			The respondent objects to certain aspects of the proposals. They are concerned that an already busy part of the road (where there are no significant restrictions either now or proposed) will become even more so as a result of displaced parking. They report that at almost all times of the day cars are parked in all available spaces, making entry to/exit from driveways difficult and often dangerous. Whilst accepting that the introduction of permits will help certain areas of Hale they feel that the traffic problems will be exacerbated where there are no restrictions.	The Council acknowledges that the scheme may displace long-stay daytime parking to unrestricted roads further from the village centre, but the extent and effects of such parking are difficult to predict, and may be limited where on-street parking is already extensive. The promotion of further restrictions or permit parking at this stage would delay implementation of the scheme, which the Council believes would not be in the best interests of the community at large, and would in any event need to be designed to address the specific extent and nature of any parking problems that are generated. However, it is the Council's practice, in common with all schemes, to monitor the effects of the scheme once introduced, and further proposals would be considered if necessary. As a result, the Council considers that the objection should be over-ruled.
OTHER	OA1			The respondent is a worker in Hale village who objects to the proposed restrictions together with the 'extortionate' increase in car parking charges. They state that the increase in parking charges makes parking in the car parks on a daily basis totally impossible for most people. This, together with the proposed on-street restrictions will, they say, exacerbate the daily struggle to find a parking space. They strongly object to the proposals on the grounds that these will have a substantial impact on all those who work in the village and the immediate vicinity, and they believe that the proposals will have an adverse impact on the village and employment growth within it and will not benefit the continued success and prosperity of the village. As wages have not increased in line with the car parking charges, and are no longer affordable, they ask the Council to reconsider.	The current charges in Council-owned public car parks in Hale, whilst not precluding all-day parking, favour short-stay parking, to help ensure that there are opportunities for customers and visitors of local businesses to find convenient short-stay parking spaces that might otherwise be occupied by commuter parking, thereby promoting the vitality and viability of village businesses. These charges were set as part of the overall Council budget review and following the consideration of comments received during a 6-week consultation period. Similarly, the current on-street parking scheme intentionally does not give priority to on-street parking for local workers and commuters (about which the Council has received many long-standing complaints), in line with national sustainable transport policies. The Council is of the view that parking for employees of local businesses should not be given priority within the village centre. The Council acknowledges that, as a result, the scheme may displace long-stay daytime parking to unrestricted roads further from the village, but believes that it is necessary, for the prosperity of the village, to ensure that there are short-stay parking opportunities for business customers and visitors close to the village centre. The Council supports employees who seek to travel more sustainably, for example by public transport or car sharing. As a result, the Council believes that the currently proposed on-street parking scheme is appropriate and considers that the objection should be over-ruled.

Legend:

	Objects
	Generally supportive but seeking an extension of the proposals
	Supports/Not considered an objection