

Aaron Gordon

From: Heather Miller
Sent: 10 September 2012 14:39
To: 'GEORGE IRVINE'
Cc: Aaron Gordon
Subject: RE: Parking restrictions
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Dear Mr Irvine

Thank you for your message. Your concerns about the proposals for Felixstowe Road have been noted. If these cannot be resolved by the scheme manager, they will in due course be included in any report made to the Rights of Way Committee. This Committee considers both rights of way and traffic management proposals that are contested. The Committee's recommendations are then reported to the Portfolio Holder, Councillor Guy McGregor, for the Council's final decision on the proposals and in that case I will contact you again after the decision.

The dates of the next two committee meetings when these proposals are likely to be considered are 8 November 2012 and 16 January 2013. The meeting agenda can be found at the appropriate time on the SCC website on the following link, together with the procedure for those wishing to speak at the meeting:

<http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/your-council/decision-making/committees/rights-of-way-committee/>

In the meantime I am forwarding your message to the scheme manager for his attention.

Kind Regards
Heather Miller
Senior Legal Officer

Suffolk Legal, Suffolk County Council, Endeavour House, Russell Road, Ipswich, IP1 2BX
DX 87951 Ipswich Tel (01473) 264184 Fax (01473) 216825

 www.suffolklegal.co.uk

The contents of this email are subject to legal privilege and must not be disclosed without the permission of the author.

From: GEORGE IRVINE [mailto:george.c.irvine@btinternet.com]
Sent: 10 September 2012 11:03
To: Heather Miller
Subject: Parking restrictions

'Wendover',
Felixstowe Rd.
Nacton.

We live on the slip road opposite the Honda garage and are going to be effected by the proposed parking restrictions; 'Restriction of Waiting Order 201'.

I want to raise the strongest possible objections to their introduction.
I have already raised my concerns with the Parish Council and with Suffolk County Council.

In my view, 1) there is no need for these restrictions; they are a disproportionate response to the current situation; 2) they are likely to replace one problem with an even greater one; 3) the

11/09/2012

restrictions will be difficult to monitor and enforce; 4) there are problems of much larger importance that need more urgent attention and which, if they were addressed, would have much greater impact on the quality of residents lives.

1) 'There is no need for these restrictions - which are a disproportionate response to the current situation'.

I invite members of the committee charged with making decisions on parking restrictions to visit the area on any day of their choosing. They will find that there are never more than four and often three cars, parked along the whole service road and, on inspection, none of those restrict residents access or exit.

We never have a problem with cars parking outside our property.

The proposals are an over reaction to problem which 'may' have existed for 'some residents' two years ago, and certainly does not merit the kind of response that is proposed.

2) I do not believe that many of the house holders have thought through the consequences of introducing yellow lines and accompanying signs. If these come, they will convert the area from being semi rural into urban and in time, that will allow industrial and commercial development on a substantial scale.

Does the County Council not have a duty to protect areas like this from 'creeping development'?

In this instance, it seems not! ; because, in the half mile between the introduction of the 40 miles per hour restriction, at the entrance of the Suffolk Show ground and its termination, at the bottom of the road, there are already around 40 road signs of one kind or another.

3) I cannot see how these restrictions would be monitored or enforced. At a time when Police forces are having to be much more focused and selective, are they going to respond every time an irate reside calls and identifies a parking offender?

4) I understand that these proposed restrictions are to be funded from a 'Quality of Life' budget. If that is so, then it is a complete misunderstanding of the pressures and priorities that effect people's lives in this areas.

It may be inconvenient for one or two individuals to have someone park outside their property - I would doubt that this has prevented residents exiting their homes on more than one or two occasions, in total -, but that is nothing when compared with the noise and pollution we have to endure, continually from traffic, a very high percentage of which ignore the speeding restrictions.

If the Council are really concerned about influencing our quality of life, then they should use that budget to install electronic signs which alert motorists that they are above the speed limit. All of the national evidence on these, demonstrates that they do have a calming effect.

Finally, it is almost inevitable that the existing business will suffer as a consequence of parking restrictions and while I oppose further commercial development, I am also against 'killing off' the ones that are already in place.

I am also against the devaluation of my property and that will inevitably happen if this area is identified - as it will be with the introduction of more signs every 60 metres - as having a 'problem'.

George Irvine