

COMPANY A

OBJECTION ONE
1ST OBJECTION

I wish to object to the proposed changes to the regulations regarding the Aviator Park car park on the following grounds;

I have used this car park since it opened. It provides convenient local parking for me. I regularly use it for periods of up to 3 hours before leaving for meetings etc. The inability to return within 5 hours will cause me significant issues.

If I did not have use of this car park, I would have to park in the local streets as the alternative parking in the town (the multi-storey car park) is too far away. This would further congest roads such as Victoria Road, Garden Close and Albert Road, which already suffer from on street parking issues.

Council officials have told me that this car park is intended for users of the green space known as Marconi Sports Field. However, that green space is rarely used and certainly not by people who need to use the parking facilities to then use the green space. This car park could be used by green space users and others in harmony without any capacity issues as it has since it opened.

I believe the main drive of your proposed changes is to prevent local people, be they local workers or residents, using the car park on a regular basis.

I do not believe you have researched the use of this car park in any way.

I believe research would show you that this car park is never full and probably only has a handful of visitors a week that use the green space. I used the car park yesterday and there were five other cars parked at the time of my arrival. On Tuesday, there were four other cars at my time of arrival. I don't believe I have ever seen it anywhere near full.

I would remind you that this car park used to allow parking for 5 hours maximum, no return within 2 hours. Council policy on this car park is therefore disjointed and poorly thought out as this would be the fourth set of regulations to apply since it opened.

I would be willing to pay for a permit to use this car park so that it could become "permit holders or 3 hours maximum, no return within 5 hours". As a business, we would only need 2 or 3 permits annually. With 21 spaces available in the car park, I don't believe issuing permits would prevent other users accessing the car park as it is never full. Permits would also give the council an additional revenue stream.

COMPANY A

OBJECTION ONE

2ND OBJECTION

I have now received a copy the Council's reasons for changing the parking rules at the above car park and therefore wish to make further representation and objection as follows;

Your reasons talk about the "original intention of the car park". The only intention of a car park should be to provide parking for vehicles. No intention for use has ever been publicised in that car park.

Your reasons state "This misuse by business users...." It is categorically not misuse. Vehicles have been correctly parked in line with regulations.

Your reasons take no account whatsoever of the number of users that use the car park to park their vehicles whilst using the recreational area. I don't believe there will EVER have been an instance whereby a person intending to use that car park in this manner has been prevented from doing so because the car park was full. Virtually no one parks in that car park to then use the recreational space.

As a responsible Council, I believe you should undertake research to understand how many "recreational users" use that car park. I think you'd be hard pushed to find anyone in a typical week.

Overall, your reasons suggest this is more about stopping me and my colleagues from using that car park whilst using the smokescreen of hypothetical users who simply don't exist.

All users have happily used this car park side by side for many many years without there ever being capacity issues. You simply have no logical or sensible reason to change the regulations. I can therefore only conclude that this is a

case of victimisation by the Council against a specific type of user of the car park, simply because you don't like the reasons why that car park is being used.

•

COMPANY A

DBSELTWN TWO

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object to the proposed changes to the regulations regarding the Aviator Park car park on the following grounds;

- I have used this car park since it opened. It provides convenient local parking for me. I regularly use it for periods of up to 3 hours before leaving for meetings etc. The inability to return within 5 hours will cause me significant issues.
- If I did not have use of this car park, I would have to park in the local streets as the alternative parking in the town (the multi-storey car park) is too far away. This would further congest roads such as Victoria Road, Garden Close and Albert Road, which already suffer from on street parking issues.
- Council officials have told me that this car park is intended for users of the green space known as Marconi Sports Field. However, that green space is rarely used and certainly not by people who need to use the parking facilities to then use the green space. This car park could be used by green space users and others in harmony without any capacity issues as it has since it opened.
- I believe the main drive of your proposed changes is to prevent local people, be they local workers or residents, using the car park on a regular basis.
- I do not believe you have researched the use of this car park in any way.
- I believe research would show you that this car park is never full and probably only has a handful of visitors a week that use the green space. I used the car park yesterday and there were five other cars parked at the time of my arrival. On Tuesday, there were four other cars at my time of arrival. I don't believe I have ever seen it anywhere near full.

I would remind you that this car park used to allow parking for 5 hours maximum, no return within 2 hours. Council policy on this car park is therefore disjointed and poorly thought out as this would be the fourth set of regulations to apply since it opened.

Regards,

•

COMPANY A

OBJECTION THREE

Dear sirs

I wish to object to the proposed changes to the regulations regarding the Aviator Park car park on the following grounds;

I have used this car park since I started working in Addlestone. It provides convenient local parking near my place of work. I regularly use it for periods of up to 3 hours before leaving for meetings etc and the inability to return within 5 hours will cause significant problems with trying to park and return to work.

Parking in local areas is already difficult and the multi storey is far too distant to my place of work and would incur additional cost during times where we are all suffering due to the ongoing pandemic.

Please review your intended plans and liaise with local businesses and residents as to a much better plan that would accommodate already struggling businesses and concerned residents.

Many thanks,

Kind regards,

COMPANY B

OBJECTION FOUR

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object to the proposed changes to the regulations regarding the Aviator Park car park on the following grounds;

I have used this car park since 2012, when I moved to the area. It provides convenient local parking for me. I regularly use it for periods of up to 3 hours before leaving for meetings etc. The inability to return within 5 hours will cause me and my business significant issues.

If I did not have use of this car park, I would have to park in the local streets as the alternative parking in the town (the multi-storey car park) is too far away. This would further congest roads such as Victoria Road, Garden Close and Albert Road, which already suffer from on street parking issues.

Council officials have told me that this car park is intended for users of the green space known as Marconi Sports Field. However, that green space is rarely used and certainly not by people who need to use the parking facilities to then use the green space. This car park could be used by green space users and others in harmony without any capacity issues as it has since it opened.

I believe the main drive of your proposed changes is to prevent local people, be they local workers or residents, using the car park on a regular basis.

I do not believe you have researched the use of this car park in any way.

I believe research would show you that this car park is never full and probably only has a handful of visitors a week that use the green space. Most days there are three or four cars parked and I have never seen it in anyway busier or full.

I would remind you that this car park used to allow parking for 5 hours maximum, no return within 2 hours. Council policy on this car park is therefore disjointed and poorly thought out as this would be the fourth set of regulations to apply since it opened.

I would be willing to pay for a permit to use this car park so that it could become "permit holders or 3 hours maximum, no return within 5 hours". As a business, we would only need 2 or 3 permits annually. With 21 spaces available in the car park, I don't believe issuing permits would prevent other users accessing the car park as it is never full. Permits would also give the council an additional revenue stream.

I do hope that you will consider my objection sympathetically.

Yours sincerely,

5

COMPANY B

OBJECTION FIVE

Hi Mario

An individual in my office has made me aware that you intend to increase the no return time in the Aviator Park car park to 5 hours, essentially prohibiting anyone using the car park twice during a normal day-time.

Having worked in an office in Station Road opposite the car park for several years, it is incredibly helpful to have parking spaces nearby that allows a reasonable timeframe for return. I agree with there being a "no-return within..." policy as it prevents local workers from parking there all day and also commuters from using all the spaces to take the train, again all day. I do have an objection however to the proposed 5 hour no return policy, as your reasoning for your proposal is factually incorrect, and only seeks to victimise local residents. I also object on the basis that your offices have been knowingly issuing incorrect parking fines, and having discussed your procedures for issuing tickets with your offices, I am concerned that you have and are wasting crucial time and public money changing something that has no practical benefits for the local community and its residents.

Surely your role is to do what is best for the local community, and I can see your argument seems to present you are doing this by making sure there are free spaces for users of the park. Can I ask, if the car park is to only be used by users of the park, (1) why are there no signs to this effect? And (2) why do you even have a return policy at all?

It appears clear to me that having had to retract several incorrectly issued parking tickets, you are simply doing this so that your wardens are easier able to "catch out" people so that fines can be issued. Having a previously 2 and then 3 hour no return window logically causes some difficulty managing the frequency in which your wardens need

to attend in order to issue tickets. However, instead of managing the frequency of warden visits, you have simply unlawfully issued tickets which have subsequently been retracted following appeal. I sympathise with your position in having to police the car park to some extent, but this proposed order only satisfies your self-interest in issuing tickets rather than the local interests of the community you are in office to serve. That is wrong.

What is also wrong is that you are stating the use of the car park is for visiting the park, and that is complete nonsense. Would you encourage a local resident in Addlestone to drive to the park? In today's environmentally conscious society of course you wouldn't. Also, it is completely illogical to suggest the purpose of the car park is so that somebody living within a reasonable walking distance of an area used for non-car based recreation, can park their car there. Your stance makes no sense, so again, it can only be inferred that your intention is to only serve your own interests, which is fundamentally against the whole purpose of a publicly funded council. The car park is clearly a multi-purpose car-park designed to cater for all types of users. It being next to a park is incidental, and is certainly irrelevant if you do not explicitly advertise who the users of the park should be. If you are going to suggest this measure is necessary to protect users of the park who drive, then surely you should demonstrate, with some evidence, the number of park users who drive. Because I know for a fact the number of people in this category are probably the lowest in number in terms of using the car park.

CONTINUED ..

6

I object to you classing my potential use of the car park as misuse. Not only do you not inform the public of the intended use of the car park, you do not seem to understand that somebody could both be legitimately using and "misusing" (to use your term) the car park, and at the same time! For instance, I myself have used the park whilst at work on my lunch break, whilst parked in the car park. According to your logic, I "misused" the car park when I arrived at work, but perhaps I became a legitimate user of the car park the moment I stepped into the park? It is a ridiculous proposition you are making and doesn't even make logical sense, and because you cannot police your fictitious "original intention" of the car park, you use it to legitimise a draconian measure only seeking to punish

local business residents. I have never once been asked either on arrival or departure what my intended use of the car park is/was, and so I would question how you know when I park there that I am "misusing" the car park. Not only that, but you also cannot guarantee legitimate users of the car park (people driving here to use the park) do not start misusing the car park if they perhaps decide to walk away from the park and into one of the local shops. In that case, you are protecting this category of person's rights above my own, even though they are also misusing the parking facilities, especially as you yourself acknowledge, people rarely use the park for longer than 2 hours.

It is also ironic you are championing the use of a car park for recreational activities in a location that has been next to an enormous building site for several years to date and still continuing. If you did have community interests at heart, then you might have looked at alternatives to allowing the noise and the pollution associated with the building work next to this recreational area.

Lastly, I have never in my time observing the car park, noticed it to be full or close to full (even prior to the awful building sites surrounding it). Again, your proposal seeks to address an issue that does not actually exist, for a category of users who you cannot substantiate nor do you even know exist. Your reasoning is completely illogical and based on a fictitious premise that tries to legitimise issuing tickets within your monitoring capabilities, and I fundamentally object to there being any change to the parking rules on this basis. There have never been any issues with space in the car park which suggests to me that the current parking rules are doing what they are supposed to. That you would prefer to "catch out" people like me who work in the local area (committing, I'm sure, vital public resources to), I would suggest is at odds with your role in working with the community to provide better local services. This measure only serves yourselves, and to pretend and try to legitimise otherwise is wrong.

I'll end by saying, if you decide to bring in a measure which effectively prioritises the rights of someone who lives outside of a reasonable walking distance of a public space over and above those of a local business resident on the park's doorstep, then it demonstrates quite clearly how seriously you take your role as public servant. For you to spend any more time or public resource on such a self-serving non-issue demonstrates your contempt for the community you serve.

COMPANY B

OBJECTION SIX

Dear Mario,

I would like to object to the proposed changes regarding the Aviator Park car park.

I use this car park regularly for work. If I did not have use of this car park, I would have to park down local streets such as Garden Close, Albert Road and Victoria Road which are already extremely busy.

Please do not change the parking at Aviator Park it will cause no end of issues for people that use it regularly for work and meetings.

Best Regards

8

LOCAL RESIDENT

OBJECTION SEVEN

Dear Mr. Mario Leo,

I wish to object to the proposal to alter the return period to Aviator Park Car Park.

I have just read the signage in the car park which is dated 3rd December 2021. It is not possible to attend the Civic Centre to read the draft 'Order and Statement' owing to the guidance regarding social distancing and the necessity to avoid meeting indoors. The virus is spreading and Christmas is imminent. It is not a risk worth taking. RBC opening hours for today, according to your website, are also unclear. It is very unhelpful that this document is not available for safe and convenient perusal on line. It would be fair and reasonable to defer any decision making process until I and other local residents have been given an opportunity to read the document and can provide a meaningful contribution to the consultation.

Without having sight of your rationale, which I hope is supported by substantial evidence, I object to the proposal on the basis that it seems perverse and unnecessarily punitive to local residents. I live locally and the car park is never full therefore an argument based on the premise that an increase in the return period is a deterrent is not made out.

Perhaps it is a cynical ploy to acquire more revenue for the Local Authority.

Since 2019 I have been in communication with Peter Winfield, the Head of Green Space for RBC, with a view to amending restrictions in the car park so that it can be used by local residents at night when there are no park users. Parking for local residents in the vicinity of Aviator Park is severely restricted. In March 2020 Mr Winfield informed

me that he was looking at *'whether the existing parking restrictions could be lifted at dusk each evening until 8am the next day'*. This would require a report to the Council's Environment and Sustainability Committee.

I requested an update from Mr Winfield in August 2020 and I was informed that *'as with much other normal business there has been no progress with this since we were hit with lockdown in March. The Council has quite rightly re-deployed many of its staff to supporting vulnerable people in the community which means that, as with other departments, we have been running short staffed for several months.'* In May 2021 I requested a further update and I was informed that *'we are now starting to clear a backlog of work that built up last year, so I would expect to be able to start drafting the committee report in the next few weeks'*.

I note that RBC evidently no longer have to re-deploy staff to support vulnerable people and that the backlog of work must have cleared (although this didn't extend to keeping me updated) to the extent that you now have the time and staffing capacity to attempt to implement an unnecessary change to the regulations of a small car park.

In summary I object to this proposal and I would be grateful if you could publish the 'Order and Statement' and defer the consultation process. Please can you also provide me with an update from the Council's Environment and Sustainability Committee on the matter of amending the parking restrictions.

I look forward to hearing from you within the next 10 working days.

Yours sincerely and Happy Christmas

9