

## APPENDIX A

### Letter from objector no. 1

With reference to **The Leicester (Consolidation)Traffic Regulation Order 2006 [Amendment] LEW 25 TRO**. Leicester Mercury 22/12/2021, I now write to register my objections.

I have lived at \*\*\*\*\* with my family since 1975, some 46 years and well before the school, Buswells Lodge Primary, was built.

During this time we have seen many changes in the evolution of this area.

Increasingly, the Drive has become a service road to the school with residents becoming victims of irresponsible drivers. They have also suffered because of the increasing volume of goods vehicles and even double-decker buses accessing and servicing the school. This has caused excess wear and tear of the road surface with potholes, road stone and, in some gutters, some subsidence near or around drain areas.

I now write to register my objections and to offer some options to the proposed parking restriction being made permanent on Beauville Drive LE4 0PT (**The Leicester (Consolidation)Traffic Regulation Order 2006 [Amendment] LEW 25 TRO**) in your recent Public Notices from the Leicester Mercury of 22/12/2021.

There is clearly a resolution needed for Beauville Drive and its many problems, but this has to satisfy everyone to one degree or another. There needs to be thorough surveys and consultations, not just knee jerk reactions to individual issues, which often, such as now, may actually compound the problems.

This scheme appears to have a contradiction and lacks logic – it is proposed that the scheme will appear to operate all year round and yet, during term time only on the entrance zig-zag lines .This gives the clear impression that one may park with impunity across the school entrances but nowhere else on Beauville Drive when term ends!

The scheme appears to be punitive action against residents who are in no way responsible for the problems. This belief is further supported by there being no exemptions mentioned anywhere for said residents.

All-year-round restrictions are unnecessary when one considers the context of the original purpose of the scheme i.e. to prevent irresponsible and dangerous parking of vehicles dropping off pupils at the beginning and picking them up at the end of the school day - which means, **during term time**. When the school is closed such restrictions are neither required nor necessary. This is when most visits can be made to residents' homes by friends and relatives, who might require overnight accommodation. Otherwise, the scheme severely restricts overnight visits of guests to residents' homes.

From your Public Notice, it would appear that parents and teachers have been consulted in developing this plan, but not residents – this would suggest further

evidence of punitive action against residents, since they have had no input into its development or that of alternative solutions.

Further contempt for residents was shown when they were not informed nor consulted about the recent extension to the staff car park to ensure convenient parking for school staff at the expense of the environment – two perfectly healthy and mature trees were cut down to do this. Is it not unfair and discriminatory to provide alternative parking to non-residents because they are school staff, but not for the residents who are most affected?

I believe that this scheme goes a long way to suggest Infringement of Human Rights, as stated in Article 8 of EHCR, Article 16 of Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 23 of The International Covenant for Human Rights. These conventions all state the human right to a family life and civil liberty. All year round restrictions severely affect this right especially at holiday times and religious celebratory times such as Christmas etc.

It also curtails the ability of residents to have tradespeople or carers come to their homes.

Working from home may well become the norm for a sizeable number of the working population but this plan may affect this possibility.

Not everyone has a 9-5 job. Shift workers living here will be adversely affected

This scheme can only serve to **transfer the problems** elsewhere e.g. across the road to Farrier Lane/Harvest Close or onto Badgers Close (where there are no restrictions - why not?).

Regular movement of residents' vehicles will result in a quadrupling of journeys to move vehicles to legitimate parking places **at two points in the day, morning and afternoon**. This will **not** improve the amenity of the locality but add to the pollution.

Offenders will continue to show contempt because they have become accustomed to the temporary restrictions **not** being enforced. The cost of enforcing the imposed restrictions will have to be met by the City Council. Consideration of "residents' only parking", however, would contribute to the cost of enforcement especially if the scheme could be enhanced if residents were to have the facility to report offenders themselves.

**If these parking restrictions are imposed, it is only right that a residents' only parking scheme is also brought in to enable residents, and their visitors, to be able to park outside their own homes.**

A residents' only scheme will also put an end to other problems of this nature – it might stop non-locals parking large parcel delivery vans, often being parked overnight on the Drive, often near or even on the blind bend. Most times these vehicles are also parked on the pavement preventing safe passage for pedestrians. Such a scheme might also prevent taxis parking at night at the head of the Drive, waiting for their next call from their office regarding a pick-up.

The proposed new scheme does not improve the environment or amenity for the residents as is stated in the justification of the plan. On the contrary it does just the

opposite. Whilst no one has the right to park a vehicle on the highway, this has been an amenity which residents on Beauville Drive have exercised and enjoyed since their homes were first built in the mid-70s, well before the school was here.

Alternative solution which should be considered:-

- Residents' only parking scheme
- Referral to the original plans for the school which appeared to provide a fit-for-purpose entrance and access to the school inside the school perimeter and from Strasbourg Drive (such as it was in 1975).
- Use made of the hard standing of the abandoned public playground to the rear of the school boundary with ready-made access from Darent Drive (apparently already used on occasion by council parks and recreation for mowing common land etc.
- CCTV/ANPR cameras pre-programmed with exempt residents' car registrations

Further points:

- LEW 25 notice of intention was never published on-line (the Public Notice does state how it can be seen on your website but an "error" page shows instead). This was reported but never corrected.
- In other areas within this LEW25 zone there are fewer restrictions put on residents where schools' desires and residents' needs seem to conflict. (There are few areas addressing problems of the same nature).
- The Clarendon Park scheme allows for permits to exempt residents from parking restrictions (which, in a way, suggest an income generator which will reduce the financial commitment to the City Council for enforcement.).

Finally, I think that some locals, not necessarily residents, have already expressed their opinion of restricted parking scheme and the temporary restrictions when, every day traffic cones have to be put back on the road by "a man in a van" because they have been removed, displaced, hidden or destroyed overnight.

One of my neighbours expressed fear for the value, desirability and saleability of their property.

This is especially if they cannot afford to pave part of their front garden – I wonder if the city council will provide any financial support for this.

**Please consider the wellbeing and rights of the people who live on Beauville Drive and include residents only parking as part of this scheme.**

**The better solution would be for the restrictions to apply only during term time and not the year round as an e-mail from an officer confirmed for the morning and afternoon periods whilst at the same time also confirming that the zigzag markings were only enforceable during term time alone.**

I make these comments sincerely on the basis of our experience living here and having already managed to accommodate many changes sometimes at a cost.

