

	<p>Do you agree or disagree that the parking bays should be suspended to enable a trial scheme to improve pedestrian safety in Station Road? (Please tick one answer.)</p>	<p>Please provide comments and/or questions</p>
1	YES, I AGREE	
2	YES, I AGREE	
3	NO, I DISAGREE	Without the parking bays cars would drive at greater speed.
4	NO, I DISAGREE	Without the parking bays cars would drive at greater speed.
5	YES, I AGREE	
6	NO STRONG VIEWS	
7	YES, I AGREE	
8	YES, I AGREE	
9	YES, I AGREE	
10	YES, I AGREE	.
11	YES, I AGREE	
12	YES, I AGREE	
13	YES, I AGREE	
14	YES, I AGREE	
15	YES, I AGREE	
16	YES, I AGREE	.
17	YES, I AGREE	I have lived in _____ since the beginning of December, and found drivers very careful and courteous. Pedestrians also very careful and cautious.
18	YES, I AGREE	
19	YES, I AGREE	
20	YES, I AGREE	
21	YES, I AGREE	.
22	YES, I AGREE	.
23	NO, I DISAGREE	
24	NO STRONG VIEWS	What good is a survey of traffic speeds when you don't seem to have any control over the 20 miles per hour speed limit from the arcade to the railway bridge in the High Street.
25	YES, I AGREE	For disability scooters the canker (?) of Station Road needs levelled. It is dangerous.
26	YES, I AGREE	For disability scooters the canker (?) of Station Road needs levelled. It is dangerous.
27	YES, I AGREE	
28	YES, I AGREE	
29	NO STRONG VIEWS	
30	YES, I AGREE	
31	NO STRONG VIEWS	

32	YES, I AGREE	
33	YES, I AGREE	
34	NO STRONG VIEWS	
35	YES, I AGREE	Pedestrian safety does not exist on this road as there is no pavement for much of its length. A PPL is the next best thing to a pavement, but you haven't even explained this in the survey as the MIGGS consultation was based on a PPL being introduced. You should have done so to make sense of suspending the parking bays.
36	NO, I DISAGREE	I would rather spend the money on resurfacing the road (Station Road, Manor Road and Red Cross Road). The road surface is a disgrace.
37	NO STRONG VIEWS	
38	YES, I AGREE	
39	YES, I AGREE	Although High Street does provide alternative pedestrian route it would be good to have safe route to library.
40	NO, I DISAGREE	Have used this road regularly on foot and by car and can see no valid reason for change.
41	NO, I DISAGREE	
42	YES, I AGREE	Agree that pedestrian safety should be improved. There are only 5 spaces here and plenty of alternative parking.
43	YES, I AGREE	
44	NO STRONG VIEWS	
45	YES, I AGREE	
46	NO, I DISAGREE	.
47	NO STRONG VIEWS	The biggest improvement that needs to be made for pedestrian safety is better lighting from the railway station up to the bridge on Wallingford Road. Female at night feel very vulnerable.
48	YES, I AGREE	
49	YES, I AGREE	
50	NO STRONG VIEWS	
51	NO STRONG VIEWS	
52	YES, I AGREE	We need traffic lights adjacent to railway bridge
53	YES, I AGREE	
54	YES, I AGREE	It would be a good opportunity to repair the road surface at the same time.
55	YES, I AGREE	It would be a good opportunity to repair the road surface at the same time.
56	NO STRONG VIEWS	
57	NO STRONG VIEWS	
58	YES, I AGREE	.
59	YES, I AGREE	
60	NO STRONG VIEWS	
61	YES, I AGREE	.
62	NO STRONG VIEWS	

63	NO, I DISAGREE	
64	YES, I AGREE	Station Road is dangerous for all users, but in particularly the elderly, mothers with prams and children, scooter drivers.
65	YES, I AGREE	
66	NO STRONG VIEWS	
67	NO, I DISAGREE	Trials should be conducted in real life conditions. A trial without parking will not indicate conditions when the parking bays are reinstated after.
68	NO, I DISAGREE	
69	NO STRONG VIEWS	
70	YES, I AGREE	
71	YES, I AGREE	Will replacement free parking be offered elsewhere?
72	NO, I DISAGREE	It will become a one track
73	YES, I AGREE	
74	YES, I AGREE	but please see additional notes re this 'dilemma'. (NO NOTES ATTACHED THAT WE COULD FIND)
75	YES, I AGREE	
76	NO STRONG VIEWS	
77	NO, I DISAGREE	
78	YES, I AGREE	You also need to enforce parking restrictions at the top of Station Road - entrance to the Station.

79	YES, I AGREE	<p>Station Rd - One of the biggest issues with pedestrian and mobility scooter safety on Station Road is the appalling condition of the road surface, especially from the railway to Croft Road. It's seven poor for motorcycles (I speak from experience). Years of 'patch on patch' temporary repairs have got to the point where a new surface is required. It is therefore disappointing that Note 4 hints at POTENTIAL surface repairs - and of a minor nature to boot. - It seems that space for a pedestrian lane will only be possible with the suspension of the parking bays BUT as they stand, gaps between parked cars do at least provide a refuge for pedestrians to let cars pass. - on the downside, an improved road surface and the suspension of parking bays might just lead to a temptation for traffic speed to increase which would need to be carefully monitored. - Policing of traffic and parking regulations is virtually non-existent and the regulations are frequently flouted. Currently two cars (local residents?) are parked on the DOUBLE YELLOW LINES at the eastern end of Station Road, virtually 24/7, with impunity. Apart from blatantly contravening parking regulations, these make an already dangerous junction more so by restricting wriggle/manoeuvring room when traffic at the junction is busy. - A feature of any trial scheme to improve safety must NOT introduce any weakening of current parking restrictions/regulations, preferably their strengthening, especially at the eastern end of Station Road. - It has to be hoped that any trial scheme produces SUBSTANTIVE DATA to indicate the way forward, something which has been conspicuously lacking hitherto.</p>
80	NO STRONG VIEWS	
81	YES, I AGREE	
82	NO STRONG VIEWS	
83	YES, I AGREE	Traffic is numerous and increasingly so and presents a hazard to pedestrians.
84	YES, I AGREE	
85	YES, I AGREE	
86	YES, I AGREE	.
87	YES, I AGREE	A permanent pavement and widening of the road would be a better solution.
88	YES, I AGREE	
89	YES, I AGREE	
90	NO STRONG VIEWS	
91	NO, I DISAGREE	I do not agree with the proposal to change Station Road - I have used Station Road for over _____ year and as long as one is sensible, there is no danger.
92	YES, I AGREE	
93	NO STRONG VIEWS	
94	YES, I AGREE	.
95	YES, I AGREE	

96	NO, I DISAGREE	Parking is already difficult. This would worsen the situation.
97	NO STRONG VIEWS	
98	NO STRONG VIEWS	
99	YES, I AGREE	Currently dangerous for pedestrians, especially people with push chairs, etc.
100	YES, I AGREE	
101	YES, I AGREE	
102	YES, I AGREE	
103	YES, I AGREE	
104	NO, I DISAGREE	
105	YES, I AGREE	
106	NO, I DISAGREE	Station Road is a shared space. The highway code gives priority to pedestrians over cars in ALL occasions!
107	YES, I AGREE	
108	YES, I AGREE	Making Station Road a one-way street should also be considered.
109	YES, I AGREE	
110	YES, I AGREE	
111	YES, I AGREE	
112	YES, I AGREE	
113	NO, I DISAGREE	There is insufficient parking already in Goring in peak periods.
114	YES, I AGREE	
115	YES, I AGREE	.
116	NO STRONG VIEWS	
117	YES, I AGREE	
118	NO, I DISAGREE	
119	YES, I AGREE	
120	NO, I DISAGREE	1. Traffic would be able to speed with no impediment. 2. There is not enough free parking. The village is POLICED with reference to time limits.
121	NO, I DISAGREE	Very few accidents in the road. Road just wants resurfacing (not just filling in potholes).
122	YES, I AGREE	.
123	YES, I AGREE	
124	YES, I AGREE	Any markings or signs should be as discreet as possible so as not to detract from the Conservation Area.
125	YES, I AGREE	Any markings or signs should be as discreet as possible so as not to detract from the Conservation Area.
126	NO, I DISAGREE	Cars parked in these bays act as a 'traffic calming measure'
127	NO, I DISAGREE	Cars parked in these bays act as a 'traffic calming measure'
128	NO STRONG VIEWS	
129	NO STRONG VIEWS	
130	YES, I AGREE	.
131	YES, I AGREE	
132	NO STRONG VIEWS	
133	NO STRONG VIEWS	

134	NO STRONG VIEWS	If you take away the few spaces in Station Road this would encourage them to park in Lockstile Way (for commuters). There is already a problem with commuters taking spaces in the road.
135	NO STRONG VIEWS	If you take away the few spaces in Station Road this would encourage them to park in Lockstile Way (for commuters). There is already a problem with commuters taking spaces in the road.
136	YES, I AGREE	
137	YES, I AGREE	
138	NO STRONG VIEWS	Caution please.
139	NO STRONG VIEWS	Caution please.
140	YES, I AGREE	Given there is no footpath for the majority of Station Road I think a trial to improve pedestrian safety makes sense. Data of the trial should be quantitative as far as possible. The parking spaces on Red Cross Road should remain.
141	NO, I DISAGREE	Have had no problems with this road, People seem to wait for others to drive safely
142	NO, I DISAGREE	I frequently drive along Station Road and have not observed any problem. Have there actually been any serious problems?
143	NO STRONG VIEWS	But I'd prefer the focus to be on other main road stretches rather than this back road behind the high street
144	YES, I AGREE	
145	YES, I AGREE	
146	YES, I AGREE	
147	YES, I AGREE	
148	NO, I DISAGREE	
149	YES, I AGREE	Agree to TRIAL. Any subsequent proposal should be put to public consultation in the same way.
150	YES, I AGREE	Agree to TRIAL. Any subsequent proposal should be put to public consultation in the same way.
151	YES, I AGREE	
152	YES, I AGREE	
153	YES, I AGREE	
154	NO STRONG VIEWS	
155	YES, I AGREE	I agree to a TRIAL scheme to assess result on traffic flow and speed. Interested in the result, as suspect that it will not benefit the situation. I have the view that the parked cars (in the designated bay) do in fact act as a means of slowing the traffic. Without these cars vehicle speed will increase unless there are deterrents e.g speed limit of 20mph and speed humps
156	YES, I AGREE	
157	NO, I DISAGREE	We consider the dangerous area for pushchairs and people with mobility issues is when crossing over the road to Tesco's.

158	NO, I DISAGREE	We consider the dangerous area for pushchairs and people with mobility issues is when crossing over the road to Tesco's.
159	NO STRONG VIEWS	
160	YES, I AGREE	
161	YES, I AGREE	
162	YES, I AGREE	
163	NO, I DISAGREE	I don't think this is necessary. The cars parked already slow the traffic down and we are short of parking places.
164	NO, I DISAGREE	I fear that drivers would drive faster along Station Road if parking bays were to be removed.
165	NO, I DISAGREE	Removing spaces is likely to mean more speeding.
166	YES, I AGREE	.
167	YES, I AGREE	
168	NO, I DISAGREE	Parking and pedestrians in the road act as traffic calming. Walking with or without a pushchair has never been an issue. Without the parked cars traffic will be faster.
169	NO, I DISAGREE	Parking and pedestrians in the road act as traffic calming. Walking with or without a pushchair has never been an issue. Without the parked cars traffic will be faster.
170	YES, I AGREE	
171	YES, I AGREE	The parking bays make walking along Station Road hazardous
172	YES, I AGREE	It would also help if there was a white line in the middle of the road by the John Barleycorn bend to discourage vehicles heading south from swinging into Manor Road without pausing at the junction.
173	YES, I AGREE	
174	NO, I DISAGREE	
175	NO, I DISAGREE	Parking is already limited. Money would be better spent on control of speeding in Wallingford Road and High Street up to Railway Bridge.
176	NO STRONG VIEWS	
177	NO STRONG VIEWS	
178	YES, I AGREE	
179	YES, I AGREE	
180	NO, I DISAGREE	Removing bays will increase the speed of vehicles. People drive too fast there already.
181	YES, I AGREE	
182	YES, I AGREE	
183	NO, I DISAGREE	I don't support the trial because I don't support the permanent loss of already scarce parking spaces which will be the logical and inevitable consequence if the trial is deemed successful. Removing these spaces, even temporarily, will also encourage higher traffic speeds which a 20 mph speed limit will not prevent because it will be unenforceable and unenforced as well as adding to the street clutter in the Conservation Area.

184	YES, I AGREE	
185	NO STRONG VIEWS	
186	NO STRONG VIEWS	
187	NO STRONG VIEWS	
188	NO STRONG VIEWS	
189	YES, I AGREE	
190	YES, I AGREE	Improved safety on Station Road is vital.
191	YES, I AGREE	There are too many cars. People should make the effort to walk to football training/dog walking/tescos etc. (I am not sure how we can persuade people about this).
192	NO, I DISAGREE	I believe they help to slow the traffic. It is difficult for poorly sighted people, but, safer otherwise.
193	NO, I DISAGREE	There are much more important areas which higher traffic. It's a wide enough road that is not very busy. Spend the budget elsewhere.
194	YES, I AGREE	Though despite have a pavement on Manor Road most people walk on the road.
195	NO STRONG VIEWS	It is a relatively quiet road so not too much of a problem to walk round the cars but equally there is alternative parking close by.
196	YES, I AGREE	Also beneficial to have pedestrian safety on the High Street. There are no crossings. Would be grate by the grocer, the Miller and Pierrepoints. Especially for those of us with children.
197	NO, I DISAGREE	Removing parking bays will lead to increased traffic speeds unless other calming measures were included.
198	NO, I DISAGREE	The current parking bays are very useful, especially for users of the Community Centre.
199	YES, I AGREE	
200	NO, I DISAGREE	
201	NO STRONG VIEWS	
202	YES, I AGREE	The cars constantly parked there are a nuisance on such a narrow road - I welcome their suspension, permanently!
203	YES, I AGREE	
204	YES, I AGREE	
205	NO, I DISAGREE	The parking in Station Road is valuable for access to the village when the main car park is full.
206	YES, I AGREE	
207	YES, I AGREE	I agree with a trial but suspect the removal of parked cars will result in drivers increasing their speed
208	NO, I DISAGREE	The parking bays provide a 'safe haven' for pedestrians from cars and vans driving along Station Road. Very important in a road with no pedestrian footpaths.

209	YES, I AGREE	We agree to temporary suspension, but feel these should be reinstated since they are very useful and slow down the traffic using Station Road. On a longer-term basis, the road surface should be improved seriously (not just 'minor improvements').
210	YES, I AGREE	We agree to temporary suspension, but feel these should be reinstated since they are very useful and slow down the traffic using Station Road. On a longer-term basis, the road surface should be improved seriously (not just 'minor improvements').
211	NO STRONG VIEWS	
212	YES, I AGREE	
213	NO, I DISAGREE	There is simply NOT sufficient parking available in Goring and with the planned housebuilding this will become even worse. Additional free car parking please.
214	YES, I AGREE	.
215	YES, I AGREE	.
216	YES, I AGREE	The road surface needs to be completely renewed. V. dangerous and especially at night as there are no lights.
217	YES, I AGREE	,
218	YES, I AGREE	,
219	YES, I AGREE	,
220	YES, I AGREE	,
221	YES, I AGREE	,
222	YES, I AGREE	,
223	NO, I DISAGREE	These parking bays are really useful. Remove them only if more are provided in the area outside Goring Hardware and the PC office.
224	NO, I DISAGREE	These parking bays are really useful. Remove them only if more are provided in the area outside Goring Hardware and the PC office.
225	YES, I AGREE	This road is quite narrow and dangerous without the parking bays. I would be worried about traffic speeding up, so the survey would be good.
226	YES, I AGREE	
227	YES, I AGREE	.
228	YES, I AGREE	.
229	NO, I DISAGREE	.
230	YES, I AGREE	.
231	YES, I AGREE	Pedestrian safety concerns are much bigger along Wallingford and Elvendon Road
232	YES, I AGREE	.
233	YES, I AGREE	.
234	YES, I AGREE	Needs pavement and one way traffic (not wide enough for 2 way traffic and pavement)

235	YES, I AGREE	Would definitely like improved pedestrian safety but concerned that removing parking bays will allow traffic to go faster. Need to know that there will only be single file traffic adjacent to pedestrian areas.
236	NO STRONG VIEWS	I am a bit skeptical about how this would help as the road is already narrow (one way traffic effect) at the Red Cross Road end. But I'm not a mobility scooter user and maybe things would look different from that perspective.
237	YES, I AGREE	May I use this space to request maintenance of the Wallingford Road boundary. The intrusive brambles/shrubbery narrows the pathway and results in the inevitable snagging of clothing.
238	YES, I AGREE	.
239	YES, I AGREE	.
240	YES, I AGREE	.
241	YES, I AGREE	.
242	NO, I DISAGREE	Length of stay at parking bays may help. If removed cars are likely to drive faster. Why not put a pavement on the side away from the parking?
243	YES, I AGREE	.
244	NO, I DISAGREE	Not enough parking in Goring and cars already drive respectfully. I would be concerned that the removal of the spaces would become permanent.
245	YES, I AGREE	.
246	NO, I DISAGREE	.
247	YES, I AGREE	.
248	YES, I AGREE	.
249	YES, I AGREE	.
250	YES, I AGREE	.
251	YES, I AGREE	.
252	YES, I AGREE	.
253	YES, I AGREE	.
254	YES, I AGREE	.
255	YES, I AGREE	.
256	YES, I AGREE	.
257	YES, I AGREE	Pedestrians are more important than cars.
258	YES, I AGREE	Pedestrians are more important than cars.
259	YES, I AGREE	.
260	YES, I AGREE	.
261	YES, I AGREE	.
262	YES, I AGREE	.
263	YES, I AGREE	.
264	YES, I AGREE	.
265	YES, I AGREE	.
266	YES, I AGREE	The addition of speed bumps would control traffic speed and so be better for pedestrians

267	YES, I AGREE	The addition of speed bumps would control the traffic speed and so be better for pedestrians
268	YES, I AGREE	I have misgivings about the proposal to run a TRIAL scheme as it's likely to be cheaply executed (ie painted road) and to become permanent by default. Station Rd is the least altered of Goring's historic village streets, lined by some of our most interesting (and listed) buildings, which need protection from poor drainage. A poorly executed scheme, without some re-engineering of the camber and selection of sensitive surfaces, could cause physical damage to the buildings lining it, and damage the street's visual character.
269	YES, I AGREE	
270	YES, I AGREE	Parking is an issue in the Village and removing these spaces does not help. Perhaps a review of parking requirements generally would be of benefit.
271	YES, I AGREE	.
272	YES, I AGREE	.
273	YES, I AGREE	.
274	NO STRONG VIEWS	.
275	YES, I AGREE	.
276	YES, I AGREE	.
277	NO STRONG VIEWS	I feel some parked cars are a very effective traffic calming device, but happy to try alternative.
278	YES, I AGREE	As someone who often walks this way with a pushchair, this would be welcome. However, some provision for non-charged short stay parking is also important, otherwise the paid car park will be oversubscribed.
279	YES, I AGREE	As someone who often walks this way with a pushchair, this would be welcome. However, some provision for non-charged short stay parking is also important, otherwise the paid car park will be oversubscribed.
280	YES, I AGREE	n/a
281	YES, I AGREE	na
282	YES, I AGREE	na
283	YES, I AGREE	.
284	NO, I DISAGREE	Unnecessary
285	YES, I AGREE	I can't see that there is any need for these parking bays. I often walk down Station Road and the parked cars would be an obstacle for pushchairs / those with mobility issues.
286	NO, I DISAGREE	Unnecessary
287	YES, I AGREE	
288	YES, I AGREE	
289	NO STRONG VIEWS	The council seems obsessed with one side of the railway line while traffic daily endangers the lives of children walking to school on the other side.
290	YES, I AGREE	.

291	YES, I AGREE	.
292	NO, I DISAGREE	I have hesitations re changing current system in Station Road
293	YES, I AGREE	.
294	NO, I DISAGREE	Removal of parking bays will increase traffic speed.
295	NO, I DISAGREE	.
296	NO, I DISAGREE	Parking slows traffic
297	NO, I DISAGREE	Parking slows traffic
298	NO STRONG VIEWS	.
299	YES, I AGREE	.
300	YES, I AGREE	.
301	NO STRONG VIEWS	.
302	NO STRONG VIEWS	.
303	YES, I AGREE	.
304	YES, I AGREE	.
305	NO STRONG VIEWS	.
306	YES, I AGREE	.
307	NO, I DISAGREE	.
308	NO, I DISAGREE	.
309	NO, I DISAGREE	.
310	YES, I AGREE	.
311	YES, I AGREE	.
312	NO, I DISAGREE	The parking bays serve to slow traffic. There is not enough parking in the centre of the village.
313	NO, I DISAGREE	We cannot understand where the parking bays you are referring to are. The main pedestrian safety problem for me is the narrow pavement between the stables and the road bridge, next to the railway.
314	NO, I DISAGREE	We cannot understand where the parking bays you are referring to are. The main pedestrian safety problem for me is the narrow pavement between the stables and the road bridge, next to the railway.
315	NO STRONG VIEWS	.
316	NO STRONG VIEWS	.
317	YES, I AGREE	.
318	YES, I AGREE	.
319	NO, I DISAGREE	In my experience, traffic is not a huge problem in Station Rd and car drivers are considerate. This is an unnecessary expenditure.
320	YES, I AGREE	.
321	NO, I DISAGREE	Several surveys show that roads are safer when used by pedestrians and cars
322	YES, I AGREE	When liaising with OCC could I ask that a more strict monitoring of speed limits be initiated.
323	YES, I AGREE	20mph should be continued from High Street - Manor Road - Station Road.
324	YES, I AGREE	.

325	YES, I AGREE	Those parking spaces can be very useful at times, but do create a hazard for pedestrians, especially wheelchairs and pushchairs.
326	YES, I AGREE	I AGREE SUBJECT TO THERE BEING SOME CONTROL OVER THE FLOW OF TRAFFIC SUCH AS LIGHTS TO AVOID CARS MEETING IN THE MIDDLE HEAD ON.HIGHER SPEEDS OF CARS MAY BE EXPERINCED DUE TOI LACK OF PARKED VEHICLES TO SLOW THEM DOWN.
327	NO STRONG VIEWS	I presume that the road surface will be made safe as well
328	NO STRONG VIEWS	
329	YES, I AGREE	
330	NO STRONG VIEWS	
331	NO STRONG VIEWS	
332	YES, I AGREE	We need make Station Road safer for pedestrians, children and people with mobility issues
333	NO STRONG VIEWS	
334	NO STRONG VIEWS	
335	YES, I AGREE	
336	YES, I AGREE	
337	YES, I AGREE	
338	YES, I AGREE	
339	NO STRONG VIEWS	
340	NO, I DISAGREE	I don't see that there is much of a problem. Also, with no parked cars the traffic would go much faster. This would further compromise pedestrian safety.
341	YES, I AGREE	
342	YES, I AGREE	
343	YES, I AGREE	
344	YES, I AGREE	
345	YES, I AGREE	My wife and I have often had to hide between parked cars to avoid oncoming traffic, esp vans. I'm sure we're not alone. Improvement would be welcome.
346	YES, I AGREE	It has never been clear why the parking bays are in Station Road since alternative parking is close at hand. The bays are a traffic hazzard.
347	YES, I AGREE	
348	YES, I AGREE	The whole of Station Road needs to be totally resurfaced as it is dangerous for pedestrians and is a disgrace!
349	YES, I AGREE	
350	YES, I AGREE	
351	YES, I AGREE	
352	YES, I AGREE	.
353	YES, I AGREE	.
354	YES, I AGREE	
355	NO STRONG VIEWS	.
356	YES, I AGREE	.

357	YES, I AGREE	I strongly agree that something needs to be done to improve pedestrian safety along Station Road.
358	YES, I AGREE	Currently quite hazardous for less able people especially and pushchairs.
359	NO STRONG VIEWS	
360	YES, I AGREE	.
361	YES, I AGREE	However the short term parking bays by the hardware shop need to be kept as they are essential for that business.
362	NO, I DISAGREE	The priority should be to tackle speeding on the main routes used by children to get to school (i.e. Wallingford Road and Elvendon Road). If policemen have been knocked by the wing mirrors of cars/ buses it's only a matter of time before a child is injured, possibly fatally.
363	NO STRONG VIEWS	.
364	NO, I DISAGREE	Whilst I am supportive of improving pedestrian safety, our house does not have a driveway so we often use these bays for visitors.
365	NO STRONG VIEWS	
366	NO STRONG VIEWS	
367	NO STRONG VIEWS	
368	NO STRONG VIEWS	I do not have enough experience/knowledge of Station Road to comment.
369	YES, I AGREE	
370	NO STRONG VIEWS	
371	NO, I DISAGREE	Speeds will increase. This will have the very opposite effect.
372	YES, I AGREE	
373	YES, I AGREE	A good idea to get rid of parking bays but please no pavements etc. Keep simple with a line painted on road to separate pedestrian pathway from road. We must not urbanisé the village any more.
374	NO STRONG VIEWS	Had no idea there were any 2 hour parking bays in Station Road
375	YES, I AGREE	Yes, but make a proper path.
376	YES, I AGREE	
377	NO STRONG VIEWS	
378	NO, I DISAGREE	Why do this as a test? What will you measure? How will you know if successful? Removing cars will of course make it safer for pedestrians, so why waste money on a test.
379	YES, I AGREE	
380	NO, I DISAGREE	It is fine as it is and shortage of parking.
381	NO STRONG VIEWS	
382	NO STRONG VIEWS	We find traffic is considerate - give & take seems to work.
383	YES, I AGREE	The road surface should be improved - walking with a stick is difficult
384	YES, I AGREE	Adequate parking at surgery and they are dangerous - wheel chair users have to go onto the centre of road.

385	YES, I AGREE	The bays are themselves the main hazard
386	YES, I AGREE	The bays are themselves the main hazard.
387	NO STRONG VIEWS	The gaps between cars can be safe places for a lone pedestrian, less so with a dog, not so for a wheelchair.
388	YES, I AGREE	
389	YES, I AGREE	
390	YES, I AGREE	
391	YES, I AGREE	
392	YES, I AGREE	
393	YES, I AGREE	Strongly support the need to improve pedestrian safety on Station Road
394	NO STRONG VIEWS	
395	YES, I AGREE	
396	NO, I DISAGREE	
397	YES, I AGREE	
398	NO STRONG VIEWS	
399	YES, I AGREE	
400	NO STRONG VIEWS	
401	YES, I AGREE	
402	YES, I AGREE	
403	NO, I DISAGREE	This preference is unfair.
404	NO, I DISAGREE	There is a perfectly good pavement on the High Street for pedestrians and those with mobility issues etc., who are uncomfortable about using Station Road. This is a village, we have narrow roads which makes it part of its quaintness and character.
405	YES, I AGREE	Parked cars added to a narrow road with no accessible verges and a poor surface make an already difficult position for pedestrian safety much worse particularly for the less mobile.
406	YES, I AGREE	
407	YES, I AGREE	To assess the viability of improving pedestrian safety it is essential to clear visual obstructions such as parked cars but only for a strictly limited period.
408	YES, I AGREE	
409	YES, I AGREE	Agree to a trial removal of the Parking Bays, but not to replacing them with a segregated pedestrian lane for mobility scooters and pushchairs. As part of this removal the whole road should be re-surfaced as it is in an appalling condition. Trial should be re-assessed after three months
410	YES, I AGREE	
411	YES, I AGREE	
412	NO STRONG VIEWS	
413	NO STRONG VIEWS	
414	YES, I AGREE	

415	NO, I DISAGREE	My wife and I walk daily up and down Station Road to avoid the cars and petrol fumes in the village centre. We consider the parking bays are a GODSEND AS THEY SLOW THE TRAFFIC down this narrow lane stopping it racing through at speed. If not there would be dreadful accidents we think. So WE DISAGREE!
416	YES, I AGREE	
417	YES, I AGREE	Yes providing traffic calming measure stop a free for all. At present they cause a degree of safety from cars trying to pass each other.
418	YES, I AGREE	
419	YES, I AGREE	It is sometimes awkward to skirt around cars parked closely together, unfortunately
420	YES, I AGREE	
421	YES, I AGREE	
422	YES, I AGREE	
423	YES, I AGREE	
424	YES, I AGREE	
425	YES, I AGREE	
426	YES, I AGREE	
427	YES, I AGREE	
428	YES, I AGREE	
429	YES, I AGREE	.
430	YES, I AGREE	
431	YES, I AGREE	
432	NO STRONG VIEWS	
433	YES, I AGREE	
434	NO, I DISAGREE	The parked cars stop other cars driving too fast.
435	YES, I AGREE	
436	YES, I AGREE	
437	YES, I AGREE	
438	YES, I AGREE	Would hope (and recommend) the survey of traffic speeds would be done both before and after introduction of the suggested parking bays - at the same times. This would help establishment of how effective the measure is, and should inform future decisions on how to proceed.
439	YES, I AGREE	_____ has balance problems so we have to walk side by side and although we often park in those bays we are willing to give them up for a short period of time to enable the trial to go ahead. We often walk Station road and the issue certainly needs addressing.
440	NO STRONG VIEWS	
441	YES, I AGREE	The whole of Station Road needs to be resurfaced as it is an absolute disgrace
442	NO, I DISAGREE	We live in a historic village: you cannot make it all perfect for pedestrians.

443	NO, I DISAGREE	What is the proposed trial scheme? Two-way traffic is imperative. Don't see any issues with current situation.
444	NO, I DISAGREE	Unaware of any significant problems.
445	NO STRONG VIEWS	
446	NO STRONG VIEWS	Scheme to improve the slowing of traffic in High Street has not made it more safe for pedestrians. Will this trial work to improve!!!
447	NO, I DISAGREE	No park cars will encourage people to speed up As lack of hazards
448	YES, I AGREE	Worth doing a trial. As this (is) narrow rd.
449	NO STRONG VIEWS	
450	YES, I AGREE	
451	NO, I DISAGREE	Pedestrians now, by law, have priority, so this proposal is obsolete.
452	NO, I DISAGREE	Parked cars slow traffic, provide refuge for pedestrians and make traffic move out. Without the speed of traffic will increase.
453	NO, I DISAGREE	Parked cars slow traffic, provide refuge for pedestrians and make traffic move out. Without the speed of traffic will increase.
454	YES, I AGREE	.
455	YES, I AGREE	.
456	NO, I DISAGREE	
457	NO, I DISAGREE	
458	NO, I DISAGREE	Not enough traffic down this road to warrant the potentially huge costs.
459	NO, I DISAGREE	Not enough traffic down this road to warrant the potentially huge costs.
460	NO, I DISAGREE	It is arrogant pedestrians usually elderly that have brought this about. It is a slow quiet road. Again, save the money!
461	YES, I AGREE	Improving pedestrian safety on Station road is a priority. Cars, vans and small lorries drive far too fast (particularly when coming from the Manor Road end) and when there are cars parked in the carpark spaces (which is most of the time), you have to wait until the traffic has passed in order to continue on the road.
462	YES, I AGREE	.
463	YES, I AGREE	
464	YES, I AGREE	Yes, walking on Station Road is hazardous for pedestrians.
465	YES, I AGREE	Yes, walking on Station Road is hazardous for pedestrians.
466	YES, I AGREE	
467	NO STRONG VIEWS	
468	YES, I AGREE	
469	YES, I AGREE	
470	NO, I DISAGREE	Having the bays acts to slow traffic

471	NO, I DISAGREE	Why are you running a test and what will you measure to see if it's successful? Removing cars will of course make it safer for pedestrians? What's the cost, what are the trade offs on parking vs safety and how will you make the final decision? Please just debate that now instead of running a trial.
472	YES, I AGREE	NON
473	YES, I AGREE	NON
474	NO STRONG VIEWS	non
475	YES, I AGREE	non
476	YES, I AGREE	NON
477	NO, I DISAGREE	Insufficient alternative parking
478	YES, I AGREE	non
479	YES, I AGREE	non
480	YES, I AGREE	non
481	YES, I AGREE	non
482	YES, I AGREE	N/A
483	YES, I AGREE	n/a
484	YES, I AGREE	n/a
485	NO STRONG VIEWS	No, parking is only a problem outside Jacks shop and going through the village to streately. DEAL WITH THOSE AREAS FIRST
486	YES, I AGREE	non
487	YES, I AGREE	n/a
488	YES, I AGREE	n/a
489	YES, I AGREE	Most importantly the road surface needs to be brought into good condition. It is pot holed extensivley which is an immediate threat/hazard to all users.
490	YES, I AGREE	na
491	NO, I DISAGREE	1) There is no pedestrian problem in station road 2) traffic flow is very light 3) Bays are useful for short term parking for shops
492	NO, I DISAGREE	1) There is no pedestrian problem in station road 2) traffic flow is very light 3) Bays are useful for short term parking for shops
493	YES, I AGREE	You might like to talk to the hardware store to see if they notice an impact on trade (due to reduced local parking) during the trial.
494	NO, I DISAGREE	
495	YES, I AGREE	Maybe parking in Croft Rd could be adjusted to compensate for loss of parking in Station Rd.
496	YES, I AGREE	I think other spaces should be made available to help those coming into the village for work.
497	YES, I AGREE	
498	NO STRONG VIEWS	
499	YES, I AGREE	
500	YES, I AGREE	.

501	NO, I DISAGREE	How is this going to make the top end of Station Rd (where the wooden posts are) any wider?
502	NO, I DISAGREE	Parked cars act as a traffic 'slower'. When no cars parked the traffic speeds so quickly that it is dangerous for me to step out from my drive.
503	NO STRONG VIEWS	
504	NO, I DISAGREE	
505	NO, I DISAGREE	The parking bays act to make drivers slow their vehicles down in Station Road. This helps pedestrians.
506	NO, I DISAGREE	Cars need to park somewhere? There should be NO interference with Station Road. Traffic regulations are NOT enforced in village anyway. Most acceptable would be discrete visible lines marking pedestrian pavement. No bollards, High Street is a disaster.
507	NO STRONG VIEWS	
508	NO, I DISAGREE	The parking currently forces traffic to slow down. Traffic speed would increase without the parking.
509	NO, I DISAGREE	
510	YES, I AGREE	Sooner rather than later.
511	NO, I DISAGREE	If footpath is needed in Station Rd then with the road being narrow it should be made one-way.
512	YES, I AGREE	
513	YES, I AGREE	
514	YES, I AGREE	
515	NO, I DISAGREE	This does not say what the improvements actually are.
516	YES, I AGREE	Since coming to live in Station Road four months ago, I find the top end of Station Rd from Croft Rd quite hazardous as a pedestrian.
517	YES, I AGREE	I frequently cycle around the village but try to avoid Station Road because the road surface is so poor. It will need to be improved to make it safe for mobility scooters.
518	NO STRONG VIEWS	
519	YES, I AGREE	The road surface up Station Rd + Red Cross Road junction is deplorable.
520	NO STRONG VIEWS	
521	YES, I AGREE	
522	NO, I DISAGREE	The parked vehicles serve to slow down traffic.
523	YES, I AGREE	
524	NO STRONG VIEWS	
525	NO STRONG VIEWS	
526	NO, I DISAGREE	The road is much too narrow at the top - a danger to pedestrians. Where the parking bays are it is far wider.
527	YES, I AGREE	
528	NO, I DISAGREE	- Parked vehicles slow traffic down (see Streatley Road) - Pedestrians slow traffic down - Is a 1-way system through Station Road/High Street better solution?

529	YES, I AGREE	.
530	YES, I AGREE	
531	YES, I AGREE	
532	YES, I AGREE	
533	YES, I AGREE	
534	YES, I AGREE	
535	NO, I DISAGREE	
536	NO STRONG VIEWS	
537	YES, I AGREE	Pedestrian safety HAS to be a priority!
538	YES, I AGREE	
539	NO, I DISAGREE	It could change the nature of a small rural village. The High Street has perfectly good pavements which should be used.
540	NO STRONG VIEWS	I hope the the residents of Station Road have been asked what is necessary as they will, no doubt, have know the best solution.
541	YES, I AGREE	
542	YES, I AGREE	As a wheelchair/mobility scooter user and pedestrian these improvements are essential.
543	YES, I AGREE	As a wheelchair/mobility scooter user and pedestrian these improvements are essential.
544	YES, I AGREE	There is a car park nearby, why the need for parking bays around the corner?
545	NO STRONG VIEWS	
546	YES, I AGREE	na
547	YES, I AGREE	na
548	YES, I AGREE	This should be a priority as provision for wheelchair user is appalling at present
549	NO, I DISAGREE	The parked cars could be regarded as a traffic calming measure. without them cars will go faster
550	NO, I DISAGREE	The parked cars could be regarded as a traffic calming measure. without them cars will go faster
551	YES, I AGREE	
552	YES, I AGREE	na
553	YES, I AGREE	NA
554	YES, I AGREE	na
555	NO, I DISAGREE	No details provided as to what the trail scheme will entail - why would i support it?
556	YES, I AGREE	Most cars parked here stay well over 2 hours
557	YES, I AGREE	na
558	YES, I AGREE	na
559	YES, I AGREE	
560	YES, I AGREE	
561	NO, I DISAGREE	The parking acts as a means to slow traffic
562	YES, I AGREE	
563	YES, I AGREE	

564	NO STRONG VIEWS	BETTER TO DO: 1: All station car parks should be free 2: Repair all pavements in Goring, at night they are treacherous
565	YES, I AGREE	na
566	YES, I AGREE	NA
567	YES, I AGREE	n/a
568	YES, I AGREE	na
569	NO, I DISAGREE	na
570	YES, I AGREE	A pavement in station road is certainly overdue for pedestrians safety
571	YES, I AGREE	concerned that removing the 'chicane' of parked cars might lead to increased speeding
572	NO STRONG VIEWS	A useful idea, but levelling the N. side is almost impossible unless the road is 'lowered' as filling n.side would lead to flooding of barn,
573	NO, I DISAGREE	
574	YES, I AGREE	n/a
575	NO, I DISAGREE	I don't feel this is a problem that needs solving. A waste of money. No pedestrians have been injured here. If you remove these parking spaces, cars will drive faster there!
576	YES, I AGREE	n/a
577	YES, I AGREE	Is the 'trial' just get rid of the parking spaces? Cars there do force pedestrians out into the middle of the road.
578	NO, I DISAGREE	I see no reason for a trial safety scheme. In ____ years of walking the road i have always found it safe
579	YES, I AGREE	n/a
580	YES, I AGREE	Safety
581	NO STRONG VIEWS	n/a
582	YES, I AGREE	
583	YES, I AGREE	n/a
584	NO, I DISAGREE	n/a
585	NO, I DISAGREE	n/a
586	YES, I AGREE	N/A
587	YES, I AGREE	n/a
588	YES, I AGREE	There is a car park nearby
589	YES, I AGREE	But it will encourage cars to drive faster, The Parked cars slow vehciels down. if speed bumps installed, probably not a problem?
590	YES, I AGREE	But it will encourage cars to drive faster, The Parked cars slow vehciels down. if speed bumps installed, probably not a problem?

591	YES, I AGREE	Having visited people in Station Road over the last ____ years the traffic has steadily built up in numbers and speed. It is highly dangerous coming out of some of the houses down this road which access straight onto the road from their front gates. A pedestrian walkway would be used by all, homeowners, walkers, those accessing or egressing the Station. Safety for pedestrians is always a good thing.
592	YES, I AGREE	Adding a safe space for pedestrians alongside ensuring speed limits are adhered to is good. Note however that there are cars parked regularly on the pavement where there is one, near the manor road end.
593	YES, I AGREE	
594	YES, I AGREE	I would not be in agreement with making Station Road into a one way system as this would be disruptive for other roads in the area.
595	YES, I AGREE	
596	YES, I AGREE	
597	YES, I AGREE	
598	NO, I DISAGREE	
599	YES, I AGREE	
600	YES, I AGREE	
601	YES, I AGREE	
602	NO STRONG VIEWS	
603	YES, I AGREE	
604	YES, I AGREE	
605	YES, I AGREE	
606	NO, I DISAGREE	Space needed here as those by the hardware store are often full
607	YES, I AGREE	I think the bays should be permanently suspended to enable pedestrians a safer walk
608	YES, I AGREE	
609	YES, I AGREE	
610	NO STRONG VIEWS	
611	YES, I AGREE	
612	YES, I AGREE	
613	YES, I AGREE	Yes, Safety is paramount. Road humps or chancines to calm traffic. Hedges on Croft Road Corners to be cut back for traffic to see as currently blind, accident waiting to happen, or mirrors to see what is coming down or up Station Road
614	YES, I AGREE	
615	NO STRONG VIEWS	
616	YES, I AGREE	
617	YES, I AGREE	Hard to see round some parked vehicles. As a pedestrian it can be dangerous to step out on to an uneven surface and you are expected to give way to vehicles. Electric cars can be difficult to hear when they are behind you.

618	NO STRONG VIEWS	when trialling this, can we trial more local residents parking at the same time?
619	YES, I AGREE	Have to cross two roads - to get access to station/village/supermarket
620	YES, I AGREE	n/a
621	YES, I AGREE	
622	YES, I AGREE	
623	YES, I AGREE	At the moment, it is unsafe for pedestrians and those in wheelchairs to walk along this road with cars parked. It would be interesting to see the impact on local streets of any changes.
624	YES, I AGREE	I am in favour of a permanent walkway up Station Road, never mind the trial
625	YES, I AGREE	
626	YES, I AGREE	
627	YES, I AGREE	
628	YES, I AGREE	
629	YES, I AGREE	
630	YES, I AGREE	Make it easier to reach the library
631	YES, I AGREE	
632	NO STRONG VIEWS	
633	YES, I AGREE	A One Way system could be part of this trial.
634	NO STRONG VIEWS	
635	YES, I AGREE	
636	NO, I DISAGREE	
637	YES, I AGREE	Driving up and down station road becomes very difficult particularly in the summer when visitors and locals use this road + the car park with no pedestrian pavement can at times become a free for all between all three road users. A priority like those found in multi car parks say a green strip pavement and solid white line to remind all of its purpose. Pavements are for people!
638	YES, I AGREE	
639	YES, I AGREE	
640	NO STRONG VIEWS	
641	NO STRONG VIEWS	
642	YES, I AGREE	n/a
643	YES, I AGREE	n/a
644	YES, I AGREE	N/A
645	YES, I AGREE	n/a
646	YES, I AGREE	
647	YES, I AGREE	
648	YES, I AGREE	
649	NO STRONG VIEWS	

650	YES, I AGREE	Hopefully any traffic calming proposals will take into account the 20 new homes scheduled to be built at the southern end of Manor Rd that are expected to generate an additional 100 cars per day at the potentially dangerous 'John Barleycorn' junction.
651	NO, I DISAGREE	Scheme to slow traffic down. The parking currently does this.
652	YES, I AGREE	I have difficulty walking and find the existing parking makes progress challenging.
653	YES, I AGREE	
654	NO, I DISAGREE	
655	YES, I AGREE	
656	YES, I AGREE	
657	NO STRONG VIEWS	
658	NO STRONG VIEWS	
659	NO STRONG VIEWS	Having parked cars slows the traffic. If there were no parking bays, it might be difficult for elderly residents nearby to receive visitors/carers. On the other hand, a pavement would make pedestrians safer.
660	NO STRONG VIEWS	
661	YES, I AGREE	Safety of Pedestrians
662	YES, I AGREE	Traffic is quite a problem for pedestrians using Station Road
663	YES, I AGREE	Station road has become a busy route to avoid congestion on the High Street, which will only get worse thanks to the new housing estate being built in Manor Road, and it has large sections without a pavement. Many elderly residents, including those in wheelchairs, use it and frankly there is a serious accident waiting to happen on the road. Proactive management is urgently required to prevent this happening and the closure of the parking bays and the construction of pedestrian safety zones is the right way forward.
664	YES, I AGREE	
665	NO, I DISAGREE	There is not enough parking close to the village centre. To remove these bays will add to an already poor situation
666	YES, I AGREE	
667	YES, I AGREE	
668	NO STRONG VIEWS	
669	YES, I AGREE	
670	YES, I AGREE	
671	YES, I AGREE	
672	YES, I AGREE	
673	YES, I AGREE	
674	YES, I AGREE	
675	YES, I AGREE	
676	NO STRONG VIEWS	
677	NO STRONG VIEWS	
678	YES, I AGREE	As stated above, there is alternative parking nearby.

679	YES, I AGREE	I look forward to see how the trial goes, and to find possibilities for Station Rd and other areas in the village
680	NO STRONG VIEWS	
681	NO, I DISAGREE	
682	NO STRONG VIEWS	
683	NO STRONG VIEWS	
684	YES, I AGREE	The existing parking bays add significantly to the hazards of walking along Station Road
685	NO STRONG VIEWS	
686	YES, I AGREE	
687	NO STRONG VIEWS	It is not a road I walk down very often.
688	YES, I AGREE	We need a pedestrian priority lane.
689	YES, I AGREE	
690	YES, I AGREE	
691	YES, I AGREE	Everything that could improve pedestrian safety and encourage more residents to walk should be considered.
692	YES, I AGREE	
693	NO STRONG VIEWS	
694	NO STRONG VIEWS	
695	YES, I AGREE	
696	NO STRONG VIEWS	It's not a very busy road so never found it an issue
697	YES, I AGREE	
698	YES, I AGREE	I agree to suspend them for the trial but details regarding measures would be helpful to provide a complete answer. The spaces are well used and I regularly use them as well as walking down Station Road. I would be against measures that spoil the character of the road.
699	YES, I AGREE	Safety is paramount and this area feels very dangerous
700	NO, I DISAGREE	There is not enough parking. Suspending parking bays is very unhelpful
701	YES, I AGREE	
702	NO, I DISAGREE	
703	NO, I DISAGREE	These are very useful parking spaces - removing them will mean more illegal parking as well as further congestion in the car park
704	YES, I AGREE	
705	NO STRONG VIEWS	
706	NO STRONG VIEWS	
707	NO, I DISAGREE	Parking is already horrendous in the village and these parking bays provide short term access in a very convenient place. They also provide 'refuge' for pedestrians at busy times and cut down the speed of traffic.
708	YES, I AGREE	
709	YES, I AGREE	
710	NO, I DISAGREE	I'm not convinced the trial scheme is a good idea.

711	YES, I AGREE	I am not sure where the free parking is situated - or whether there are usually spaces available. However, as this is for a trial period, presumably any issues will be identified and discussed when the trial is complete.
712	YES, I AGREE	Station road is already quite a narrow road with car trying to pass by
713	NO, I DISAGREE	
714	YES, I AGREE	
715	YES, I AGREE	
716	YES, I AGREE	
717	YES, I AGREE	
718	YES, I AGREE	
719	YES, I AGREE	
720	NO STRONG VIEWS	
721	NO, I DISAGREE	
722	YES, I AGREE	
723	YES, I AGREE	
724	YES, I AGREE	
725	NO STRONG VIEWS	
726	NO STRONG VIEWS	
727	NO STRONG VIEWS	
728	YES, I AGREE	
729	NO STRONG VIEWS	
730	NO STRONG VIEWS	
731	YES, I AGREE	
732	YES, I AGREE	
733	YES, I AGREE	
734	NO, I DISAGREE	
735	NO, I DISAGREE	
736	YES, I AGREE	
737	YES, I AGREE	
738	YES, I AGREE	
739	NO, I DISAGREE	
740	NO, I DISAGREE	
741	YES, I AGREE	
742	NO, I DISAGREE	
743	NO, I DISAGREE	
744	YES, I AGREE	