

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Guildford Road service road, Effingham (introduce HCV and Bus waiting restriction)		(6 representations)
1	<p>I am a resident of the service road affected by the proposal to restrict waiting by HGV's and coaches.</p> <p>Over the past 20 years the access road to my neighbours and my house has seen a dramatic increase in 24/7 indiscriminate parking by HGV's, many of which are foreign.</p> <p>They park on the pavement causing damage and churning up of the grass island. The narrowness of this ancient stretch of the A246 cause residents distress in gaining access to their homes especially at night without street lighting.</p> <p>When other HGV parking lots similar to the one on the A3 near the M25 motorway are full lorries seek out alternate places to park and unfortunately our access road has become one of them.</p> <p>As more HGV's traverse our highways this problem is not going to go away but get worse.</p> <p>Therefore your proposals are supported.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>
2	<p>We live in one of the three houses in the service road that is the subject of the proposal to restrict waiting by HGV's and coaches.</p> <p>Over the 11 years that we have been resident here, there has been a serious increase in large vehicles which find it convenient (and cost-effective) to park in the narrow road that was originally part of the A246 Guildford-Leatherhead road, and now represents our means of accessing our houses. Large vehicles, often foreign, arrive at any time, but very often settle down in the evening and remain all night. The roadway is badly blocked, even if vehicles park over the pavement. The grassy area that is planted with young beech trees is often badly damaged by vehicles driving over it. Our gateways are often semi-blocked making our access difficult and dangerous.</p> <p>This access road has become a parking lot for lorries' convenience.</p> <p>We all pay top council rates, and this area is designated a Conservation area.</p> <p>We therefore strongly support your proposals.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Guildford Road service road, Effingham (introduce HCV and Bus waiting restriction) (6 representations) continued...		
3	I support the proposals.	<p>Support for the proposal noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>
4	<p>My wife and I have lived in one of the 3 houses situated in the service road referred to in your letter, for 41 years. When my family first moved there in 1974 the service road was only used for access to the houses as was the original intention when the A246 was widened.</p> <p>In the past 20 years the service road has progressively been used by an ever increasing number of HGV's, trucks of varying sizes who park in the road as a rest area day and night. More recently the road is being used as a turning point for a local bus which apart from causing further obstruction is clearly creating a highway danger when maneuvering into our service road. The parking of vehicles is often on the curb which continually causes damage. We and our neighbors are frequently frustrated trying to maneuver past these vehicles to enter or leave our properties. Security for our homes is also a concern to all the 3 houses. Many HGV's come from all over Europe and we have no idea of the background of the drivers.</p> <p>We welcome your proposal which we hope will improve matters and therefore give it our SUPPORT.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>
5	The parking of Heavy Commercial Vehicles in the lay-by beside the Guildford Road, A246 should not be permitted and I would strongly approve of the proposed changes.	<p>Support for the proposal noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Guildford Road service road, Effingham (introduce HCV and Bus waiting restriction) (6 representations) continued...		
6	<p>We live on The Grove (former site of St Theresa's school). We were previously advised by GBC to use this service road for overflow parking as GBC had restricted parking arrangements when Berkeleys submitted their proposals for developing this site.</p> <p>We welcome restrictions as outlined in your letter - HGV etc, especially as our vehicle has been damaged whilst parked there. However, we would be opposed to the prevention of any parking by local residents or any park and pay schemes as it was the council's decisions relating to this development that has led to the displacement of some parking from The Grove.</p> <p>Will the council be considering repairing the road surface and a review of lighting to the service road in the near future?</p>	<p>Support for the proposal noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Agraria Road, Guildford (changes to accommodate new development)		(1 representation)
7	<p>I would like to make the following comments regarding the changes to parking at the Farnham Road end of Agraria Road. We objected to the planning application at 67 Farnham Road on the grounds that it would lead to a loss of parking amenity and cause a dangerous road junction with Farnham Road. We were assured at the time that the development would have sufficient on-site parking and that there would be no take up of parking spaces in Agraria Road by residents of the development now known as The Carrols. I am therefore now objecting to the loss of parking at this end of Agraria Road and would like the Council's assurance that the residents of The Carrols will not be able to obtain resident parking permits on the grounds that they have sufficient on-site parking.</p>	<p>The proposals are required to accommodate the vehicular access associated with the redevelopment of 67 Farnham Road. Nevertheless, where possible we have endeavoured to provide compensatory parking nearby.</p> <p>Having an Agraria Road address, residents of the Carroll Close development will be eligible for residents and visitor parking on the same basis as other Agraria Road residents. The fact that the new dwellings have some off-street parking provision will reduce their reliance on on-street parking and eligibility for residents' permits.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Cranley Road, Guildford (changes to accommodate new development)		(1 representation)
8	<p>My observations are limited to Cranley Road.</p> <p>I support the move to replace unrestricted parking. However, would observe that rather than a single yellow line - resident parking would have the benefit of not penalising residents in the flats at that end of Cranley Road, generate an income and discourage Parkersburg using the station at London Road and local schools.</p> <p>Of course this would rely on a degree of enforcement which is not evident at present.</p>	<p>The proposals are required to accommodate the vehicular access associated with the redevelopment of 65 Cranley Road. The opportunities to provide compensatory parking nearby are limited. However, the remaining combination of unrestricted and time-limited parking bays offer residents and their visitors a flexibility. Residents of the new developments will also be able to park across their own driveways at times when the single yellow line restrictions does not operate.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Ellis Avenue, Guildford (changes to accommodate vehicle crossover)		(1 representation)
9	<p>I hope very much it will be a two car bay, not one as one would generally be used by my neighbour and it is still very convenient for visitors to hopefully find a bay empty opposite my house. I would be pleased if you would confirm how many cars will be able to park opposite.</p> <p>I was a little concerned that the exit from my left hand entrance might be hindered, but i have experimented and i think i will be able to get in and out ok.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this change at this time.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal noted. The bay proposed to compensate for the one being lost to accommodate the crossover will be slightly smaller. However, it will still be capable of accommodating two medium-sized vehicles.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Falcon Road, Guildford (changes to improve access to off-street parking)		(3 representations)
10	<p>We are formally objecting to the proposals to change ,or get rid of a parking space in our road !</p> <p>Parking in our road is of a premium , and in my opinion ,there are not enough spaces to supply the demand !!</p> <p>So , to loose a space at our end of the road , just so that 1 York rd resident can get his car into his garage ,is extremely unfair , and a total waste of council tax money .</p> <p>The garage , no matter how you approach it , is not wide enough to swing a car into, unless you are driving a super mini (i,e)a very small car . Those Marley garages (or pre-fabricated garages) are very narrow , and not your average size for today's cars .</p> <p>So , by getting rid of one space at the end of the two bay space will cause a lot of aggravation to the residents, who are not lucky enough to have a garage.</p> <p>Unless the council is willing to create one or two more parking bays in Falcon road which , in my opinion ,there is space to do so.</p> <p>I would like a meeting with the person who is in charge of parking controls at the council , and i could show them where some more spaces can be achieved .</p> <p>So, please accept this as a formal complaint (objection) to the proposal.</p> <p>Please see fit to turn down the proposal, as i do not want one person to win over the majority of paying resident permit holders in and around my road. I also don't want my council tax to rise as a result of the substantial work that would have to be taken out , and any resulting chaos/ road closure that would surely come with it !!</p>	<p>The objection to the proposal is noted.</p> <p>The proposal improves access to an existing garage. The end of the adjacent parking bay currently abuts the lowered kerb. Therefore, if vehicles overhang the parking bay, they impinge on the access to the garage.</p> <p>The adjacent parking bay currently accommodates two medium-sized vehicles, but is larger than necessary. The proposed bay will still accommodate two medium-sized vehicles, but the increased setback distance will provide greater protection for those wishing to use the garage.</p> <p>Over the years, a larger number of additional parking bays have been created in Falcon Road and the surrounding area. The proportion prioritised solely for permit holders has also been increased. The opportunities to provide further increases in space are somewhat limited.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed change is made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Falcon Road, Guildford (changes to improve access to off-street parking) (3 representations) continued...		
11	I have no problem with this specific change.	<p>No objection to the proposal is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed change is made and implemented, as advertised.</p>
12	With reference to the proposed changes to parking in Falcon Road, I would like to formally oppose these changes.	<p>The objection to the proposal is noted.</p> <p>The proposal improves access to an existing garage. The end of the adjacent parking bay currently abuts the lowered kerb. Therefore, if vehicles overhang the parking bay, they impinge on the access to the garage.</p> <p>The adjacent parking bay currently accommodates two medium-sized vehicles, but is larger than necessary. The proposed bay will still accommodate two medium-sized vehicles, but the increased setback distance will provide greater protection for those wishing to use the garage.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed change is made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Josephs Road, Guildford (changes to disabled parking facilities)		(2 representations)
13	<p>The lady at no 61 has been disabled a long time and waiting for a disabled bay outside her house; the sooner she gets it the better - get a move on!</p> <p>As to Alan's disabled parking outside his house at No 13 if he doesn't need it any longer and is happy for it to be removed - fine. But if he still needs it, it should stay as it isn't inconveniencing anybody.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal outside No.61 is noted.</p> <p>Surrey County Council have confirmed that the resident for which the disabled bay outside No.13 was provided no longer requires the facility.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes outside No.13 and elsewhere within the road are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>
14	<p>The change that affects me is the introduction of a disabled bay outside No: 61. I do not have a problem with this change.</p> <p>Parking in Josephs Road for residents without off street parking is a complete nightmare ! One of the main issues is Enterprise Car Rentals parking their vehicles in the 2 hour bays then moving them to another bay before they get a parking ticket ! On one particular day I counted 10 of their vehicles parked in these bays with no spaces for the residents or their visitors to park. Surely one or both of these bays at the end of Josephs Road could be changed to permit holders only ? Another issue is Guildford City Club. I work shifts so do come home late at night. Most spaces have been taken by visitors to the club again leaving no spaces for residents.</p> <p>If it is not possible for these bays to be changed to resident permit holders only, would it not make more sense to introduce pay and display with a maximum length of stay 2 hours ?</p>	<p>No objection to the proposal is noted.</p> <p>The reason Josephs Road is being considered within a review primarily dealing within issues outside the town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ) is because the issue relates to a disabled bay application. Consideration of more general parking issues within Josephs Road would be the topic of a review dealing with the CPZ.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes outside No.61 and elsewhere within the road are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Markenfield Road, Guildford (introduction of disabled parking facility)		(4 representations)
15	<p>In 2014, I applied for a disabled parking bay outside my home of Bethshalom, Markenfield Road, as I was disabled, and found it extremely difficult to park my car outside my home on many occasions, causing me to walk further than I was easily able to, and resulting in increased disability due to exhaustion.</p> <p>In February this year 2015, I moved to Normandy and now have adequate parking directly adjacent to my front door.</p> <p>When I knew I was going to move and would no longer needed this application to go ahead, I telephoned to cancel the application.</p> <p>Thankfully, my friend who is the continuing owner of Bethshalom, Markenfield Road, has informed me of this application to place a disabled bay in front of her home. But, although she is 80, she does not need this, and in fact it would cause her increased problems as her visitors would have even more difficulty in parking in the road, due to a further limited number of spaces then available, if this proposed change went ahead.</p> <p>So, in summary: Please do not proceed with converting a residents' bay into a disabled bay, as it is no longer needed for a disabled person.</p>	<p>The withdrawal of the application for a disabled bay is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are not progressed.</p>
16	<p>Having been a resident here for almost 10 years, I am familiar with the annual cycle of 'invitation to comment' in respect of the on-street parking situation on this road (and indeed surrounding roads in the same zone). Regrettably, I am also familiar with the lack of change - nothing has really changed at all here in the 10 years we've owned our property in Markenfield Road. The same parking issues prevail - namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Shortage of bays. ➤ I believe that permits granted to those who don't actually live on the Road, but instead live in the (non-street-facing) flats of Old School Close. (based on observing the comings and goings of those parking over the last 10 years) ➤ No protection for <u>true residents</u> of Markenfield road; nearby pubs result in our end of the road being a veritable 'dumping ground' for non-resident cars after 4pm on a daily basis. If one arrives home from work past 5pm, 	<p>The reason Markenfield Road is being considered within a review primarily dealing within issues outside the town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ) is because the issue relates to a disabled bay application. Consideration of more general parking issues within Markenfield Road would be the topic of a review dealing with the CPZ.</p> <p>Indeed, residents were given the opportunity to comment on a whole host of parking issues during the last review of the CPZ. This included the operational hours of the controls. The feedback from Markenfield Road residents, and those living in the wider area, was that there was no clear desire for change. However, previous reviews have increased both the number of spaces and their prioritisation for permit holders.</p>

	<p>there's rarely a bay to park in (and I mean the whole or Markenfield/Dapdune Roads and Nettles Terrace); people are forced to park on double yellow lines which are eagerly patrolled by your parking enforcement team as early as 0730am the following morning.</p> <p>Perennial requests/feedback to extend the parking enforcement hours to genuinely protect residents are ignored.</p> <p>The only change I can recall is that during a recent (last 4 years) re-surfacing, the number of bays across the road from our house was reduced, presumably on safety grounds? Anyway, you get my point. Things are difficult here and this latest proposal does nothing to help. I can see what you are proposing, but <u>you have not presented any facts as to WHY you are proposing this</u>. I know of no registered disabled people on this street who have an issue parking (and I'm referring to residents, not transient tenants). I also know that the blue bay proposed outside Bethshalom (which we are attached to) will be, for the most part, an empty bay, a 'cash cow' for your enforcement officers no doubt.</p> <p>My understanding is that disabled badge holder are within their rights to leave cars on double yellow lines - so to sacrifice a bay permanently makes no sense to me whatsoever. Moreover, to sacrifice a bay in the midst of other bays makes no sense - it's fair to say that many disabled drivers would generally struggle with parallel parking so even if you could justify a blue bay, then surely it should be somewhere at the end of a marked set of bays, not in the middle</p> <p>This is a view shared by my fellow neighbours, I can only hope they take the time to write and lodge an objection similar to my own.</p> <p>I note that ITEM 16, ANNEXE 3 states http://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/s22786/Item16%20Ad-HocRequestsReportANNEXE%203_FINAL.pdf</p> <p><i>Proposed locations for formalised disabled bays primarily for particular residents</i></p> <p>...I'm not sure which "particular residents" you have in mind, but you should know the following: I spoke to our neighbour who has lived @ Bethshalom for over 30 years. She told me that her <u>former</u> housemate with whom she shared Bethshalom since 1985, may have put a request to the council about a blue bay some years back (when she was suffering from ME). You should know that he is alive & well and not disabled, nor does she live on the Road anymore as she sold her share of Bethshalom and has moved away since January 2015.</p> <p>In summary, I see no logic in this proposal, nor have you presented any rationale</p>	<p>Notwithstanding, in view of the withdrawal of the application for the disabled space, officers recommend that the proposed changes are not progressed.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>for it. The facts point to it causing an increase in problems for residents, not resolving any issues for us. I really hope common sense prevails in this instance and you do not go ahead with the proposed changes.</p>	
17	<p>I wish to comment on the proposal to introduce a formalised disabled bay outside Bethshalom in Markenfield Road.</p> <p>I do not disagree with the proposal to have a disabled bay, just its positioning.</p> <p>It would surely be more sensible to place it on the other side of the road, preferably adding it to the parking bays outside 1-6 Cathedral Close, where a bay has recently been removed. A disabled bay is unlikely to be occupied all the time, if the parking bay was removed so that refuse lorries/deliveries could get access more easily.</p> <p>Parking in Markenfield Road is very difficult to find and it would be even worse if an existing space were given up.</p> <p>I hope you will take my representation into account in reaching a decision.</p>	<p>In view of the withdrawal of the application for the disabled space, officers recommend that the proposed changes are not progressed.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Markenfield Road, Guildford (introduction of disabled parking facility)		
18	<p>I'm not sure how well a disabled bay will work in a road so heavily used as Markenfield is. Human nature being what it is, if every space is filled I think someone will use the disabled bay and hope for the best. Perhaps you could create another space somewhere?</p> <p>I don't quite understand what is meant by "revise the parking in the immediate vicinity to increase its prioritisation for permit holders"?</p> <p>If we lose the two hour slots it will have a very adverse effect on permit holders, as short stays are often very useful. For example, my hairdresser calls every six weeks and park in the short stay parking places. Last week the electrician came and used them. He was only in the house for half an hour. If it were not for the short stay spaces, I would have used 9 visitor scratchcards this year – at least.</p> <p>At the moment I'm very well off for permits – my daughter has been ill and unable to visit. In a normal year, she and the family comes three times, staying from four to six days. Taken in conjunction with my son staying for a few days – this varies from year to year – for family alone in a normal year I need about 18 permits, and about three over for emergencies. This is very tight, I don't own a car, if anyone wants to visit, I can't go and collect them.</p> <p>At the meeting when permission for the flats was being discussed, the residents of Markenfield Road pointed out that the parking would be adversely affected. If I remember correctly, there were to be 44 units and 33 parking places. I'm not sure my memory is correct on that point, but what I do remember very clearly – I don't know if it was recorded – was one of the councillors saying "People like that don't have cars." Well they certainly do, and some have big ones.</p> <p>What worries me personally, is the fact that I am now in my late seventies, and I am having problems with mobility. Within the next year or so I will need a cleaner, to start with for at least an hour a week. I certainly couldn't provide 50 permits a year.</p> <p>Having two pubs and a dry cleaner at the top of the road puts extra pressure on parking places. The Stoke is very popular and sometimes at lunch time its car park fills up and overflows.</p>	<p>(4 representations) continued...</p> <p>The reason Markenfield Road is being considered within a review primarily dealing within issues outside the town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ) is because the issue relates to a disabled bay application. Consideration of more general parking issues within Markenfield Road would be the topic of a review dealing with the CPZ.</p> <p>The proposal would increase prioritisation for permit holders by increasing the number of permit only spaces. The provision of a disabled bay and conversion of some others to permit only would however reduce the availability of short-stay shared-use spaces.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, in view of the withdrawal of the application for the disabled space, officers recommend that the proposed changes are not progressed.</p>

	<p>The road is under a lot of pressure when it comes to parking. I have met people who once lived in Markenfield Road and moved because of the parking, I can quite understand it.</p> <p>The situation is not good as it is, I've got a feeling it will get worse.</p>	
--	---	--

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Pewley Hill, Guildford (changes to accommodate a new development, a vehicle crossover and improve access to existing off-street parking) (2 representations)		
19	<p>Ref: 16 Pewley Hill, GU1 3SN</p> <p>I note the new proposals for parking restrictions. My main concern is not the length of time people can park for but the fact that the parking bays outside No 16 are very close to our driveway.</p> <p>I have written about this before on grounds of safety. The reply seemed to be that we have enough room on the property to be able to turn a vehicle round and exit forwards. In reality this makes no sense because for almost all cars the position of the driver's head is halfway along the length of the vehicle and so a forward or reverse exit from our drive does not change the visibility situation. The fact that the road curves round away from us at this part of the hill makes it even more difficult to see traffic coming down.</p> <p>Often at weekends we have either vans or 4x4's parked right up to the limits of the lines which means the ends of the vehicles are often even closer to our drive. This makes it virtually impossible to see traffic approaching and is in fact an accident waiting to happen, especially at times of school traffic. Sometimes it is necessary to have someone to look out for us before proceeding but of course on many occasions there is no one available.</p> <p>Even an extra 2 or 3 feet on each side would make a lot of difference to the visibility.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal to increase the setback distance from the driveway to the adjacent parking bays is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that this proposed change and others elsewhere within the road are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>
20	<p>I am worried about the proposed changes to the parking at the top of Pewley hill road.</p> <p>I am a carer and have a low income, I can just about afford a 3 hour pottery class at Guildford adult education centre which I really enjoy. Finding a 4 hour free parking space has been wonderful. If I was unable to park I would have to give up my pottery. Parking elsewhere would add a possible £5.00 to my class.</p> <p>I hope there will be enough 4 hourly parking places for everyone.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity for me to make my views known.</p>	<p>The concern about the availability of 4-hour limited-waiting parking is noted.</p> <p>The proposals are required to accommodate the vehicular access associated with the development of 50 Pewley Hill and the creation of a new access at 54 Pewley Hill. Although there may be opportunities to provide compensatory parking nearby, there generally appears to be a surplus of parking space within the area. However, if issues do arise, a future review of the town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ) may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed changes are made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Tormead Road, Guildford (changes to improve access to off-street parking)		(4 representations)
21	<p>We wish to confirm that this entire household welcomes and fully supports the proposal in KM/16/0001 that the parking bay outside 64 Tormead Road be removed permanently and replaced by a single yellow line.</p> <p>In addition, because the awkward positioning of this bay, which is usually occupied, continues to cause gross inconvenience and obstruction for us and our visitors when entering or leaving our premises by car, we would urge the Council to give priority to its removal at the earliest possible opportunity.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed change is made and implemented, as advertised.</p>
22	<p>I am writing to fully support the proposed change to remove the parking space outside No.65 Tormead Road, and replace with a single yellow line.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed change is made and implemented, as advertised.</p>
23	<p>We would like to formally support the proposal detailed in KM/16/0001 for the removal of the parking bay directly outside our property which is currently impeding access to our neighbour's property (65 Tormead Road).</p> <p>If this proposal is approved the removal of this bay will not only greatly assist access to number 65 it will also improve traffic flow and safety during peak times.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed change is made and implemented, as advertised.</p>
24	<p>I am fully in favour of this change as it will reduce the bottleneck of traffic at the top of the road.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed change is made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Manor Road, Guildford (changes to improve access to off-street parking)		(2 representations)
25	<p>I live in Manor Road, opposite the tattoo shop.</p> <p>I totally support the proposed changes as I struggle to get on and off my driveway due to parked vehicles. Vehicles regularly park on single yellow lines and the double yellow lines at various times of the day.</p> <p>I do appreciate that people need somewhere to park in the road, and also that there is a business here too. However I feel that due to the obstructed view from the bend and that its a bus route, that the double yellow lines would be much better. Buses and HGV's regularly mount the pavement to get around the corner when vehicles are parked within this area. The pavement is also very narrow on the tattoo shop side. When the parking restrictions are not observed by motorists it causes carnage at peak hours of the day, and sometimes it's a cause for confrontation.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed change is made and implemented, as advertised.</p>
26	<p>I am in support of the proposed changes to the single/double yellow lines on manor road.</p> <p>I live almost directly opposite the proposed changes. There are regular arguments/issues on the road associated with reduced visibility because of parked cars.</p> <p>I would add that this only goes a small way to solving the issues. Cars regularly using the road as a cut through travel too fast, the current levels of parking cause issues for traffic causing jams, buses and lorries using the road cause damage to old houses through vibrations and people ignore parking restrictions.</p> <p>For us in particular it is often difficult to reverse off the drive as cars are parked on the yellow lines opposite during the day without ever getting ticketed. At weekends cars are often parked up around the corner on double yellow lines causing major issues for traffic and a hazard for pedestrians. In this example there is nothing to be done, no number to call.</p> <p>Is this change good? Yes. Would I like to see more traffic wardens and restrictions that mean less people use the road and hence less blockages? Definitely.</p>	<p>Support for the proposal is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed change is made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Send Road service road, Send (introduction of a disabled parking facility)		(1 representation)
27	<p>As a resident of Send Road, I visit the Send Parade shops every day and observe the present parking arrangements and how they are used. Most days it is possible for drivers to find a convenient place to park while they do their shopping, or eat in the cafe. Occasionally, however, every space is taken, and then drivers resort to parking on the grass verges. This is particularly the case on Saturday mornings when families fill the cafe, and some mornings when the cafe is full of workmen having breakfast. I think the cafe and shops are a great asset to the village and they all depend on having adequate car parking spaces available for their customers.</p> <p>I am not aware of any high demand for spaces for disabled drivers, and therefore write to object to setting aside a dedicated disabled bay at the expense of a "normal" bay which would not then be available for the majority of drivers. I have just returned from Ripley, where I spent some time trying to find a parking space for 10 minutes – and where the only spaces available (but not to me) were two disabled bays.</p> <p>Whilst I do not wish to make life difficult for disabled drivers, I do find it a frustration in most car parks to find so many bays that are denied to non-disabled drivers. I would suggest instead that more overall car parking spaces should be made available, and then one disabled bay would perhaps be appropriate.</p>	<p>Objection to the proposal is noted.</p> <p>The proposal was developed because of a request received, now that the Post Office has relocated to the parade. Parking Services introduces disabled bays for general use on demand, rather than to meet a 'quota' for such facilities.</p> <p>Whilst the concerns about the overall availability of space is noted, they have not been raised as an issue with Parking Service previously.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the proposed change is made and implemented, as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Tannery Lane, Send (introduction of double yellow lines to protect junction)		(1 representation)
25	<p>I am writing regarding the proposed parking restrictions at Tannery lane, Send. I have been resident in Send for 50 years.</p> <p>I have no objections to parking restrictions around the corners at this junction and on the main road but I strongly object to double yellow lines extending 20 metres down Tannery lane because;-</p> <p>1, The highway code states that 10 metres is sufficient distance away from a junction to park safely.</p> <p>2, At 20 meters and because of the limited kerb space, both my partner and I, visitors, to surrounding business and visitors to the recreation ground would end up parking further down the lane where it is considerably narrower thus causing a greater obstruction for the large vehicles that use this road, or park on the main road (where two cars I have owned have been hit) and cause more obstruction on an already busy road.</p> <p>3, All the accidents or near misses seem to be from vehicles trying to join Send road from Sandy lane or Tannery lane, so the issue seems to be badly parked cars on the main road.</p> <p>4, After the post office shut parking was greatly eased on the main road and side roads as the number of people short term parking dramatically decreased sometimes to the point where there were no parked cars at all , recently building works at the post office and Clayton house has resulted in a number of builders vans parked in the area but once these works have finished they will not be an issue.</p> <p>5, Most of the badly parked cars are visitors not residents so if this proposal goes ahead perhaps single yellow line could be considered as at least I could park near my house at night/ weekends.</p> <p>6, I believe that this course of action will result in parking issues in other places, so perhaps a parking strategy for the whole of Send with better parking facilities would be a better suggestion as demand for parking will only increase as more and more people move to the area especially if more houses are built <u>locally</u></p>	<p>Objection to the proposal is noted.</p> <p>The proposals were developed because of concerns about parking in and around the Send Road / Sandy Lane / Tannery Lane junction. The extents of the controls on the various arms of the junctions was primarily determined by Send Road's classification as an A-road. Indeed, it was this fact that influenced the location's priority and led to its progression as part of this review.</p> <p>Nevertheless, following discussions with the local county councillor, it is proposed to reduce the length of the proposed restrictions on the south-east side of Tannery Lane from around 20 metres to 12.5 metres. This will still afford sufficient, albeit lesser protection. Given the nature and geometry of the junction, the minimum distance of 10 metres is deemed insufficient to provide adequate visibility and space for queuing.</p> <p>Therefore, officers recommend that the revised proposal is made and implemented. The proposals for Send Road and Sandy Lane are to be made and implemented as advertised.</p>

ANNEXE 5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation

Locations that received no representations were:

Spiceall, Compton

Cline Road, Guildford

Aldershot Road (service road), Guildford

Barrack Road, Guildford

Manor Road, Guildford

Sandy Lane, Send

Send Road, Send

Please note that there were other locations that, individually, did not receive any specific representations, but which form part of a wider proposals that have received a number of representations.