



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE
(ELMBRIDGE)**

**WALTON PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING SCHEME:
CONSIDERATION OF FORMAL OBJECTIONS
ANNEX A – OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

7 DECEMBER 2009

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Annex should be read in conjunction with the main report.
- 1.2 This Annex contains a summary of the comments made in each objection. For each comment the Officers response has been detailed alongside.

2 ANALYSIS

- 2.1 There are 35 objections to the scheme.
- 2.2 These have been listed in the Annex by road. A summary response has been included with each objection and a recommendation on how to proceed, taking the objection and response into consideration.

3 OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1 That the proposals are implemented as advertised subject to the amendments recommended in this Annex.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

Objection no.	Location	Objection	Response	Recommendation
1	High Street	I would like to object to the proposed loading restrictions in the High Street. There are a number of retail and food outlets which will require deliveries and it is unclear how these premises are to be adequately serviced under the proposals.	There are 2 dedicated goods vehicle only loading bays, one on the High Street itself and one just off it, at the end of Churchfield Road, which are designed to primarily serve the loading/unloading needs of the northern end of the High Street, where planned environmental works will reduce the capacity for any other loading space to be available.	Implement as advertised.
2	Bowes Road	In most residential roads all restrictions have been dropped and Sidney Road only has the yellow lines around junctions now not by the humps as originally suggested. Bowes Road still has double yellow lines around each hump which given the number of them in the road means not much space for residents and visitors to park. If cars are allowed to park down our road, then that naturally slows the traffic to single lane, making the bollards and lines an unnecessary and unwanted expense. I attach the original letters and signatures from residents in the road and I ask that we end up with no lines all down the Road	The original letter referred to asked for no yellow lines except at junctions with other roads. It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.
3	Bowes Road	Please note, I have lived in Bowes Road for over twenty years and do not want to see double yellow lines down the road. When I first lived here there was not even a single white line in the middle of the road. The aesthetic appearance of the road has been ruined over the years. I see no need for yellow lines as we have	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		neither shoppers nor commuters parking in our road.		
4	Bowes Road	I have lived in Bowes Rd since 1999, over this period of time I have noticed an average of 5 trade vehicles,vans,etc parked in the road each day, serviceing the the local residents. Also numerous private cars belonging to residents living in the road. At the present Bowes Rd is busy but it flows, and very rarely is there a jam. So it works for everyone. My wife and I feel strongly against any restrictions at all, and it seems silly to fix something that is not broken (as the saying goes) Another aspect may be that residents will seek to tarmac over their front gardens to make parking places. Something which is not in accordance with Elmbridge Planning Dept.	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.
5	Bowes Road	I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the unwanted and absolutely un-required parking restrictions that are proposed for Bowes Rd in Walton-on-Thames. Further to the objections placed by myself and other residents I understand we are to have numerous unnecessary yellow lines placed all along our road in addition in addition to the un helpful traffic management system we had imposed against our wishes. There is no issue with parking on our road as we	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards. The removal or otherwise of the bollards is not a matter for consideration at this time.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		do not currently have a parking problem. With the addition of these lines the quality and character and ease of use of our road will be severely disrupted for a poorer quality of living and enjoyment of the character of our town. We do not require or want yellow lines in Bowes rd. Yellow lines in Bowes road is a waste of resources.		
6	Bowes Road	I ABSOLUETLY OBJECT to any double yellow line outside my house. As it is I have bollard and I do not want them. I need to park outside my house and this will end with me getting fines all the time. Close Bowes road off or restrict it to only to buses and residents- this would be doing a good job for the neighbourhood	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards. Closing the road or restricting its use is not a matter for consideration at this time.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.
7	Bowes Road	The proposal to add double yellow lines to the zones neighbouring the existing bollards and cushions would in effect line the majority of the road with unsightly and unnecessary double yellow lines. We think that a better proposal would be to use single yellow lines in these zones (with appropriate sign poles indicating the restricted parking time) to restrict parking during 0800hrs to 1800hrs. This scheme has been successfully adopted in other local areas such as the proximity to Walton Station, where the restricted parking applies during daytime hours but enables residents and their visitors to park on the road in the evening. Please can you recognise our concerns to the	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		current proposed scheme and take into consideration our alternative suggestion.		
8	Bowes Road	<p>I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the unwanted and absolutely unrequired parking restrictions that are proposed for Bowes Rd. I understand that we are to have numerous unnecessary yellow lines placed all along our road. There is no issue with parking on our road as we do not currently have a parking problem. With the addition of these lines the quality and character and ease of use of our road will be severely disrupted for a poorer quality of living and enjoyment of the character of our town. We do not require or want yellow lines in Bowes Rd. We do not currently have a safety or parking or car problems that need valuable council finances being wasted on. If the road needs anything it needs priority arrows as used in Cottimore Lane and Hersham (old) Road. Yellow lines in Bowes Road is a waste of resources.</p>	<p>It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.</p> <p>Installing priority arrows is not a matter for consideration at this time.</p>	<p>Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.</p>

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

<p>9</p>	<p>Bowes Road</p>	<p>We are writing this note in response to the proposed changes regarding the double yellow restrictions along Bowes Rd at Walton On Thames. We are basically against this proposal for the following reasons: 1. The monetary value of the houses along Bowes Rd will be significantly dropped. 2. We also believe that the sense of the current community's lifestyle will disappear if this proposal goes ahead. Again, we would like to keep Bowes Rd as is, i.e. a community road with unrestricted parking...</p>	<p>It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.</p>	<p>Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Bowes Road</p>	<p>As residents of Bowes Rd we object strongly to the proposal to restrict parking totally either side of all the bollarded width restrictions in Bowes Road. Such a restriction reduces the parking space available to residents and their visitors. By permitting unrestricted parking, there is a natural narrowing of the road caused by the parked vehicles, which increases traffic calming - a much needed requirement. Bowes Road is a residential road, and any proliferation of traffic signs and lines is detrimental to the visual environment. We recognise that Bowes Road is a bus route, and an access route for other residents of Walton-on-Thames, debouching onto a major road. Accordingly we have no objection to the double yellow lines at the junctions of Hershams and Sydney Roads. Similarly, double yellow lines are required at the junctions of Crutchfield Road and</p>	<p>It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards. Reduced width yellow lines are only considered for use in conservation areas.</p>	<p>Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.</p>

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		Midway, but please would you reduce the width of the stripes to half the norm? - in keeping with the neighbourhood.		
11	Bowes Road	I object to the proposals for road safety reasons: For many years Bowes Road has been misused. Since measures were put in place to 'calm' traffic and improve access in the wider area it has resulted in increased speed, hugely increased volume of vehicles. Cars and lorries wanting/needing to avoid the Halfway and railway bridge routinely speed down the road. Yellow lines and the removal of obstacles (ie parked cars) that currently require them to slow down will only exacerbate the problem. I would echo the view that the Council looks at restricting access to the road to buses and residents for at least part of the road to stop its use as a rat run. In terms of improving flow Bowes Road could be made a one way street with a 20mph speed limit, for example, and Kings Road could take the traffic flowing in the opposite direction. The decision to close Kings Road was always subject to review. Finally I want to reiterate that yellow lines will put lives at risk. Parked cars slow down (but do not stop) vehicles using the road to a safer speed. In my view road safety, particularly regarding pedestrians, certainly does not appear to be a criterion that has been considered in this case. I would ask that the Council takes into	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		account the above, the strongly and sincerely held concerns of a mother, and revises these proposals.		
12	Bowes Road	I understand that it is proposed to put parking restrictions down Bowes Road. We already have the misfortune of having a speed hump outside our house. This causes noise and inconvenience to any visitors who wish to park near our house. The idea of also having yellow lines is ridiculous and I wish to register our opposition. Please make sure this is recorded and communicated to those who make the final decision	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.
13	Bowes Road	I am writing with regard to the proposed double yellow lines near to the bollards in Bowes Road. We feel strongly that if there were to be unrestricted parking, the traffic would automatically be slowed down, without need for either the bollards or the yellow lines. Double yellow lines will make it extremely difficult for residents, visitors and tradesmen to park and are not necessary.	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

14	Bowes Road	I want to formally object to the yellow lines proposed for Bowes Road. I request specifically that the length of the yellow lines to be minimised and believe that most cyclists would be safer if encouraged to use Crutchfield lane as an alternative than creating yellow lines around the traffic calming obstructions in Bowes road where many cars currently park. The amount of yellow lines on the drawings for Bowes road will cause considerable difficulty for residents. There is a high demand for parking around the Hershams road end from the Chiropractic Clinic and Ashley medical practice, and the Homeopathic business at No3 Bowes Road. I would prefer to have no yellow lines at all in Bowes road at all.	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.
15	Bowes Road	I am writing to object to the proposed marking of yellow lines in Bowes Road. It would appear that the council deems these necessary where the bollards are situated. These bollards have always been a bone of contention anyway. They do nothing to slow the traffic, most of the time cars are speeding up to get through before the opposing cars. I've lost count of the number of times that drivers have lost exhausts, or cargo on trailers speeding over them. The main concern is that there will be no virtually no parking space left at all. Due to the present economic climate, most "adult" children are still living at home. I have three, two have cars which are necessary for work.	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		There are many people in Walton in the same situation. If we need the yellow lines because of the futile bollards, then they should go. I am not averse to yellow lines at the junctions, each end, as this would improve safety		
16	Bowes Road	I have been informed by a neighbour that there are plans to put double yellow lines down Bowes Road, which I would find very inconvenient because I do not have off street parking. Please can I register my objection to any parking restrictions being applied on either Bowes Road or Crutchfield Lane?	It appears that road safety would not be unduly compromised by not having the double yellow lines by the traffic calming humps and bollards.	Only implement double yellow lines at junctions with other roads, to improve sight lines, visibility and safety at junctions, but do not install them elsewhere.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

<p>17</p>	<p>Manor Road</p>	<p>I am a resident of Manor Road and head up the interests of the Residents Association. I note that the proposed amount of additional yellow lines in Manor Road is on a very large scale, much larger than we had anticipated. We feel that this amount of additional lining and restrictions will be disruptive because of the amount of long term parking that will be taken away from the residents. Whilst none of us would object to anything which promotes road safety (and this is a dangerous road) we feel that the additional lines are way over the top especially at the junctions of Stonebanks, Sullivans Reach, near the Swan and the junctions at Thames Street and Bridge Street and in Bridge Street itself. There are 47 properties in Manor Road with no off street parking facilities whatsoever, and if this increase of restrictive lines is put into place there will be insufficient parking places for the Residents. This will obviously cause friction with the residents to say nothing of what it will do to the Pub and Leisure Trade. I wish therefore to register my strong objection with you to the revised plans as they currently stand.</p>	<p>The yellow lines were proposed in Manor Road for safety reasons, however there is scope to take some more small sections out, without unduly compromising road safety.</p>	<p>Remove double yellow lines from opposite Sullivan's Reach spur and from opposite Bishop's Hill, except outside no. 69. Remove double yellow lines from south side of Manor Road between its junctions with Berkeley Gardens and with Thames Street.</p>
-----------	-------------------	--	---	--

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

<p>18</p>	<p>Manor Road</p>	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the introduction of yellow lines in Manor Road. Manor Road has never had a problem with parking and the yellow lines will only make the problem worse. Although the yellow lines on both sides of the road at various junctions could provide better visibility, it will also make the road more dangerous. Manor Road is used as a 'rat run' during rush hour but most cars are forced to drive carefully because of cars parked on one or both sides of the road. Introducing yellow lines will make driving easier and therefore faster, which will increase the danger, especially to pedestrians. Furthermore there are 3 pubs in Manor Road and even when the pubs are busy, the road can cope with the volume of traffic and still allow parking for residents. The yellow lines will cut the number of spaces available. I have never had parking issues in Manor Road and wish the road to remain free of restrictions.</p>	<p>The yellow lines were proposed in Manor Road for safety reasons, however there is scope to take some more small sections out, without unduly compromising road safety.</p>	<p>Remove double yellow lines from opposite Sullivan's Reach spur and from opposite Bishop's Hill, except outside no. 69. Remove double yellow lines from south side of Manor Road between its junctions with Berkeley Gardens and with Thames Street.</p>
-----------	-------------------	--	---	--

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

19	Manor Road	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the introduction of yellow lines in Manor Road. Manor Road has never had a problem with parking and the yellow lines will only make the problem worse. Although the yellow lines on both sides of the road at various junctions could provide better visibility, it will also make the road more dangerous. Manor Road is used as a 'rat run' during rush hour but most cars are forced to drive carefully because of cars parked on one or both sides of the road. Introducing yellow lines will make driving easier and therefore faster, which will increase the danger, especially to pedestrians. Furthermore there are 3 pubs in Manor Road and even when the pubs are busy, the road can cope with the volume of traffic and still allow parking for residents. The yellow lines will cut the number of spaces available. I have never had parking issues in Manor Road and wish the road to remain free of restrictions.</p>	<p>The yellow lines were proposed in Manor Road for safety reasons, however there is scope to take some more small sections out, without unduly compromising road safety.</p>	<p>Remove double yellow lines from opposite Sullivan's Reach spur and from opposite Bishop's Hill, except outside no. 69. Remove double yellow lines from south side of Manor Road between its junctions with Berkeley Gardens and with Thames Street.</p>
----	------------	--	---	--

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

<p>20</p>	<p>Bridge Street</p>	<p>A number of areas where parking is currently uncontrolled are being turned into short term controlled parking, which reduces the spaces versatility, as it can no longer be used by residents or shop workers to park all day, but only by shoppers for a short while. This will remove about 85 long term spaces and replace them with short term ones. This will increase the difficulties faced by shop workers looking for somewhere affordable to park and reduce the stock of spaces available to residents. This element of the scheme should be dropped. When the scheme was considered by the Local Committee in September, it was resolved that "parking controls are progressed as consulted only in those roads where responses indicate that a majority of residents are in favour". The results for Stompond Lane, Bridge Street and Ashley Road showed more "other" responses than "support scheme" responses. In addition a petition was presented to the committee in September with 16 signatories from 11 dwellings in Bridge Street, and it is clear that all these people were opposed to changes to parking restrictions in Bridge Street. Taking all this into account, I cannot see how the changes for any of the above three roads can be legitimately progressed.</p>	<p>The introduction of limited waiting parking bays was designed to a turnover of vehicles parking and using the local shops.</p>	<p>Do not implement the limited waiting bay on the southern side of Bridge Street between its junction with Hepworth Way and Manor Road or the limited waiting bays outside Orchard Court but leave those stretches of road unrestricted.</p>
-----------	----------------------	---	---	---

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

21	Bridge Street	<p>Within the part of Bridge Street between its junction with Hepworth Way and Manor Road, some of the residents have no off street parking and parking is already restricted on street because of the traffic signals. The proposal is to leave one side of the road unrestricted and put in 2 hour limited waiting bays on the other side of the road. This will make life difficult, particularly at weekends, as residents currently park on both sides of the road, and to take away so much of the only unrestricted facility seems grossly unreasonable. Currently there is, more often than not, space available for residents on one side or the other of this stretch of road, which will no longer be the case if the limited waiting bays are introduced.</p>	<p>The introduction of limited waiting parking bays was designed to a turnover of vehicles parking and using the local shops.</p>	<p>Do not implement the limited waiting bay on the southern side of Bridge Street between its junction with Hepworth Way and Manor Road or the limited waiting bays outside Orchard Court but leave those stretches of road unrestricted.</p>
22	Bridge Street	<p>The proposed Bridge Street scheme will be unworkable for residents and crippling for those of us living in flats where there is no designated parking who need to park on street during the week. The time limited parking bays on Bridge Street, along with the introduction of yellow lines in the surrounding area will mean many people will not be able to park within walking distance of their homes. On street parking in Bridge Street and the surrounding areas does not cause any inconvenience, and there are no safety issues on Bridge Street. At the moment there are no problems for residents at weekends, but the introduction of the proposed scheme</p>	<p>The introduction of limited waiting parking bays was designed to a turnover of vehicles parking and using the local shops.</p>	<p>Do not implement the limited waiting bay on the southern side of Bridge Street between its junction with Hepworth Way and Manor Road or the limited waiting bays outside Orchard Court but leave those stretches of road unrestricted.</p>

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		on Saturday and Sunday will be a nightmare and completely unworkable. The introduction of residents permits in Bridge Street, combined with the short stay parking would work. The council has to be realistic about the number of cars on street and the number of residents per dwelling. Orchard Court has no designated parking for its flats. I object to this scheme as it stands because it gives no solution to the residents who are car owners but will not be able to park for more than one hour in the street where they live, and have no where else to park.		
23	Bridge Street	As a resident of Bridge Street I object strongly to the introduction of short term parking restrictions. I have no opportunity for off street parking and the introduction of restrictions will make it very difficult for me to park. Bridge Street should be left as unrestricted as it is now.	The introduction of limited waiting parking bays was designed to a turnover of vehicles parking and using the local shops.	Do not implement the limited waiting bay on the southern side of Bridge Street between its junction with Hepworth Way and Manor Road or the limited waiting bays outside Orchard Court but leave those stretches of road unrestricted.
24	Esher Avenue	As a frequent visitor to one of the houses at the end of the cul-de-sac in Esher Avenue I cannot see the logic of putting no parking lines around this end of Esher Avenue as it is not a through route and therefore will not affect the movement of traffic through the area. I consider restricting parking here will result in cars parking elsewhere in Esher Avenue which is more likely to affect traffic flow. I object to this part of the proposal and request it be reconsidered.	The double yellow lines were left in the cul-de-sac in order to assist one of the residents exiting his drive. However it is not necessary to have yellow lines in the whole of the cul-de-sac to serve this purpose.	Do not implement the double yellow lines except across the end of the cul-de-sac and for a length of 5 metres from the end wall in front of no. 28 in order to maintain a turning circle.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

25	Esher Avenue	I wish to object to the proposal to prohibit waiting in the cul-de-sac end of Esher Avenue. I have no objection to limiting waiting on the junctions in Esher Avenue, I regard the prohibition at the end of the cul-de-sac as completely unnecessary. It will mean more cars having to park in other parts of Esher Avenue, so increasing congestion there and adversely affecting traffic flow. I would appreciate a cancellation of this proposal.	The double yellow lines were left in the cul-de-sac in order to assist one of the residents exiting his drive. However it is not necessary to have yellow lines in the whole of the cul-de-sac to serve this purpose.	Do not implement the double yellow lines except across the end of the cul-de-sac and for a length of 5 metres from the end wall in front of no. 28 in order to maintain a turning circle.
26	Esher Avenue	I am writing to express my horror at the proposed plans to add double yellow lines to the cul-de-sac area of Esher Avenue. There are no parking issues in this bit of road, except sometimes during church services. I fully support the double yellow lines at the junction in Esher Avenue, but yellow lines are not needed in the cul-de-sac.	The double yellow lines were left in the cul-de-sac in order to assist one of the residents exiting his drive. However it is not necessary to have yellow lines in the whole of the cul-de-sac to serve this purpose.	Do not implement the double yellow lines except across the end of the cul-de-sac and for a length of 5 metres from the end wall in front of no. 28 in order to maintain a turning circle.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

27	Stompond Lane	<p>I am extremely concerned that much of the south side of Stompond Lane between its junctions with The Links and Ashley Road will only have a waiting restriction from Monday to Friday between 9am and 5pm. This stretch of road is not wide enough to allow waiting at any time and there can be no practical scope for easing the double yellow line restrictions currently in force on both sides of the road.</p> <p>I am extremely concerned that no consideration appears to have been given to the likely effects of the proposals on roads such as The Links. If all day parking is prohibited on Stompond Lane it will migrate to unrestricted roads, such as The Links. Some form of protection is needed to guard against this and the potential disruption it will cause.</p>	<p>Some residents originally requested some form of permit parking in this section of Stompond Lane. Although this did not have wide support it was felt that a part time waiting restriction (from 10am - 11am on Monday to Saturday) could be applied in part of the road to deter commuter parking and so make the road more accessible to residents.</p> <p>There is always the possibility of migration of parking if new restrictions are introduced, which is why parking controls and restrictions are kept under review.</p>	<p>Reduce the length of the part time waiting restriction so it starts at the boundary of nos. 7 and 9 and so is further from the bend in the road. Otherwise implement as advertised.</p>
28	Red House Lane	<p>Objection to the restrictions on the issue of residents permits - the restriction is arbitrary and does not take account of the wishes of residents, the nature of the road and the fact that the parking problems are caused by non-residents. Letter/ petition signed by occupants from 15 of the 17 houses in Red House Lane, requiring unconditional right to purchase at least one resident's parking permit, regardless of off street parking spaces. Otherwise most residents will not be able to park in their own road, which would be absurd, and many residents would find themselves significantly constrained and</p>	<p>The permit allocation for Red House Lane is the standard county allocation. The restrictions on the numbers of residents permits and visitors permits was made clear at the time of the public exhibitions of the original proposals in the summer.</p>	<p>Do not proceed with the residents permit scheme in Red House Lane. Do not implement the residents permit bay and change the dual use bay to limited waiting only. Implement the single yellow line (8am to 6pm) restriction as advertised.</p>

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		in a worse position than at present.		
29	Red House Lane	<p>I am writing out of concern that we will not be permitted to buy a resident's permit for our road. We regularly have groups of visitors and often put our car in the road so that they can park in the drive. If we cannot do this the 30 visitors permits available to us would soon be used up. Visitors will then have to park in Hersham or Ashley Road. I would rather it was a free for all as it is now, at least we would have the road for visitors at weekends. Could Sundays be unrestricted at least? I feel that you are favouring the dentist and the shoppers at the expense of the residents. Perhaps the shared use bays could be for residents only at the weekends, so we have somewhere for our guests at weekends. We went to the trouble and expense of converting our garden into parking for family cars and are now being penalised for doing this because we have off street parking. Please think again about these restrictions. The main problem is pavement parking. If that can be stopped,</p>	<p>The permit allocation for Red House Lane is the standard county allocation. The restrictions on the numbers of residents permits and visitors permits was made clear at the time of the public exhibitions of the original proposals in the summer.</p> <p>In order to help deter parking on the pavement, the daytime restriction should be implemented.</p>	<p>Do not proceed with the residents permit scheme in Red House Lane. Do not implement the residents permit bay and change the dual use bay to limited waiting only. Implement the single yellow line (8am to 6pm) restriction as advertised.</p>

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		it would be much better. I would rather opt out and go for a free for all.		
30	Red House Lane	<p>1. My house is on the apex of the bend in the road. Opposite there are often cars parked on or near the apex, reducing the road to a single carriageway, and seriously obscuring the view of the road as cars coming the other way. This presents a safety hazard, particularly when turning in to my driveway, so the proposed restriction should be extended to 24 hours covering the bend in the road.</p> <p>2. Crossovers to houses on the south side should have H-bars to allow use by residents and stop other drivers parking there. If this was introduced the south side parking bays could be extended to include house 1A and maybe 1. 3.</p> <p>Consequentially to this use of H-bars, the current drafting states that we would need to display a permit to confirm the car belongs to a resident, but it also states</p>	<p>The permit allocation for Red House Lane is the standard county allocation. The restrictions on the numbers of residents permits and visitors permits was made clear at the time of the public exhibitions of the original proposals in the summer.</p> <p>It is not possible to increase restrictions at this stage, the request to have a 24 hour restriction on the apex of the bend can be considered in the next review.</p>	<p>Do not proceed with the residents permit scheme in Red House Lane. Do not implement the residents permit bay and change the dual use bay to limited waiting only. Implement the single yellow line (8am to 6pm) restriction as advertised.</p>

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		that we cannot have a permit because we have off street parking. Can this be resolved? I have discussed these points with my immediate neighbours. They agree and are joint signatories. [Letter signed by 3 residents]		
31	Crutchfield Lane	Please can I record my objection to the addition of double yellow lines on the part of Crutchfield Lane which joins to Bowes Road. This is immediately outside the front of my house and is where I park.	The yellow lines are a road safety feature to improve sightlines, and do not cover the whole part of this road.	Implement as advertised.
32	Bridge Street	With regard to the new parking spaces outside 45 Bridge Street, the house at this address is immediately adjacent to the side of the road and about a metre below street level. A car parking in the proposed new bay would be outside the living room window and so would block light and take away privacy. Also a car parking outside the front door would impede access to the house when people are getting in or out of the car. It is for these reasons that we object strongly to the proposed parking spaces.	These were limited waiting parking bays.	Do not implement new bays but leave existing restriction.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

33	Winchester Road	I live in Winchester Road, where there is not presently a parking problem. The proposed scheme will create great parking difficulties in Winchester Road. If it were to be implemented I would undoubtedly find it difficult to park reasonably near my house because of vehicles unable to find space in alternative areas of controlled parking. Please do not go ahead with the scheme.	The proposed scheme has been significantly reduced from the original proposal, and so the impacts on unrestricted roads should be reduced. There is however the possibility of migration of parking if new restrictions are introduced, which is why parking controls and restrictions are kept under review.	Implement scheme as recommended in this report.
34	Manor Road	Recently controlled parking in Manor Road was shelved. This was a sensible move. I was furious at the proposal to start putting further yellow lines in the road. It will make an already tight situation considerable worse and to put these restrictions in on the grounds of road safety is a preposterous expedient. Which world do these planners live in? There have been no serious accidents that I am aware of in the 29 years I have lived here so why change things now? It would be so refreshing if the council planners could try and make residents' lives a little easier for once in a while rather than impose these authoritarian regulations to pressurise us into towing the council line. At the beginning of Bishops Hill there is a bay with five parking spaces at present reserved for the adjoining Day Centre. The Centre already has its own car park. The Bishops Hill parking bay would provide six parking spaces for the public. But I suppose that would be too much to ask!	A considerable amount of the proposals for Manor Road have been discarded. It may be possible to investigate converting the bay in Bishop's Hill to public parking, but it will depend on the status of the land.	Implement scheme as recommended in this report.

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

35	Betley Court	The slip road in front of Betley Court is private land.	This is being investigated by the county council's Highways Information Team	If the slip road is on private land, leave it out of the proposed scheme. If it is part of the highway, implement as advertised.
----	--------------	---	--	--