

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
1	JTW Martin Beechfield, 54 Warren Road, Guildford, GU1 2HH	In total agreement with the proposals for the junction of Warren Road Tangier Road. The sooner the better.	
2	W John Wortt 23 Rosetrees, Guildford, GU1 2HS	Objects to the extensions of the Controlled Parking Zone and considers parking should be improved in the town and parking charges reduced. The only thing of merit is junction protection at junction of Warren Road / Tangier Road, but would prefer nothing at all to avoid other restrictions.	Most of the parking in this area comes from outside the town centre.
4	Mr Brown 10 Tormead Road, Guildford, GU1 2JA	Wants bay opposite driveway (o/s No 9) removed to facilitate easier reversing onto highway in both directions.	Officers have visited the site and are proposing to reduce the bay slightly in size. The width of the road and the number of driveways make it difficult to position bays without some impact but access and egress is possible.
5	John Rule 29 Warren Road, Guildford,	Considers parked cars will block his sight lines. Would like restrictions placed to restrict parking to 2 car lengths of his drive.	Warren Road is not currently included in the proposals but can be considered during the next review.
6	Tim J Lux Morston, 11a St Omer Road, Guildford	Cars parking opposite and to the side of the driveway exits often make it difficult to manoeuvre in and out. Strongly objects to St Omer Road not being included in the CPZ proposals and objects to the proposed double yellow lines around the bend as these will push cars closer to the driveways. Would like to see the double yellow line extended across the driveway.	St. Omer Road was not in favour of restrictions but these problems can be considered in the next review.
7	Mr & Mrs MJM Bennett 34 Tormead Road, Guildford, GU1 2JB	<p>We object to restrictions of single yellow lines in Tormead Road on the grounds that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It restricts any parking (apart from the very few bays you will put in) for what amounts to a commuter problem that only needs to be monitored for a couple of hours a day at most. 2. It is ridiculous and completely unnecessary to have any restrictive parking on a Saturday 3. Having yellow lines and minimum parking bays will encourage speeding vehicles which are already a problem in the road. <p>One solution to the problem would be to have restricted parking for a period of time during the day which would prevent commuters parking.</p>	There are around 17 parking bays in Tormead Road which from observation exceeds the current demand from residents. The bays stop people parking in places which would obstruct driveways or cause potential danger.

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
3	David Darnell 56 Tormead Road, Guildford, GU1 2JB	<p>Objects to the application of an order as applied to Tormead Road but the grounds for objection refer to roads elsewhere within both the existing and proposed extension to the CPZ. The grounds for objection are</p> <p>1. No current parking problems Throughout the majority of weekdays there is, at present, not a parking problem along Tormead Road and there is definitely no problem on Saturdays. There is currently a safety issue at the junction with Cranley Road due to the existing double yellow lines not extending sufficiently to allow cars to enter Tormead Road unimpeded and have sufficient forward visibility to pass parked cars safely This was obviously not considered when the yellow lines were initially implemented. During school terms there are also problems caused by cars dropping off and collecting pupils stopping and parking inconsiderately and illegally. It is unlikely that the implementation of the CPZ will alter this as there is presently no enforcement and regularly cars and coaches are parked on double yellow lines, across driveways and even double banked. Outside school terms there is no problem whatsoever.</p> <p>No proposals are forthcoming on how to manage the school traffic. GBC Parking Strategy states "Controlled Parking Zones are used where demand regularly exceeds the supply and controls are needed to manage the use of space". In respect of Tormead Road demand does not currently exceed supply and controls are therefore not required based on the present situation.</p> <p>2. Disbenefits to Residents The reason for the CPZ review was due to parking issues along Aldersey Road, Hillier Road and Pitt Farm Road as a consequence of the previous extension of the CPZ. According to a survey undertaken by GBC, to which a considerable response was received, many of these parkers are "employees at London Square, DEFRA and teachers/sixth form pupils at the schools". Whilst the extension of the CPZ may address the issues raised by residents of these roads it will impose constraints upon the residents of Tormead Road which were not previously experienced. The Guildford Parking Strategy states that the aim of introducing a CPZ is "to Control the supply and demand for space and provide parking for residents and visitors". There is currently no demand for space along Tormead Road and they have even acknowledged that the introduction of parking restrictions will make parking for residents and visitors to many properties inconvenient and, I will add, probably impossible. In fact commuters could take up the proposed bays for the entire day, either in the long stay bays or by moving from one 4-hour bay to another at different locations. Therefore contrary to one of the aims and objectives of the GBC Parking Strategy, the introduction of the CPZ will actually impact on the ability of Tormead Road Residents to park. The extension will therefore be a disbenefit to many residents along the road.</p>	<p>When asked in March 2005, around 90% of the residents who responded believed there was a parking problem in Tormead Road and 77% want to be included in an extension to the CPZ. A separate and detailed consultation was conducted with the residents of Tormead Road. The current proposal is based on the feedback from residents of the road.</p> <p>1. One of the main issues at present the parking at the Cranley Road end particularly at school pick up and drop off times. With the extension of controls elsewhere the problem is likely to spread further into the road. While the problems are not as great outside the working week Tormead Road is a through road and parked cars parked on the road make the traffic single lane. There is parking at weekends on the right-angled bend. Vehicles either park on the road and cause a potential hazard or on the grass verge/pavement and reduce the width for pedestrians. The introduction of parking restrictions will prevent people parking where an obstruction or danger could be caused.</p> <p>2. The strategy does not say the aim of a CPZ is to control the supply and demand for space and provide parking for residents and visitors. One of the aims of the strategy is to control the supply and demand for space and provide parking for residents. This can be done using controls within a CPZ. Any control that stops people parking in certain areas will by definition restrict them. Under the proposals there is parking for around 17 cars in Tormead Road and observation shows that parking by residents does not exceed this.</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
3	(continued)	<p>3. Loss of Amenity As a consequence of the introduction of the CPZ parking constraints, residents will be forced to pave over their front gardens not only for their own cars but also to accommodate their visitors. This is already occurring to some degree along the road and will not only destroy the avenue effect of the road but also, in times of heavy rain fall increased run off is likely to surcharge the sewers.</p> <p>4. Unnecessary Restrictions GBC officers acknowledge that the parking issues are caused by commuters from employees/students at DEFRA, London Square and the schools i.e. during the weekdays only. It is evident therefore that no parking problems will exist on Saturdays and in actual fact there is currently spare capacity within the existing CPZ areas for all day parking so there is consequently no demand. It therefore seems unreasonable to impose unnecessary parking constraints upon Tormead Road residents and visitors on Saturdays. The explanation that the relaxation of controls along Tormead Road which is away from the town centre confuses motorists and leads to more tickets being issued is illogical. The reference to confusing motorists also seems to contradict the aim of the CPZ which is “ to control the supply and demand for space and provide parking for residents and visitors and discourage other parkers. There are already variations within the existing CPZ – 2 hour parking, unrestricted parking, single yellow lines, double yellow lines and 4 hour parking is to be introduced. The Cranley Road Tormead Road is a significant junction could be a point where controls change. As a ratepayer I also object to the unnecessary cost of policing this area on Saturdays and, if not policed, then what is the use of the restriction. Clause 3.4.1 of the GBC parking strategy states “Controlled parking zones cover areas where all roads are subject to restriction during busy times of the day” Saturday is not a busy day down Tormead Road but residents do have visitors. Parking is not an issue on Saturdays along Cranley Road let alone Tormead Road and therefore the implementation of Saturday restrictions is contrary to the philosophy of the GBC Parking Strategy.</p> <p>5. Alternative Solutions There is no indication that alternative solutions to the parking problem have been investigated. One of the strategic priorities of the local plan is to “Reduce the demand for travel by car”. DEFRA and a number of the employers at London Square are government organisations. The Council must, under sustainable transport policies put pressure on these organisations to comply with Local Plan strategies for Green Travel Plans. The proposed extension of the CPZ is consequently a “quick fix” and does not address or promote the Local Plan objectives of reducing demand for travel to work by car.</p>	<p>3. Residents always have this choice. There are approximately 17 parking spaces in Tormead Road and this exceeds the likely demand from residents.</p> <p>4. A controlled parking zone uses entry signs to indicate when controls within the zone apply on single yellow lines. The entry signs are the only chance a motorist has to establish when these controls apply. The confusion will occur when a motorist crosses from a zone with lesser controls into one with greater controls unless the motorist is aware of he/she is entering a new zone. If only Tormead Road is excluded from restrictions on Saturdays then there is still potential for confusion as it would be the only road in the area with totally different restrictions. To achieve this each stretch of yellow line would need to be separately signed. Again with regard to the parking strategy the CPZ generally is busy on a Saturday. Saturdays have been raised as an issue in a number of representations and it is recommended that the issue is re-considered when the scheme is reviewed.</p> <p>5. A number of alternative proposals have been considered for Tormead Road. The alternative suggested by Mr Darnell of a single yellow line operating for an hour in the morning and an hour in the afternoon would not offer any control over people parking across driveways or other sensitive places at times the restrictions did not apply.</p>
8	Eric McCurdy 68 Tormead Road, Guildford, GU12JB	Supports the proposals but requests an increased setback distance of the bay to the right of their driveway to improve visibility.	Officers have visited the location and the bay can be shortened by 1.8m without reducing the number of cars that can park. Minor amendment proposed on the plans.

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
9	Dr EE & Mr AOH Blair 27 Tormead Road, Guildford, GU1 2JA	<p>Could I ask again for protection for the 4 fine fir trees at the entrance to the cul de sac. They are a feature of the area and if as is likely a wide van is parked underneath, tall lorries such as recycling vehicles cannot get through without damaging the trees. I can see no reason why we should provide all day parking bay for strangers in our cul de sac. On the revised plan I see a proposed crossover just about where the trees are – we do hope that this means there will be no parking under the trees. We would prefer the proposed area of long stay parking at the entrance to the cul de sac to be limited to 2 or 4 hours. This would help provide parking for essential carers, workmen etc.</p>	<p>The plans for Tormead Road have been widely discussed and while it is not possible to accommodate everyone's needs they do strike a balance. The crossover is a proposed new entrance to a property.</p>
10	Anna Lebbell Flat 5, 26 Cranley Road, Guildford, GU1 2JS	<p>I cannot understand why Monday to Saturday restrictions are needed as the area is not used for parking of people visiting the town centre. The only cars parked along the road on a Saturday are residents. The amount of cars parked along this road would not be diminished with the introduction of parking restrictions.</p> <p>I also object to the 2 parking permits per household. I have two other housemates. All three of us own cars and need to drive to work. We feel that the restriction on two permits per household would be a large problem. There are going to be areas marked opposite our flat which are going to be unlimited time but there are so many residents in the flats these will be highly competitive spaces</p> <p>I think more of a problem along Cranley Road are the areas surrounding the schools. In the morning the road can be quite impassable. This is the most congested and problematic time when parking restrictions would be helpful.</p>	<p>The question of Saturday controls is addressed in the main body of the report. The scheme provides unrestricted parking bays which can be used by people without permits.</p>
11	Mr R Stone 35 Tormead Road, Guildford, GU1 2JA	<p>I support the main proposals. We desperately need some controls in the road. I need DYLS introduced opposite our driveway between Nos21-23 because there are constant problems with parked cars which force us on to the wrong side of the road preventing sufficient turning room.</p>	<p>The area has been surveyed and such restrictions are not considered necessary.</p>
12	Quentin Reynolds Two Beeches, Pit Farm Road, Guildford	<p>There is no need to introduce these limited parking conditions, as DEFRA will soon close and the hotel will redevelop. The restrictions reduce flexibility for residents and their visitors, and the removal of parked vehicles is likely to increase vehicle speeds.</p>	<p>There is no indication that there are any plans to vacate the DEFRA site.</p>
13	Jon & Mary Korndorffer 32 Tormead Road, Guildford, GU1 2JB	<p>I am writing to object to the proposals as they now stand. I am concerned that I shall not be able to reverse safely eastwards out of my drive and summarily entering my drive from the east will be difficult. The position of the parking space on the south side outside 39 and 41 makes these manoeuvres risky. Indeed parking at that position in the past has resulted in minor accidents. I propose that this parking area is moved to the north side between 30 and 32. .</p>	<p>The spaces were originally situated on the north side and moved to the south side, as a result of comments received during the informal consultation. The way the scheme works will be reviewed once in operation</p>
14	Colin Davies 17 Hawthorn Rise, Hook, Hampshire, RG27 9RG	<p>Objects to the proposed restrictions for the London Road, next to Stoke Park. Whilst residents in neighbouring roads may suffer from individuals parking and walking into the town, I can see no advantage to anyone, except perhaps the council's multi storey car park takings, of restrictions in London Road. Any extension to this area will also restrict the amount of time individuals can spend in the park. Allowing parking along London Road also encourages people working in the town not to bring their cars in to an already heavily congested town centre. I would add also that while the council runs an excellent park and ride scheme, this does cover the top end of town.</p>	<p>Only a short length of parking on London Road is restricted and this is designed to maintain greater access to the park. The majority of the length is unrestricted.</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
15	Steve Haywood 15 Avonmore Avenue, Guildford	Objects to the double yellow line outside his property, as this is unnecessary and restricts his ability to park outside 24 hours a day every day. Needs to be able to park across his drive outside controlled hours as events in Stoke Park on Sundays will fill all available space. There is also a need for elderly relatives and visitors to park close. Other cul de sacs do not have double yellow lines and the approach is inconsistent.	The cul de sac unlike others in the area does not have a turning head to allow vehicles to turn easily in the road. .
16	Mrs Christine M Gear van Tricht Southwind, Khartoum Road, Witley, Godalming, GU8 5RB	As a teacher at Tormead School it is getting more difficult to get to work particularly with restricted parking on site. The restrictions will make it harder could teachers from the school be issued with special passes?	The scheme includes 4 hour limited waiting and unrestricted parking bays which can be used to park. The volume of parking by non-residents is causing problems. The scheme is designed to control this parking and it is not possible to issue permits to workers or groups of workers.
17	Caroline Warren Rosia, Ricksons Lane, West Horsley, KT 24 6HU	It is with some annoyance that I write this letter. Currently I am employed by Tormead school and we have recently been informed that the parking on the roads outside the school will be severely curtailed. So much so that I will be unable to park near the school. Along with many members of staff we need to carry books back and forth from home to school as we do marking and preparation in the evenings. This makes it essential to park reasonably close to the school, because of carrying heavy briefcases. In addition to this I think it is not safe for the predominantly female staff to be walking distances in the dark. The new parking scheme seems to be motivated by pressure rather than reason. Could there be some consideration given to staff at the school and parking permits provided for them? There is insufficient parking on site and we are told the planners will not permit any further parking spaces.	The scheme includes 4 hour limited waiting and unrestricted parking bays which can be used to park. The volume of parking by non-residents is causing problems. The scheme is designed to control this parking and it is not possible to issue permits to workers or groups of workers without the problem returning.
18	Julian Knopf 3 Fielders Green, Guildford, GU1 2JY	I am a resident of Fielders Green and I am very much aware that as a result of the current proposals there will be considerable pressure from parties in the vicinity for access to unrestricted parking bays. This is a particularly acute problem during term time for the schools. It is therefore my considered opinion and recommendation that the designated parking bays in Fielders Green be kept as unrestricted bays and not restricted to 4 hours as per the proposal. Such an arrangement will allow at least two vehicles to be parked for the entire school day without infringement of the proposed restrictions.	Spaces were originally on unrestricted and converted to 4-Hr LW, as a result of comments received during the informal consultation, in order to prioritise for residents and visitors.
19	Heather & Graham Bird 55 Tormead Road, Guildford, GU1 2JB	We are concerned that the operation of the single yellow lines in Tormead Road from 8.30 will not deal with the serious congestion problems that occur at Cranley Road end on weekday mornings during the Tormead school term from about 8.00. At this time cars are parked all along one side of the road and traffic going both ways meets head on. Often the only way that cars can pass is to mount the grass verge and as the weather worsens this will get very churned up. The proposed extension of the double yellow lines is likely to push the parking further back into Tormead Road and round the corner opposite No 57. This will exacerbate the problem, as it will not be possible to see what vehicles have already started along the stretch of road that is rendered only wide enough for traffic to move in one direction. If the restrictions could start at 7.30 we wonder if this would help keep the traffic moving.	This is an issue that can be reviewed once the scheme has been operating.

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
20	Mrs CA Carter 14 Durnsford Way, Cranleigh, Guildford, GU6 7LN	I write to object to the proposed extension of the controlled parking zone. I have worked at Tormead School for sixteen years. As there is insufficient parking on site, many staff park in the roads surrounding the school. This has always been the practice. If the proposed restrictions come into force they will create insurmountable problems for many employees. Most staff have heavy books and equipment to carry to and from school. It is not feasible for us to park and walk miles to school. Public transport is not an option. The school has been in Cranley Road for 100 years and I feel special consideration for the staff is needed. This is only the case during term time. I suggest parking permits are allocated to allow staff especially teachers to park all day in the bays.	The scheme includes 4 hour limited waiting and unrestricted parking bays which can be used to park. The volume of parking by non-residents is causing problems. The scheme is designed to control this parking and it is not possible to issue permits to workers or groups of workers without the problem returning.
21	KW Edwards Copperwood, 8a The Ridgeway, Guildford, GU1 2DG	The Ridgeway is a private road not affected by the proposals but over the past year due to extensive building work at No 31 Tangier Road and up to the junction with Warren Road this section of the road during working hours has been congested with cars and lorries. This has caused exiting from the Ridgeway to be very hazardous, as one does not have clear sight line due to all these parked vehicles. I request that serious consideration is given to the installation of double yellow lines either side of the exit from The Ridgeway similar to those proposed at other junctions. With the poor visibility and the reckless speeds that cars and lorries drive up and down Tangier Road a serious accident is likely to happen even when the building work is completed as the parking space will be occupied by residents of the new houses.	The Ridgeway is a private road and the area is not within the proposed extension. Vehicles parking dangerously can be dealt with by the Police. If further restrictions are needed this issue can be considered in a future review.
22	John Cummings Chairman of CRARA Bandol, Cranley Road, Guildford, GU1 2JS	I am writing on behalf of our Committee and with the support of a large number of residents regarding the proposed extension of the CPZ to the Cranley Road area. While we are very much in favour of extending the parking restrictions to this area and welcome the efforts of officers to bring this speedily to fruition, there are three matters of particular concern which we believe need to be addressed before the extension is sanctioned. Bearing in mind the primary objective of the scheme as set out in the Order, we would ask to make the following requirements. We hope these can be treated as minor alterations but even if they can not, and six weeks delay is inevitable, this would be a small matter compared with the need to get the scheme right and in line with residents' wishes. The three concerns are: 1. To reverse the long term and short term bays in Aldersey, Hillier and Pit Farm Roads so that the schools can benefit from the short term bays at the start and end times and not be cluttered by all day office parking, especially from SCC and other offices in London Square. At present the scheme appears to have been devised as an extended car park for London Square – ironic as their off street parking was deliberately restricted to encourage use of public transport. 2. To avoid parking bays opposite each other as scheduled for Cranley Close and the Eastern North/South section of Cranley Road. There seems no good reason for these to be singled out for potentially dangerous and inconvenient congestion. 3. To limit the restrictions at least as far as the bays are concerned to weekdays i.e. Monday to Friday. To have bays restricted at weekends is quite unnecessary and would be highly inconvenient for residents and contrary to the stated objectives of the scheme.	Any significant change to the scheme is likely to cause a significant delay much longer than six weeks. 1. There are 4-hour bays close to the school on Cranley Road and in Tormead Road. There are a large number of representations from teachers requiring unrestricted parking need to the schools. The introduction of controls is likely to free up more kerbside space for picking up and dropping off children. The design has the four-hour limited waiting bays in the middle of the road because these are more to be used by residents and their guests throughout the day. 2. Cranley Close and N/S section of Cranley Road are not through routes. There is currently parking on both sides and there is an NHS care centre in the area which creates a demand for parking. 3. The intention to include Saturdays in the scheme has been stated from the outset. It was discussed with Mr Cummings and other residents' representatives when an initial approach was made to extend the CPZ.

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
23	Sarah Travis 86 Westfield Road, Woking, GU22 9QA	- I am writing to ask for your help with the new parking restrictions. I am a part time teacher at Tormead School and I live in Westfield. Currently I drive to work and park somewhere in the roads around the school. I am very worried by the details of the proposals to make parking in this area controlled and very little of it available for all day parking. I have two primary aged children, so I cannot easily free up time for commuting by public transport. Many of the staff park on the roads, as the school has not been allowed to increase the number of parking spaces. This is a successful school in an impossible situation. Female staff cannot be expected to walk miles in the dark carrying heavy loads of book and marking. As teachers we are not paid enough to relocate to this area. Please advise me what we can do about changing the proposals, increasing our parking spaces or getting permits so we will be able to park somewhere near the school. I do understand that we should try to use public transport more but this area is not well served by frequent buses.	The scheme includes 4 hour limited waiting and unrestricted parking bays which can be used to park. The volume of parking by non-residents is causing problems. The scheme is designed to reduce this problem and it is not possible to issue permits to workers or groups of workers without the problem returning.
24	RE Ellis 1 Fielders Green, Guildford, GU1 2JY	I live in Fielders Green and I understand that the proposal is for the only two parking bays to become 4-hour bays. In my opinion if the two bays are to be controlled in this way then there must be a residents permit option on them also.	The spaces will be prioritised for permit holding residents and visitors.
26	Petition from 11 properties in Cranley Close Nos 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17 Cranley Close, Guildford	The residents of the "unadopted" part of Cranley Road object to the plans that show its inclusion in the proposed extension of the CPZ. The residents believe the exclusion of this section of road, without the appropriate deterrent to parking, would result in it becoming a focus for parking and being detrimental to road safety. For these reasons there is a requirement for its entrance to be clearly differentiated from the CPZ to ensure that the new CPZ does not adversely affect the rights of residents. The residents propose to work with the Council to install, prior to the CPZ becoming operational, 2 signs, to be strategically sited for view from oncoming traffic to state "private road – no parking". The residents also recommend that the double yellow lines proposed for the corners be extended across the road entrance. Finally they propose the sitting of two gate posts at each side of the entrance and associated extended kerb and side fencing on the inner corner entrance. These provisions are required directly as a result of implementing the new CPZ adjacent to the "unadopted" road and as such we consider it reasonable for the Council to make a contribution to these costs.	The unadopted section of Cranley Close will be removed from the proposals. There is no obligation on the Council to fund changes to the unadopted section of the highway.
27	Richard Sinker 2 The Ridgeway, Guildford, GU1 2DG	I fully support the no waiting at any time restrictions which are to be instituted in a number of roads and in Tangier Road in particular. I would like to seek your support for an additional double yellow line restriction at the junction between Tangier Road and The Ridgeway. It is my experience shared with my neighbours that speeding on Tangier Road is very often at a maximum at this junction as it is on the steepest and apparently clearest stretch of Tangier Road. Speeding is very frequent in this section. The situation is exacerbated by a poor view exiting The Ridgeway due in part to the hedge and fence on either side of the exit. However it has of late been made positively dangerous to make this exit in view of the large number of parked cars, vans and lorries that have continually parked very close to The Ridgeway exit on either side.	This will be considered as part of the next review.

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
25	Jennifer West 24 Tormead Road, Guildford, GU1 2JA	<p>I participated in the recent questionnaire stating that I was totally against the introduction of the controlled parking zone in Tormead Road. I am writing now to state my continued objection to Tormead Road being included in the scheme and to set out my reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Apart from the junction with Cranley Road where there are safety concerns caused by parking, Tormead Road does not have a parking problem and therefore does not need to be included in the scheme. - Some people argue that if the zone is extended to roads surrounding Tormead Road it will cause a knock-on effect with parking in Tormead Road. I do not believe this will happen because Tormead Road is considered too distant for those wishing to park for London Square, London Road Station and Guildford Town Centre. - One of the reasons I and no doubt many others in Tormead Road, chose to buy a house there was because there were no problems with parking and no parking restrictions for either my car or those visiting me. We pay high council tax to live there and I consider it entirely unjust that I should suffer punitive parking restrictions unnecessarily. Some of my neighbours have more than one car and park the second on street. Why should they be penalised for parking their own car in their own street? - Many people living in the road are elderly and receive assistance from gardeners, handymen carers and so on. These services will suffer if the deliveries are not able to park outside the house. <p>If the controlled parking zone is to be introduced then I would like to see the following amendments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is absolutely no need whatsoever for restrictions to be enforced on a Saturday. There are plenty of empty parking spaces in Cranley Road on a Saturday so no one has need to park in Tormead Road. - I object very strongly indeed to my weekend visitors not being able to park outside my house on a Saturday. Implementing the restrictions on a Saturday is totally unnecessary and totally unjustified. - There should be many more parking spaces allowed in the road than are shown on the plan, and many of these should have no time restriction. Tormead road is not too narrow. There is plenty of space for cars to park. Allowing more parking spaces, and more unrestricted parking spaces in particular will allow residents to park their or their visitors' cars near to their house. <p>I appreciate there are conflicting viewpoints from those living in Tormead Road but find it very hard to believe that the majority favour such harsh restrictions or that anyone would agree to them being in place on a Saturday.</p>	<p>When initially consulted almost 90% of residents who responded considered the road did have a parking problem and 77% wanted to be included in the CPZ.</p> <p>The issue is not just about controlling parking from the locations listed. There are local schools which create a demand for parking.</p> <p>The question of Saturdays is addressed in the main report.</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
28	Ms K Jakubowska 17 Broadwater Rise, Guildford, GU1 2LA	<p>I am writing to inform you that I object to any change in parking on Broadwater Rise for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The road is one of the prettiest in Guildford. It backs on to an area of outstanding natural beauty. Any yellow lines, marked white parking bays, posts with signs and associated parking paraphernalia will spoil the road. - Each house, to my knowledge along the road has quite a long private drive allowing a few cars to park. Therefore there is no reason why members of the public should not park in the road all day as this does not affect the residents. - However, if a resident, including myself were to hold a large function during the day, our visitors would be greatly inconvenienced having any form of restricted parking. I speak here from experience when I have visited mothers with small children for birthday parties and have had only 1 or 2 hours to park anywhere near the house. - All of us at some point need building work. Restricting parking would inconvenience the builders' deliveries and ourselves if we could not park on our drives. I do not believe it is fair to expect residents to pay for parking permits to park sometimes on their own road! <p>Unrestricted parking on both sides of the road could restrict traffic flow. I propose the following compromise:</p> <p>Put one yellow line along one side of the road (probably the right as you look uphill) leave the other side with no markings as unrestricted parking. The wider circular area should be left alone.</p>	<p>A yellow line has been placed down one side of the road. Parking bays have been positioned on the other side. It is not possible to have an unrestricted area in a CPZ but the formalisation of bays will prevent people parking too close to driveways etc. Builders can use the unrestricted parking bays.</p>
29	Petition from 16 properties Nos 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 10a, 11, 12, 12a, 13, 14, 15 Avonmore Avenue, Guildford	<p>We appreciate the provision of an increased number of parking bays in Avonmore Avenue including outside No 15. The parking office have refused our request that parking restrictions in Avonmore Avenue should apply only from Monday to Friday, instead of Monday to Saturday on the grounds that the restrictions must be consistent throughout the CPZ to avoid confusing motorists.</p> <p>Our contention is that, at this distance from the centre of Guildford, we do not need to worry that our road will be choked by shoppers on Saturday and that we do need to the freedom for our families and friends to park without restriction at weekends.</p> <p>Parking bays will necessarily be provided with signs specifying the maximum time (2 or 4 hours) allowed and the hours of operation (8.30 to 6.00) and crucially the days of the week when restrictions apply. Any motorist wishing to park his/her car must look at the sign to see whether the bay is a 2 or 4 hour one and must therefore also see what days are specified so that there could be no room for confusion if the Avonmore Avenue signs said "Monday to Friday".</p> <p>Double yellow line restrictions will of course be understood to apply at all times.</p>	<p>A CPZ works on common hours of restriction. The issue of Saturdays is discussed in the main report.</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
30	Janet James 2 Fielders Green, Guildford, GU1 2JY	We have noticed that the most recent proposals for parking in Fielders Green are for the parking bay to be designated for four hours parking. We understand that in previous plans the bay was to be for unrestricted parking. We have spoken with our neighbours and our preference would be for the bay to be unrestricted as previously suggested. We believe this would be most useful to us as residents since we would be able to use the bay ourselves as we often currently do.	Spaces were originally unrestricted and converted to 4-Hr Limited Waiting as a result of comments received during the informal consultation. A 4-hour limited waiting bay can be used without restriction by a resident with a permit. The fact it is restricted for other users means it is more likely to be available for residents. This issue can be reviewed once the scheme is operating.
31	Mrs E Haddy 3 Tythebarn Close, Guildford, GU4 7SS	I write to object to the proposed extension of the controlled parking zone. I have worked at Tormead School for seven years. As there is insufficient parking on site, many staff park in the roads surrounding the school. This has always been the practice. If the proposed restrictions come into force they will create insurmountable problems for many employees. We are key workers and have family commitments and housing not within walking distance of the school, so moving is not a possibility. We have bags of books and equipment to carry to and from school. It is not feasible for us to park and walk miles to school. Public transport is not an option. We have a large spread of responsibilities that dictate arrival and departure times. Our job of education is a particularly important and responsible one, investing in the future. The school has been in Cranley Road for 100 years and I feel special consideration for the staff is needed. This is only the case during term time. I suggest parking permits are allocated to allow staff especially teachers to park all day in the bays	The scheme includes 4 hour limited waiting and unrestricted parking bays which can be used to park. The volume of parking by non-residents is causing problems. The scheme is designed to control this and it is not possible to issue permits to workers or groups of workers without the problem returning.
32	P J Wilkinson Woodborough, Grosvenor Road, Godalming, GU7 1NZ	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposal to extend the CPZ. I am a teacher at one of the schools. My colleagues and I frequently have to park in the area for most of the day (7am to 6.30pm is not unusual) and carry heavy loads of books and other materials for use in the school. I am at a loss to understand if on-street parking were not available how we are practicably supposed to get to work. Already, experienced teacher colleagues are, with regret, looking for other employment out of the Guildford area because of this proposal.</p> <p>My experience of working in the zone, both with my current employer and previously at the Surrey County Council Offices in Cross Lanes is that daytime on-street parking in the proposed zone is considerate (not blocking driveways) and does not impede traffic flow. I implore you to withdraw this ill-considered and unnecessary proposal.</p>	The scheme includes 4 hour limited waiting and unrestricted parking bays which can be used to park. The volume of parking by non-residents is causing problems. It is not possible to issue permits to workers or groups of workers without the problem returning.
34	M A Bruton 3 Cranley Close	<p>I accept and indeed welcome the extension of the zone but am opposed to the detail of its proposals for Cranley Close. The proposals overload Cranley Close with all day/restricted parking compared with the rest of the area. (I exclude from my comments the non-council part of Cranley Close over which you have no control). I would like Cranley Close to have either staggered parking bays or parking on one side only. The amount of car parking if staggered would be no more than one side's worth of car parking space. I believe also that I will have problems accessing/exiting my drive with the current proposals.</p> <p>We should take our share of parking - but Cranley Close is being dealt with unfairly when compared with the rest of Cranley Road area in your current proposals.</p>	Cranley Close and N/S section of Cranley Road are not through routes. There is currently parking on both sides and there is an NHS care centre in the area which creates a demand for parking.

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
33	John Harvey 21 Tormead Road, Guildford, GU1 2JA	<p>I am writing to object to the current plan for restricted parking in Tormead Road in two respects:</p> <p>1. I object to the proposed all day parking bays in the cul de sac. We have no all day parking taking place here currently and I understand the objective of the proposal is to limit the displaced parking that may or may not, take place in Tormead Road. I believe that the inclusion of all day parking bays in the cul de sac (the first between here and Cranley Road) is like an open invitation for people to park here. The Cul de Sac is quiet enclave of just 8 houses and should not become a place where commuters or office workers should be parking. I also note that the revised proposal has significantly reduced the total number of bays in Tormead Road. I would request that the all day bays are converted to 2-hour or 4-hour residents restricted bays</p> <p>2. There is no need to have restricted parking in Tormead Road on a Saturday. We walk to Guildford most weekends and there is no problem in Cranley Road or Cross Lanes. There is no risk therefore of displaced parking coming to Tormead road at the weekend. Furthermore as a residential street of some 70 houses – it is the weekend when most people have visitors. Restricted parking would be an inconvenience to homebuyers. If we are to have restricted parking (although I for one believe we shouldn't), I would request that the restrictions in Tormead Road should apply from Monday to Friday only.</p> <p>My own solution would be very simple ...double yellow line the junctions and leave the rest as residents parking.. that way we have no displaced commuter parking at all.</p>	<p>The mixture of unrestricted bays and 4 hour bays give maximum flexibility to residents and other users. The scheme is not intended to displace all non-residents as this is likely to lead to greater displacement into other areas and simply impact on those residents.</p> <p>The Saturday issue is picked up in the main report.</p>
36	John Twining 3 The Ridgeway, Guildford, GU1 2DG	<p>I suggest that consideration be given to consulting the owners of 1 The Ridgeway and 31 Tangier Road on introducing No Waiting At Any Time restrictions in Tangier Road immediately downhill and uphill from the junction with The Ridgeway.</p> <p>During the building works in Tangier Road cars, vans and occasionally lorries have been parked in Tangier Road close to the junction with The Ridgeway, obscuring the view of the drivers of vehicles leaving The Ridgeway and thus constituting a serious hazard.</p>	<p>The Ridgeway is a private road but this can be considered at the next review.</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
35	Pat Spooner 22 Broadwater Rise, Guildford, GU1 2LA	<p>I agree in principle with the extension of the CPZ to Broadwater Rise but have certain reservations concerning the proposed parking bays in the road and the times at which restrictions apply, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Broadwater rise is 1m narrower than other roads such as Tangier and Pit Farm and two cars cannot safely pass next to a line of parked cars. For this reason it is patently not suitable for long term parking on street. 2. The proposed unlimited bay nearest the main road presents a danger to road users and should be removed. There is an acute angle of entry from the main Epsom Road and a blind corner, such that cars turning in would meet traffic exiting the road headlong. With the recent and deeply unpopular overspill from the DEFRA site there have been at least two near accidents that I am aware of, in one of which I personally was involved. 3. I note that two unlimited bays are proposed, one of either side of my driveway. The one to the left will not only make it difficult to reverse out of my drive onto the road but will make entry to and exit from my neighbours driveway opposite at 3 Broadwater Rise extremely difficult. If it is considered necessary to have any long term parking on this road could the bay be sited outside houses further up the road which are screened by hedges ? In our case the parked cars would be visible all day from our house. 4. Broadwater Rise enjoys certain unique characteristics: it is tree lined grass verged road that contributes greatly to the green character of the Epsom Road corridor and makes a major contribution to the overall attractiveness of this area of Guildford. Given this and that the lack of parking contributes to this character, it is clearly unrealistic to expect Broadwater Rise to provide a parking reservoir for the demands generated elsewhere and exaggerated by the spread of the CPZ. 5. In summary I am keen to see the bays nearest the main road deleted, all bays to be restricted to 4-hours and no bays opposite dropped kerbs. 6. Finally I can see no logic or need to restrict parking this far from town on Saturdays and Bank Holidays. This will only cause unnecessary problems for residents at times where they might have family gatherings with no overall gain for the community. With such a deep CPZ surely it is reasonable to have different times on the outer fringes. 	<p>A site visit has been conducted. The proposed position of the first bay is considered far enough back from the junction not to cause a problem. The proposed double yellow line will improve the current position by deterring drivers from parking close to the junction. The bays nearest to driveway at 3 Broadwater Rise have been made shorter to allow greater visibility. The bays opposite 22 Broadwater Rise do not prevent entry or exit from the drive.</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
37	Martin Southcott 2 Broadwater Rise, Guildford, GU1 2LA	<p>I am writing to express my concern that my reasoned comments regarding this road have not been accommodated (duplicate attached). Would you please re-read these and note the comments as objection to the latest scheme.</p> <p>In particular, the proposed 8h bays nearest the main road present a danger to road users and should be removed, as they would present a danger to road users. There is an acute angle of entry from the main Epsom road, and a blind corner. Vehicles turning in and having to pass round parked cars meet traffic exiting the road headlong. There have been two near accidents that I am aware of, and no doubt others unreported. It was, and still is, my hope that the CPZ would prevent this.</p> <p>Broadwater Rise is a narrow road, not suitable for mass long term parking on street. It is typically 1m narrower than other roads such as Tangier and Pit Farm, and two cars cannot safely pass next to a line of parked cars.</p> <p>Finally, I can see no logic or need to restrict parking on Saturdays and Bank Holidays this far from the town. This will only cause unnecessary problems for residents at times where they might have family gatherings, with no overall gain for the community. With such a 'deep' CPZ, surely it is reasonable to have different times on the outer fringes. It would appear that there is an attempt to do it on the cheap, with a <i>one size fits all</i> approach.</p> <p>Being a Chartered Civil Engineer, and Road Representative and committee member for the Downsedge Residents' Association, I have considered the issues raised by the extension of the CPZ in some detail, especially regarding this road.</p>	<p>A site visit has been conducted. The proposed position of the first bay is considered far enough back from the junction not to cause a problem. The proposed double yellow line will improve on the current situation where vehicles park close to the junction. The bays nearest to driveway at 3 Broadwater Rise have been made shorter to allow greater visibility. The bays opposite 22 Broadwater Rise do not prevent entry or exit from the drive.</p> <p>The Saturday issue is discussed in the main report.</p>
39	Anna Riches Middle Eight, 8b The Ridgeway, Guildford, GU1 2DG	<p>Following your consultation process, I understand that you are not including Tangier Road in the controlled parking area, but in anticipation of increased parking pressure in this road you will be painting yellow lines to prevent parking in certain stretches. It would be very helpful if yellow lines were painted either side of the junction of the Ridgeway. It is extremely hazardous to turn into Tangier Road from the Ridgeway when cars are parked close to the junction because the view is completely obscured. Cars are being parked either side of the junction increasingly frequently and are likely to pose a persistent danger if you do not take measures to prevent it.</p>	<p>The Ridgeway is a private road and this area has not been included in the scheme. Dangerous parking can be addressed by the Police. If there is a continuing problem the issue can be considered at the next review.</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
38	<p>Petition from 17 properties</p> <p>Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19 & 20 Cranley Close, Guildford</p>	<p>With regard to the proposed extension of the CPZ in Cranley Close we the residents make strong objection on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed CPZ is inconsistent with the practice in place in adjacent roads in Guildford. Specifically Cranley Close and the eastern arm of Cranley Road are the only roads within the extension area to be designated for parallel parking on each side of the road, effectively making the road a single carriageway. All the other roads have staggered parking bays. - Road safety would be significantly threatened. Implementation of the proposal will result in additional hazards to both road users and pedestrians from increased traffic flow seeking parking spaces and those negotiating parked vehicles in an increasingly congested area. In particular Cranley Close has 25 children under 16 and excluding the unadopted road is the route of choice for learner driver lessons and tests for both cars and motorcycles. - Unacceptable restrictions of access for residents to driveways of their premises. This is particularly relevant to 2,3,7,8 and 19. - The unadopted road section of Cranley Close (No.s 5-17 incl) is precluded from this proposal given its legal status. However the exclusion of this section of road would result in it becoming a focus for parking and being further detrimental to road safety. <p>We fully recognise the need to address the parking issues in the area and the difficulties that confront the Council. In this regard we offer the following solution:</p> <p>Cranley Close and Pit Farm Road (west) to Cranley Road (east) No 1 to 4, 18 to 20. All day parking bay at the western end, northern side to be retained, shortened so that the eastern end finishes before western boundary of drive entrance to No 1. The bay parallel on the southern side to be no parking. Middle bays – 4 hour bay to the southern side to be replaced by no parking – all day bay parallel on northern side to be re-designated 4 hour.</p> <p>The petition also supports suggestions in item 26.</p>	<p>Cranley Close and N/S section of Cranley Road are not through routes. There is currently parking on both sides and there is an NHS care centre in the area which creates a demand for parking.</p> <p>A site visit has been conducted and it is not considered that access to the properties listed will be prevented.</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
40	<p>Alan Miles (On behalf of Pit Farm Tennis Club) 14 Westward House, Abbotswood, Guildford, GU1 1UU</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of the Committee of the Pit Farm Tennis Club in Hillier Road as the proposed extension of the Controlled Parking Zone to that road in its present form could have a serious effect on the viability of our club. The club has approx 250 adult members and 180 junior members and has been located on its present site since the early years of the last century. Our members come from all parts of Guildford and the nearby areas eg Godalming, Witley, Farnham, Woking, Clandon, Blackheath, Shalford etc</p> <p>During the week there is significant parking in Hillier Road at the Cranley Road end but only during term-time. At the Epsom Road end there is some parking throughout the year but club members do not usually have to park at that end of the road. As there is currently parking on both sides of Hillier Road, members who play in the weekday mornings or afternoons can usually find parking spaces although rarely alongside the club's frontage onto the road during term time. The proposal to reduce the number of parking spaces in the road will prevent members finding nearby spaces. We expect most of the four-hour spaces to be taken by employees of the local education establishments who will be able to move their cars during their lunch hours to avoid over-running the four-hour limit. These educational establishments start by 8.30am whereas most members playing tennis in the mornings wait until 9.00am or later to avoid adding to the morning traffic congestion.</p> <p>From our discussions with you and your colleague, we understand that, based on your experience in other parts of the borough, you do not expect the four hour spaces to be taken by people from the nearby schools. Since these discussions we have tried to monitor the morning parking in Hillier Road and we believe that there are several cars which park on the road before 9.00am and leave by 12.30pm which do not belong to tennis club members. Education is a large employer of part-time teaching and support staff so we assume these cars belong to part-time employees.</p> <p>From our discussions we also understand that there is no flexibility on the days and times of the CPZ because it has to be uniform with the town centre. As we are not located near the town centre, this leads to anomalies in regard to Saturdays when no amelioration of parking congestion is required. Saturday is our busiest day with junior coaching in the morning and adult play in the afternoon. We see no reason to have any restrictions on Saturday as there is no congestion issue at present although reducing the number of parking spaces will prevent our members parking near the club.</p> <p>We have also discussed with you our annual Junior Tennis Tournament which is an LTA sanctioned event. This year we attracted over 270 boys and girls to this tournament with people travelling from many parts of the country to participate. As the parking restrictions cannot be lifted for that week, we will experience problems even with the suggestions you have made. If parents are unable to find suitable parking facilities near to the club, they will not enter their children into the tournament in future years as there are always other LTA tournaments scheduled for the same week.</p>	<p>The proposal place a considerable number of limited waiting parking places in front of the tennis club. These are least likely to be occupied by commuters. The number of representations from teachers suggests that they do not believe the 4-hour parking bays will be suitable. On Saturdays there should be far more parking bays free for users of the club. We understand the Junior tournament takes place in the school holidays there is likely to be less demand for parking at this time. We are happy to discuss what can be done to facilitate the event.</p> <p>The scheme will be reviewed and if necessary the proportion of bays adjusted.</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
40	(continued)	<p>I understand that under the Local Plan we are classified as a Protected Open Space and we are effectively tied by covenant to our site. We have been happy with this but if parking restrictions makes us uncompetitive against other tennis clubs with unrestricted parking, our viability will be in doubt. For a club like ours, it takes careful financial management to ensure we build up sufficient funds to pay for the re-laying of our courts every eight to ten years. If we see a reduction in members as they move to other clubs where parking is not a problem (e.g. Woking, David Lloyd, Oxshott etc), then we will not be able to maintain the courts and grounds to a high standard which in turn will result in lower membership and still lower income.</p> <p>We believe there should be flexibility in the days and times of the proposed CPZ to meet the different requirements in the different areas of the zones. In Hillier Road and nearby areas, parking would be reduced from current levels while still allowing some parking with the following:-</p> <p>1) Permit unrestricted parking on Saturday and Sundays (including parking on single yellow lines) 2) Allow no parking in the four hour bays (except for residents) between 8.30 and 9.30am or between 8.00 and 9.00am on weekdays. This would be easy for the Traffic Wardens to monitor, as there would be little residents' parking since nearly all the properties in Hillier Road and nearby have off-street parking. Hence any cars parked in the four-hour spaces would be breaking the parking restrictions.</p> <p>If it remains impossible to have variations in the timings of the CPZ and it is decided to extend the CPZ to Hillier Road, we would ask that more four hour spaces and less unrestricted spaces are applied in Hillier Road to help ensure the on-going success of Pit Farm Tennis Club on its current site. We are concerned that the Council's proposals in their present form will cause a reduction in membership and so affect the viability of our club. We ask that these issues are considered in the discussions on the possible extension of the CPZ to Hillier Road.</p>	
41	Louise Thompson 21 Church Road, Guildford, GU1 4NG	<p>I am a teacher at Tormead School. The on site parking facilities are presently inadequate for the needs of the school's employees and restrictions on development prevent the school from building further on site parking areas. Many teachers park in the roads adjacent to the school. I have taught at this school for 13 years. On almost a daily basis during the school week I carry a pile of marked books or portfolios, a lap top commuter and a six year old in my car to school. On days when I have little work to carry, I walk in with my daughter. I am presently residing in the town centre but know that it is unlikely I will be able to afford to buy in Guildford. Further to this I have a medical problem which prevents me from carrying weight over anything but a short distance.</p> <p>At present the teachers at my school feel under pressure to find parking close enough to work to carry work in. A large proportion of staff are women over fifty who are insufficiently robust to carry their work in by other means. Life for us is already stressful during term times. If the proposals are implemented many will find it difficult to continue their employment here. For these reasons I propose that specific all day on street parking permits should be available for Tormead staff during term time.</p>	The scheme includes 4 hour limited waiting and unrestricted parking bays which can be used to park. The volume of parking by non residents is causing problems and the scheme controls and it is not possible to issue permits to workers or groups of workers without the problem returning

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
42	Robert & Sally Wilson Bramleys, 24c Cranley Road, Guildford, GU1 2JS	<p>We object to the proposed Traffic Order because it includes Saturday which is not a normal working day. The scheme was promoted to residents on the basis that it would serve to control commuter parking during the working week. It won strong local support on that basis.</p> <p>However the inclusion of a non-working day within the proposed scheme, on the sole basis that not to do so would be confusing is not a proper reason for the inclusion of Saturday within the context of section 1 and in particular sub-paragraphs (a) to (g) of section one of the enabling Act.</p> <p>The Act enables any order to be supported by proper and adequate signage indicating the extent of the operation of the scheme. The omission of a particular day would only be confusing if not supported by clear signage. Were the Authority contention valid Sunday should also be included within the scope of the order as its omission may be shown to be equally confusing without signage</p> <p>The Highway Authority have not demonstrated any other proper reason within the context of sub-paragraphs (a) to (g) for the inclusion of Saturday within the order (for example by reference to statistical survey information which gives support to an order for the reason falling under one of those sub-paragraphs)</p> <p>The vast majority of respondents during the formal consultation indicated opposition to the inclusion of Saturday within the scheme (Local Committee Minutes 21st July)</p> <p>The inclusion of Saturday is not supported by the Authority's own published guidance as to the normal days of operation of controlled parking zones within its jurisdiction.</p> <p>It appears to us that for these reasons that the proposal to include Saturday within the order may be open to challenge on the grounds inter-alia that the Authority and Guildford BC as its agent are seeking to impose a restriction for the purpose which can not be properly shown to be both expedient and permissible under section 1 of the Act.</p> <p>We take the view that the inclusion of Saturday within the proposed order would be ultra vires. We believe there are sufficient grounds to warrant an application to the High Court for leave for judicial review should the proposed order be made to include Saturday.</p>	<p>The scheme has consistently been promoted on the basis that it will operate Monday to Saturday and as an extension of the existing Controlled Parking Zone. The restrictions will, for example, avoid or prevent danger by maintaining safe sight lines around bends and for people leaving the driveways. The proposed order will facilitate the passage on the road of cars and pedestrians by deterring drivers from parking their cars in a way which impedes the traffic flow. The proposed Order are therefore consistent with Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>The minutes of the Local Committee meeting do not state that the vast majority of respondents during the formal consultation opposed the inclusion of Saturdays. The report states that many of the respondents commented on Saturdays. The report contains a detailed list of the comments and in all 18 of 172 refer to Saturdays not being necessary. This is small compared to the number who have indicated support for the scheme. It is not clear what guidelines are being referred to but the whole of Guildford Town CPZ operates Monday to Saturday.</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
43	Nikki Vale 17 Maori Road, Guildford, GU1 2EG	<p>Would like to see the unrestricted parking bays in Cranley, Aldersey and Hiller Roads further down the roads and away from the school entrances and the shorter stay bays nearer the schools. This would increase the possibility of bays being free near the schools at pick up and drop off times.</p> <p>Would also like to see the same change made in Maori Road.</p> <p>Yellow lines do not allow sufficient time for parents to drop off or pick up children. The smaller children have to be walked into the school and when picking up, the school will want to see the adult collecting the child before they are released.</p> <p>Would it perhaps be an idea to introduce a sticker system recognisable to the parking wardens and the schools involved so if you have a sticker on your car the warden understands it is due to picking up children.</p> <p>There is apparently a school in Woking where at pick up and drop off times it is understood that parents are allowed to park on single yellow lines and will not risk a ticket.</p> <p>There is a general lack of parking and finding extra parking for school staff, employees of the county council and other local employers should have been the priority. It is understood that any attempts to do this have been turned down by planning offices concerned. This is enormously distressing.</p>	<p>There are 4-hour parking bays in Cranley Road and Tormead Road which should assist with space for parents dropping off or picking up children. The yellow lines will make it easier for traffic to manoeuvre and safer for people crossing the road. This matter can be reviewed once the scheme has been operating.</p>
45	Marie Langlet Flat 5, 46 Busbridge Lane, Godalming, GU7 1QD	<p>I am a new full time teacher at Tormead School and I feel that these restrictions would make my journeys to and from school very difficult indeed, not having proper public transport within the area to fall back onto. Financially I cannot afford to relocate myself nearer to the school in the aim to avoid commuting. Therefore I have no choice but to drive or if possible to share a lift, whenever other people's commitments allow this which can in itself be very complicated.</p> <p>May I also point out to you that as a teacher we do have numerous meetings after school activities or parents evenings to attend or run, most of which run until very late. I would not feel safe to walk long distance in the dark on my own in order to catch a bus let alone doing so twice daily. It would also be very difficult due to the numerous books one takes home to mark or plan lessons.</p> <p>With this in mind may I ask you to be more flexible with the new road regulation or to allow school to "build" parking spaces for their committed staff. Alternatively I would be grateful if you could issue permits in the vicinity.</p>	<p>The scheme includes 4 hour limited waiting and unrestricted parking bays which can be used to park. The volume of parking by non-residents is causing problems. The scheme is designed to address these problems and it is not possible to issue permits to groups of workers without the problem returning</p>

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
44	Henry Friend Flat 1, Windacres, 27 Warren Road, Guildford, GU1 2HG	<p>My flats house elderly people. The exit to our flats is immediately opposite the bus stop on the south side of Warren Road and adjacent to the bus stop on the north side of the road. By 9.00 on weekdays the space between the corner of Tangier Road and the corner of Rosetrees is filled with parked vehicles left either by commuters or workers in the town centre. I have established that at that hour there is adequate parking at both stations and in the town centre so these people are being subsidised to the detriment of highway users.</p> <p>They obstruct both bus stops on a daylong basis.</p> <p>Emerging from the of these flats is very difficult not to say dangerous. It is impossible to have any visibility through a solid bank of four or five vehicles on each side of the exit. Persons using the buses mostly elderly quite often embark or disembark in the middle of the road. I understand that you and the police are well aware of the excessive speeds used by vehicles travelling up and down the Warren Road. Its straightness is an open invitation.</p> <p>The whole position that has been exacerbated by the development of 14 new dwellings at the top of Tangier Road. Even residents on the south side of Warren Road in talking to me are beginning to voice reservations they did not previously have.</p> <p>The extension of the proposed restrictions so that they are continuous from the corner of Tangier Road to the corner of Rosetrees on the northside of Warren Road with some provision for visitors would solve a great deal to nobody's disadvantage.</p>	Warren Road is not in the proposed extension but this issue can be considered at the next review.
46	M F Chastell 12a Broadwater Rise, Guildford, GU1 2LA	<p>There is no need for Broadwater Rise to be included in the proposed Order. However it seems clear that the County Council and Borough Council are determined to include the Rise even though Tangier Road, St Omer Road and Gateways are excluded. I therefore set out below a formal objection to one aspect.</p> <p>I object to the making of the order as drafted on the grounds that the proposed waiting restrictions as they will affect Broadwater Rise should only apply from Monday to Friday. Any parking problems that are alleged to exist in Broadwater Rise only occur during the normal working week of Monday to Friday. There has never been a problem on Saturdays or Sundays. I have lived in the road for 30 years so do have a clear knowledge of past and present conditions. You may respond that the hours of restriction in the CPZ area must be the same in every road. I do not accept that this should be so. It must be possible to include modified wording in the Order to vary the times of operation in roads on the eastern fringe. If necessary make a separate order. I ask that proper consideration be given this objection.</p>	The Saturday issue is addressed in the main report.

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
47	Sue Bunyan Learning Disability Service, Greenlaws Resource Centre, 65 Cranley Road, Guildford, GU1 2JW	<p>I support wholeheartedly environmentally friendly policies and the attempt to reduce the use of the motor vehicle. However as I am General Manager responsible for the provision of specialist health services for people with Learning Disabilities based at 65 Cranley Road I need to express my anxiety on behalf of the team. The service that we provide is to adults with Learning Disabilities who live in the borough of Guildford and Waverley. We are a team of twenty-five health care professionals who work in the community. We also deliver services in the building at 65 Cranley Road. The team is a range of Health Care Professionals: Community Nurse, Psychologists, Physiotherapists, Consultant Psychiatrists, Occupational Therapists, Music, Drama and Aroma Therapists and Behavioural Specialists. This team needs access in and out of the building. Parking is a priority otherwise we would not be able to fulfil our job. As well as needing parking for our staff we need to have space for carers and parents who support people with Learning Disabilities to attend our outpatient clinics. The clinics we run are for Music Therapy, Aromatherapy, Drama Therapy, Psychological Therapy, Consultant Psychiatry and Speech and Language Therapy. We also have a Sensory Room where people attend for sessional periods.</p> <p>On viewing the map at your offices I note that immediately outside of number 65 Cranley Road there are three areas which are proposed long stay unlimited parking bays. My anxiety is that these bays will be used by early morning commuters who have been pushed out of all other areas and we will not have anywhere for our community staff to park. Within No 65 Cranley Road there we do have a small amount of parking for approximately eight cars. I would like you to consider making the bays long stay areas permit only whereby my staff could be given permits for the times they need to park when they are in and out of the building. This would alleviate these bays being filled up by people who could commute using Park and Ride because they have a 9 to 5 job. Although my staff work 9 to 5 the motor vehicle is an essential tool for them to be able to complete their work.</p>	There is no facility for issuing permits for medical staff to park outside their places of work. The need for parking around this facilitate is allowed for in the number of bays and the fact there have been placed on both sides of the road.
48	Mrs I Hummel 8 The Ridgeway, Guildford, GU1 2DG	The Borough Council should be aware since on-street parking is in so many instances controlled by yellow lines no body appears to consider the established parking advice in the Highway Code need be applied i.e. that road junctions should not be obstructed. We have countless instances of this where the offenders say they can park on a corner because there is no yellow line. The council had better get round to painting and maintaining every corner in the Borough.	Dangerously parked vehicles cause an offence whether there are yellow lines or not and the Police can take action. The Borough Council, however, can only ticket vehicles that contravene a traffic order. When we look at restrictions in a particular area we will put double yellow lines round the corners.

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
49	Helen Nelson 12 Cherry Way, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 2AZ	<p>Since I work at Tormead School and there is unfortunately not enough parking for all staff on site I was hoping that you would consider providing me and indeed any other staff at the school with parking permits.</p> <p>Due to extra curricular activities and meetings before and after school I work fairly irregular hours and this combined with the fact I live in Alton means that I have to drive to work as there is not sufficient public transport provision. Although I understand the point of view of the residents here, the implementation of parking restrictions will obviously cause huge problems for me and is becoming quite a concern. I would therefore appreciate it if you could let me know what the council would be able to do to help us combat this difficulty.</p>	The scheme includes 4 hour limited waiting and unrestricted parking bays which can be used to park. The volume of parking by non residents is causing problems and the scheme controls and it is not possible to issue permits to workers or groups of workers without the problem returning
50	Amanda Mullarkey 13 Aldersey Road, Guildford, GU1 2ER	I am writing to ask you to switch the 4-hour bays and unlimited parking bays on Aldersey Road. This would copy the successful formula on Clandon Road where shorter term bays are nearer the school (in this case Guildford High School). They are therefore more likely to be available and used by school drop off vehicles and short-term visitors to the school. If as proposed for Aldersey Road the long-term parking bays are at the end this will reduce the capacity for school traffic because the bays will be blocked up by office parkers. The benefits of the controlled parking zone will be negligible unless all day office parking is moved away from the school end of Aldersey Road. I hope you can accommodate this change as a minor amendment. If not I think it is worth delaying the scheme to get it right.	There are 4-hour parking bays in Cranley Road and Tormead Road which should assist with space for parents dropping off or picking up children. The yellow lines will make it easier for traffic to manoeuvre and safer for people crossing the road. This matter can be reviewed once the scheme has been operating.
51	Gary Durrant Applewood, Cranley Road, Guildford, GU1 2JS	<p>My reasons for objection are:</p> <p>Parking restrictions are only necessary Monday to Friday. On Saturday there are very few cars in the road. I cannot see any reason for restrictions on Saturday. It is too far from the town for shopping (1.2 miles from the centre).</p> <p>As I am opposite a junction to a cul-de-sac serving 12 houses, you state that I will have double yellow lines outside of my property. We have a drive which accommodates one car. I currently park one car outside the house there have not been any accidents and this seems to be somewhat unnecessary to be restricted at night. I anticipate that this plan will cost us in excess of £3,000 as we will have to remove the two fruit trees, further drop the kerb and pave over the garden at the front of the house to create a wider drive to accommodate the displaced vehicle.</p> <p>To conclude, we have had experience of your parking regime when we lived in the town where no doubt it was necessary. I however doubt whether any justifiable comparison can be made to the proposed scheme, where demand has been created by appalling parking provision at nearby office blocks. Enforcement of a sustainable travel plan for those employers would be a solution, where by car use is discouraged, why penalise the local residents?</p>	Applewood is located at the junction of Cranley Road and Springhaven Close and double yellow lines are placed round all junctions.