



REVIEW OF PARKING IN RIPLEY

**SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL COMMITTEE (GUILDFORD)**

22nd MARCH 2007

KEY ISSUE

The Committee is asked to consider the results of the initial consultation on plans to amend and introduce additional parking restrictions in Ripley.

SUMMARY

This report summarises the responses to initial consultation on proposed changes to parking restrictions in Ripley. Changes are recommended to the original proposals as a result of comments received and the Committee is asked to agree that amended proposals are advertised with a view to making an order to give them effect.

Report by

GBC PARKING SERVICES MANAGER

Surrey Atlas Ref.

Page 91, B6 to D6

GUILDFORD B.C. WARD(S)

LOVELACE

COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)

HORSLEYS

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to agree:

- (i) that the restrictions relating to Ripley outlined in the plans attached as **ANNEXES 3 TO 5** be approved for formal consultation.
- (ii) that the intention of Surrey County Council to make Orders under the relevant parts of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, including sections 1,2,4,32,35 and 36 and Parts III and IV of schedule 9, giving effect to the proposed Controlled Parking Zone be advertised.
- (iii) that following consideration and, where possible, resolution of any objections received, the Orders be made.
- (iv) that any objections which cannot be resolved be reported back to the Committee.

INTRODUCTION and BACKGROUND

- 1 At its meeting on 28 September 2006 the Committee agreed to an initial consultation on proposals to change and increase parking restrictions in Ripley and Ash. The purpose of the proposals was to improve safety for road users and pedestrians, improve traffic flow, allow parking where safe and practical and improve access for the disabled. There is often a balance to be made between traffic flow and parking and on occasions parking can help to reduce traffic speeds and improve safety.
- 2 The proposals have been promoted on the Borough Council's website and on signs in the areas concerned. The Parish Councils have also helped to promote the event and with facilities for the exhibitions.
- 3 An exhibition was held at the Village Hall, Ripley on 7th November and representatives from the Parish, Borough, and County Councils were available to discuss issues. The exhibition was attended by 72 people and there has been considerable feedback.
- 4 The plans which formed the basis of the consultation were contained in annexes to the report to the Committee on 28th September 2006. A summary of all the comments received and plans with the revisions made as a result of consultation are attached in the **ANNEXES** to this report, as follows:

ANNEXE 1	Summary of informal consultation comments
ANNEXE 2	Detailed responses to informal consultation
ANNEXE 3	Key Plan
ANNEXE 4	Plan 1
ANNEXE 5	Plan 2

ISSUES ARISING

- 5 There were 56 submissions in response to the consultation of these only 8 were about a single issue. A more detailed analysis given in **ANNEXE 1** and each comment is documented in **ANNEXE 2**. Below some of the major issues are outlined.

High Street, Service Road South Side

- 6 The proposal was to transfer the parking bays from the far side of the service road so they were adjacent to the pavement. In doing so the sight lines for vehicles leaving the service road would be improved.
- 7 There were 18 comments and a 217 signature petition all opposed to the proposed change. Most did not consider sight lines were an issue. The objectors raised a number of drawbacks to the proposal these included; difficulties with deliveries, impact on pedestrians, and the potential need to remove trees and the pub sign to accommodate large vehicles.
- 8 There were suggestions that the bays be kept in the same position but that the end of the parking place be shortened to improve sight lines. The proposals have been amended in line with this suggestion.

Newark Lane

- 9 The proposal was to have three parking places on the south side and a double yellow line along the north. There were 21 comments concerning this proposal which were varied, highlighting different problems and potential solutions
- 6 consultees suggested that the existing parking arrangements cause safety and traffic flow issues,
 - 1 suggested that the current parking calms traffic,
 - 7 comments suggested that parking on the south side would create a greater problem,
 - 4 comments suggested parking on the north side would be preferable,
 - 2 suggested parking on both sides,
 - 3 suggested double yellow lines on both sides.
- 10 This is a very difficult balance. There is clearly a need to ensure traffic flows particularly at peak times. There is a tendency for vehicles to speed and some parking can provide a calming effect and provide residents with parking space near their homes. Officers have considered a range of options including positioning parking bays on both sides. This would work outside peak traffic flows but in the morning the traffic builds on the north side and queues to pass through the narrowest point in the road. At the morning peak any vehicles parking on the south side would form a barrier with the queue of traffic on the north and cause gridlock and a queue of traffic would build on the south and potentially block the high street.
- 11 The proposals have therefore been amended to allow two parking places on the North side and none on the south.

Perseverance Cottages

- 12 The proposal was to extend double yellow lines further along the High Street and outside the Cottages. There was concern that this would prevent the existing practice of residents parking on the footway.
- 13 12 comments were received of which 11 were opposed to the proposal. A number of people suggested that the Village Hall car park should be made available for parking. 7 of those who commented wanted footway parking in the area to be formally permitted and 5 commented that the kerb had been lowered specifically to allow parking on the footway. Subsequently minutes of a meeting held in July 1978 between the Parish Council and Engineers from Surrey County Council have been produced which refer to lowering the kerb to allow vehicles to park on the part of the footway nearest to the road. There is no record of whether the footway has been strengthened to take the weight of parked vehicles and protect any utilities' equipment below.
- 14 While it appears that the kerbs may have been lowered to permit parking, in the intervening 30 years policies have changed to encourage walking and protect pedestrians. It is now considered that the needs of pedestrians, particular those with mobility issues or young children should be paramount, and therefore that vehicles driving and/or parking on the footway should be discouraged. Officers have measured the road width and consider there is sufficient space to accommodate a parking bay. This has also been tested by parking a vehicle in the road and while some traffic slows down there is adequate space for two lorries to pass. The proposals have been amended to include a parking place on the carriageway.

Rose Lane

- 15 The proposals for Rose Lane extended parking restrictions beyond the entrance of Ripley Court School around the bends, formalising parking but keeping safe distances from junctions and driveways.
- 16 12 comments were received specifically about the proposals with all but one opposing them to one degree or another. 4 suggested the current situation should be allowed to continue. 6 suggested that parking should be permitted in the "triangle" area. Ripley Court School suggested that the restrictions further down Rose Lane were unnecessary.
- 17 The proposals have been amended to include parking in the "triangle" and to delete the proposed double yellow lines around the bend near Ripley Court School. The restrictions elsewhere are considered necessary to formalise parking.

Additional Parking

- 18 20 comments concerned the need for additional parking in the village and a number of these related to parking at the east end of the village. Officers have looked at this and are proposing a number of new parking bays in the area around the Talbot Hotel.

Residents Parking

- 19 12 suggestions were received concerning the need for a residents parking scheme. These comments mainly came from areas where there was greatest demand from residents and least parking availability. A parking scheme which restricts access to bays in these areas is likely to increase pressure elsewhere and lead to the need for a village wide scheme where all residents relying on on-street parking would need to buy permits. Such a scheme would also place restrictions on visitors and trades people doing work for residents. For these reasons residents' parking scheme is considered unnecessary and that the flexible use of the limited amount of space should be allowed to continue.

CONCLUSIONS

- 20 In any parking scheme there are often conflicting needs which need to be balanced or resolved and the response to these two consultations has been extremely useful and resulted in beneficial changes to the original proposals.
- 21 The following changes have been proposed and are shown on the plans:
- **High Street Service Road – South side** – parking to be retained on the far side of the road but the length of the parking place to be shortened to improve sight lines,
 - **Newark Lane** – two parking places to be created on the North side with a length of single yellow line on the south side applying Monday to Friday 8.30am to 6.00pm,
 - **High Street outside Perseverance Cottages** – A parking place to has been added on the highway outside the cottages,
 - **Rose Lane** – A parking place has been added in the triangle and the parking place outside number 2 has been extended across a disused access. An additional parking place has been added just south of the Barn House and the proposed restrictions around the bends near Ripley Court School have been deleted.
- 22 It is recommended that these proposals are now advertised with a view to amending the Traffic Regulation Order.

23 The proposed programme for implementation is given below:

Month	Activity
October 2006	Start of Informal Consultation
March 2007	Report back to Local Committee on amendments
April 2007	Formal Advertisement of Proposals
June 2007	Report Objections to the Local Committee
June 2007	Specify and obtain quotes for work
August 2007	Implement

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

24 The cost of implementing the scheme is estimated at £15,000. This can be covered from the CPZ account. The overall estimate of £27,000 (including the scheme in Ash which is the subject of a separate report on this agenda) is greater than that suggested in previous reports, although as part of the work, it is intended to remove the 'No Waiting At Any Time' plates, which since 2003 have not been required, thereby reducing street clutter. It is also intended to introduce the changes within Ripley as a CPZ. This will reduce the number of signs and posts necessary, and therefore the amount of street clutter, but has increased the cost of signing due to the requirements at the zone boundary.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

25 The introduction of the proposed restrictions will assist with safety and traffic flow and formalise parking.

LEAD OFFICER KEVIN MCKEE, PARKING MANAGER GBC

TELEPHONE NUMBER 01483 444530

BACKGROUND PAPERS: Local Committee Report: 28 September 2006
Review of Parking Restrictions in Areas Outside
Guildford Town Controlled Parking Zone

SUMMARY OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION COMMENTS – RIPLEY

In total 56 submissions were received. Of these:

Overall

- 4 Consultees were generally supportive of the proposals.
- Only 8 (including a petition) referred to single issues, the remainder taking the opportunity to comment on a number of the possible changes, and other matters.

High Street - Southern Service Road

- 18 commented on the proposal to swap around the bays in the service road, including a 217-signature petition opposed to the suggestion.

High Street – Perseverance Cottages

- 12 commented on the introduction of parking restrictions, which would restrict pavement parking adjacent to Perseverance Cottages.

Newark Lane

- 21 commented on the possible introduction of parking restriction in Newark Lane.

Rose Lane

- 12 commented on the possible introduction of parking restrictions in Rose Lane.

Other Parking Related Issues

- 12 suggested a need for a residents' parking scheme.
- 7 commented on the need to address the existing issues in Rose Lane outside Watson's.
- 13 commented on the present levels of enforcement.
- 20 commented on the need to create additional parking.

Other Non-Parking Related Issues

- 16 commented about 'other issues', not related to the proposals or parking in general.

COMMENTS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS

High Street – Southern Service Road

All 18 comments received, including the 217-signature petition, opposed the proposed swap around of bays. The majority saw the sight lines issue as a 'non-issue' and highlighted the difficulties that the proposed swap would cause for deliveries, users of the relocated bays and pedestrians. A number also mentioned the need to relocate the signing and possibly remove the trees / sign for the pub to facilitate the movement of large vehicles immediately adjacent. 1 consultee suggested removing 1 space nearest the junction on the existing side to improve visibility.

1 comment was received about the proposal to reduce the control hours from Monday-Saturday to Monday-Friday, suggesting that the controls should end at 5.30pm on weekdays and noon on Saturdays. 1 comment suggested that the 2-hour limited waiting period in the bays should be reduced to 30 minutes in the lay-by(s).

A number of the changes, such as those in the northern service road, the introduction of disabled only spaces, and those to facilitate access to a garage on the south side of the High Street received no comment at all.

High Street – Perseverance Cottages

11 of the 12 comments received opposed the proposed restrictions on the basis that it would prevent parking on the pavement during the day; the other 1 suggesting that the village hall car park should be made available to residents displaced from the footway. A further 3 comments suggested that residents / the general public should be allowed to use the village hall car park during the day. 7 of the comments wanted footway parking in this area to be formalised and residents' parking introduced. 5 commented that the kerb had been specifically lowered to allow pavement parking some years ago. 1 comment did however suggest that restriction elsewhere along this section of the High Street may resolve issues caused by delivery lorries to Lovelace Works.

1 comment was received objecting to the technical alteration to the order, formally changing the spaces in the lay-by outside St Mary's Church to unrestricted. Another from a nearby business suggested the need for short term parking in the immediate vicinity of their premises for clients and deliveries.

No comments were received about the proposals to introduce DYLS outside the village hall / police station, or the introduction of SYLS in the vicinity of Church Row on the south side of the High Street.

Newark Lane

21 comments were received about the proposed formalisation of parking bays, including 2 from Newark Lane Residents' Association.

The residents' association believe that there should be some provision of parking on the north side of Newark Lane. Although they agree that the provision of parking on the south side may improve the issue of speeding vehicles from the High Street, they are concerned that it will also cause additional congestion. Enforcement against verge parking would also be welcomed, although they believe the knock on effect and pressure on the bays being provided would soon be apparent. Residents' parking should be considered, as should future changes associated with the redevelopment of the bottle works. The NLRA would welcome a meeting.

6 consultees suggested that the existing parking arrangements cause safety and traffic flow issues, although 1 comment suggested that the current parking calms traffic naturally.

In terms of the proposals, 7 comments suggested that locating the parking on the south side would cause greater issues in terms of its effect on safety / traffic flow (4), the impact on those living opposite who have off street parking spaces, and it reducing the ability to park on the verge. 4 comments suggested that parking on the north side would be preferable, although 2 preferred parking on both sides (possibly 'chicaned'), as possibly being the best option. 3 comments suggested that DYLS should be introduced throughout, although 1 suggested that the proposed DYLS on one side would encourage speeding.

2 comments suggested that residents' parking should be considered. 6 suggested that the verge parking on the south side of Newark Lane should be formalised and the verges hardened, whilst 2 suggested that the verge parking causes problems.

3 comments suggested improvements to the junction with High Street. These included improved signing, prevention of vehicles from parking on the footway outside the Suzuki garage (adjacent to the existing DYLS) to improve right hand visibility, and controlling the junction with traffic signals. Another consultee suggested a 'mini-bypass' should be created across The Green to overcome the issues caused by the narrow section of Newark Lane.

9 comments were made concerning the recently introduced pinch point on Newark Lane which is not a matter for this review. Consultees suggest that it is ineffective, or causes more danger, speeding and congestion.

Rose Lane

12 comments were received specifically about the proposals in Rose Lane, with all but 1 opposing them to one degree or another. 4 suggested that the existing situation should be allowed to continue, with 1 of the consultees even objecting to the proposal for junction protection at White Hart Meadows. 6 suggested that parking in the 'triangle' should be allowed to continue, with another suggesting that the island should be removed and echelon parking introduced.

The headmaster of Ripley Court School suggested that the restrictions further along Rose Lane were unnecessary and requested a direction sign for the school on the High Street and School Ahead warning signs in Rose Lane itself.

OTHER PARKING RELATED ISSUES

Residents' Parking

12 comments in total mentioned the need for a residents' parking scheme. 4 of these were general comments suggesting such measures should be considered for the village, 4 suggested them in the High Street outside Perseverance Cottages, 4 suggested them for Newark Lane (including the Residents' Association twice), and 1 for Rose Lane.

Present Issues Outside Watsons

7 comments were received about the issues presently occurring outside Watsons on the existing double yellow lines. Of these, 5 indicated that present levels of enforcement were inadequate.

Levels of Enforcement

13 comments in total were received about enforcement. All but 1 commented that the present levels of enforcement were inadequate, the other suggesting that if enforcement was to be increased from its present 'light' level, it should be done gradually and with notice given.

5 comments suggested the proposed changes were pointless unless they were properly enforced, with another suggesting that the existing restrictions should be enforced properly, and the situation analysed, before then suggesting proposals.

Need to Create Additional Formal Parking

20 of the 55 submissions suggested a need for more parking to be created. 4 consultees wanted more parking in general. 4 wanted more in the High Street, with 2 of these making specific references to the need for additional facilities towards the eastern end of the High Street, 1 adding that this would calm traffic entering the village. Another suggested that the bus stop clearway on the northern side of the High Street should be shortened and additional car parking provided, similar to the arrangement on the south side of the High Street.

As mentioned previously, 6 commented on the need to formalise the verge parking in Newark Lane.

5 commented that the Parish Council's Village Hall car park should be better utilised for use by either residents or the general public. Another suggested parking should be allowed in the evenings in the White Hart Meadows car park. 2 commented that parking on The Green should be permitted, although 1 submission suggested that the existing parking there should be prevented.

Other Parking Related Comments

2 comments were made about the general urbanising effect of the parking proposals.

3 comments were made about the remoteness of the White Hart Meadows car park and lighting, security and safety issues, particularly for women during the hours of darkness.

OTHER NON-PARKING RELATED COMMENTS

16 consultees commented about various 'other issues'. These included:

9 comments related to the recently introduced pinch point in Newark Lane.

3 about the need for improvements at the junction of Newark Lane and the High Street.

4 comments suggested that speeding traffic in the village generally needed to be slowed down.

3 comments were made about signing in the village and the need for additional pedestrian facilities.

DETAILED RESPONSES TO INFORMAL CONSULTATION

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
1	Val Harris, Cedar House, High Street, Ripley	Lose first parking bay in service road to improve visibility but do not swap over. Do not restrict parking in Rose Lane. Parking outside Watsons is the biggest problem that needs resolving.	We have amended the plans and removed the first length of parking in the service road. We have reduced the restrictions in Rose Lane and improved them in view of the comments received. Short stops are very difficult to enforce against.
2	Newark Lane Residents Association	Allow parking on The Green to avoid need for restrictions in Newark Lane. Creating parking on south side will cause problems for those who park on the verge. Place some parking on the north side to chicane and traffic calm, and make these residents only, otherwise residents on north side will have no convenient parking and DYs will encourage speeding. Warning sign at junction with High Street stating oncoming vehicles in middle of road.	Parking on the Green is outside the scope of this review. Parking on the verge/footway is not permitted. We have moved the parking to the north side.
3	Mrs Morrison Ashley Cottage, 63 Newark Lane, Ripley, GU23 6BS	Residents parking should be considered on The Green. Residents with restrictions in front of their homes should be provided with an alternative. Verge parking on south side can cause problems for pedestrians. Residents' only parking spaces should also be provided on both sides. Yellow lines will encourage speeding.	Parking on the Green is outside the scope of this review. Parking on the verge/footway is not permitted. We have placed some parking on the North side of Newark Lane in a way which will discourage speeding.
4	Mr H Griffiths, The Ship PH, High Street, Ripley	Proposed changes have no substance and site lines will not be improved. The unloading of supplies will be made impossible.	We have kept the parking on the far side of the service road but removed parking on the end to improve sight lines
5	Emma Moorwood, Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley	Pavement parking should continue to be allowed on wide pavement outside cottages, and if possible, be restricted to residents' only.	Pavement parking is not permitted but we have proposed to place parking bays on the highway in this area. A residents parking scheme is not viable in Ripley.
6	PG Erhardt, Homewood Farm, Newark Lane, Ripley	Continue yellow lines on both side in Newark Lane from existing restriction at bend to well beyond the pinch point. Parking in the High Street service road doesn't need swapping, just reduce by one space.	We have amended the proposal and are proposing parking on the north side of Newark Lane. We have adopted this suggestion regarding the High Street service road.
7	Miss E Wyborn, Ripley House C, High Street, Ripley GU23 6BE	No benefit in swapping parking in slip road. Parking on existing restrictions outside Watsons is more of an issue, particularly for pedestrians.	We have amended the proposal and kept the parking on the same side of the service road but reduced it by one bay. Short stops are very difficult to enforce against.
8	Mr R Cox, 5 West End, Ripley	Parking should be prevented on west side of junction with High Street, outside Suzuki Garage, to improve sight lines.	We will take action to deter this.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
9	Ms Lisanne Mealing, Little Barn, High Street, Ripley	Not happy at the present levels of enforcement. Inadequate throughout the village. Parking bay in service road should not be swapped and will not improve site lines significantly, and may actually increase speeding. Any revisions should not be proceed without further detailed consultation.	The County Council is doing a review of enforcement. We have amended the proposal and kept the parking on the same side of the service road but reduced it by one bay.
10	Mr R Hill, 48 Newark Lane, Ripley, GU22 6BZ	Parking in Newark Lane is a major problem. The parking proposed on the south side opposite No.48 would make accessing the drives of a number of properties almost impossible. Consideration should be given to hardening the verge and creating additional parking off road. The new pinch point is ineffective because it is too wide, and increases the chance of an accident. Whilst the ideal solution in Newark Lane would be no on street parking, the issue of speeding traffic must be addressed.	We have amended the proposals and moved the parking to the North side. Footway parking is not permitted and reducing the verge/footway would impact on pedestrians. The pinch point is outside the scope of this review but the revised proposals should help with speeding traffic.
11	Mr S Hill, 49 Kings Road, West End, Woking GU24 9LW		
12	Emma Morris, Crofters 46 Newark Lane, Ripley, GU23 6BZ	Verge on the south side of Newark Lane adjacent to factory should be hardened to provide additional parking. This would then allow additional parking to be located on the north side of the road. On street parking on the south side would remove this well used facility provided by the verge and could possibly cause traffic to queue back to the High Street causing congestion. The proposals should consider present and future on street parking requirements.	We have amended the proposals and moved the parking to the North side. Reducing the verge/footway would impact on pedestrians.
13	Jim Morris, Crofters 46 Newark Lane, Ripley, GU23 6BZ		We have amended the proposals and moved the parking to the North side. Reducing the verge/footway would impact on pedestrians.
14	Ms J Moss, 2 Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6AG	Removing parking on the footway is unacceptable. It is hard enough to park as it is. This would make it even worse. Allow residents to use village hall car park and make footway parking residents' only.	Pavement parking is not permitted but we have proposed to place parking bays on the highway in this area. A residents parking scheme is not viable in Ripley.
15	Mrs J Edwards, Harkness Kennett, Rio House, High Street, Ripley	Improve lighting in free public car park.	There is a balance needed between the light in the car park and the effect of too much light on the surrounding area. We consider the light level adequate for a rural site.
6	John Hartley, 186 High Street, Ripley, GU23 6BB	Additional on street parking spaces should be considered towards the eastern end of the village. This could also act as traffic calming. Parking should be considered outside garage. Parking should continue to be allowed on the 'triangle' in Rose Lane. Restrictions should end 5.30pm on weekdays and noon on Saturdays. Need for a bypass of narrow section of Newark Lane.	We have added parking at the eastern end of the High Street in the vicinity of the Talbot Hotel and in the "triangle" in Rose Lane. We are proposing to standardise the hours to 8.30 to 6.00pm but only on Monday to Friday which will give more flexibility for residents at weekends.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
17	Ms Lisa Betteridge, Harkness Kennett, Rio House, High Street, Ripley	No thought given to lighting / security in car park. Need short term parking immediately outside offices for clients and deliveries.	There is a balance needed between the light needed in the car park and the effect of too much light on the surrounding area. We consider the light level adequate for a rural site. We are providing parking where it is practical.
18	James Harkness, The Old Telephone Exchange, The Street, West Clandon, GU4 7TE	There seems little provision of public parking. There needs to be a better mix of long and short term parking throughout the village. Allow the village hall to be used during the day to prevent pavement parking nearby.	The car park provides public parking and there is a mixture of limited waiting short stay parking adjacent to the High Street and unrestricted parking in roads off the High Street.
19	Yvette Smithers, Harkness Kennett, Rio House, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6AE	Businesses find the present parking restrictions cause difficulties. More should be done to encourage people to visit the village. No provision for females to park in winter, having to walk to the dark and remote public car park. Other areas, such as the recreation ground have no lighting whatsoever.	The proposals provide a balance of parking using the car park, unrestricted bays and limited waiting bays. Lighting around the car park and on the recreation ground are outside the scope of this review.
20	Mr A Gough, Headmaster, Ripley Court School, Rose Lane, Ripley, GU23 6NE	NWAAT around bend in Rose Lane is pointless as no one waits there, other than traffic queuing to park within the school, which wouldn't be enforced effectively. Similarly NW M-F seems not to solve any problems and wouldn't be enforced. The pinch point in Newark Lane would appear to have no visible effect on traffic flow. Whilst there are issues in Ripley, the Council's urge to tidy up will only urbanise. The traffic issues would be alleviated by a proper bypass. School Approaching signs required in vicinity of school. Pedestrian facility required near Scout Hut. Sign to Ripley Court School at Rose Lanes junction with High Street.	We have deleted the NWAAT restriction outside the school. The comments about the pinch point and traffic signs are noted but are outside the scope of this review.
21	Andrew McClelland	It would seem pointless discussing the merits of the proposals unless they will be enforced effectively. Parking is presently a free for all with virtually no enforcement.	A considerable number of parking tickets are issued.
22	Mrs J A Pither, 109 Georgelands, Ripley, GU23 6DQ	Present restrictions inadequate enforced. DYLS should be introduced on both sides of Newark Lane from existing extend to west of junction with Wentworth Close and be enforced. 50mtrs of DYLS is also needed on RHS of Georgelands to give priority to vehicles turning into the estate. Again it must be enforced.	The County Council is reviewing enforcement resources. DYLS on both sides of Newark Lane will unnecessarily deprive residents of the ability to park. We do not consider DYLS in Georgelands are necessary at this time.
23	Mr G H Pither, 109 Georgelands, Ripley GU23 6DQ		

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
24	Guy Pullen, Jasmine 1 Greenside, Ripley GU23 6AR	Opposes proposed swap of bay from one side of service road to other. Present sight lines are perfectly adequate and avoid problems with deliveries, the potential for pavement parking and opening doors conflicting with footway users.	We have amended the proposal and kept the parking on the same side of the service road but reduced it by one bay.
25	Mrs Patricia Howe, 25 Wentworth Close, Ripley, GU25 6DB	Agree that parking on Newark Lane needs to be restricted on one side, but bays should be provided on the north side as opposed to the south side. The latter will cause excessive congestion. Pinch point is ineffective. Relocate 30mph speed limit sign beyond bend near Home Farm.	We have moved the parking to the north side. This is a difficult balance. The pinch point and signs are outside the scope of this review.
26	Mrs J Creasey, 6 Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6AG	Concerned that proposed parking arrangements will prevent footway parking adjacent to cottages. Would like residents' only parking in this location. The pavement was lowered in the 1980s specifically to allow pavement parking.	Pavement parking is not permitted but we have proposed to place parking bays on the highway in this area. A residents parking scheme is not viable in Ripley.
27	Barbara Ward, 7 Church Row, Ripley, GU23 6BG	The restrictions proposed are appalling. Where will local residents park? The car park in Rose Lane is locked at night making it unusable for shift workers. Residents' parking should be considered.	There is a considerable amount of parking for residents in Church Row and in addition the single yellow lines only apply Mon to Fri 8.30 to 6.00pm. The car park is not locked at night.
28	Gloria Shoemith, 1 Acacia Villas, The Green, Ripley	Believe swap around of bays in service road would make it far more dangerous. The removal of footway parking outside Perseverance Cottages would make it impossible for residents living there.	We have amended the proposal to swap the bays and are keeping them on the same side but improving the sight lines. We have also proposed on street parking outside Perseverance Cottages.
29	Mrs Gilchrist, 21 Wentworth Close, Ripley, GU23 6DB	The pinch point should be removed as it adds to confusion at peak times and causes queuing back to Pyrford traffic lights. Newark Lane's junction with High Street requires traffic lights, to overcome issues of obscured vision to right when turning out. Up to 8 cars park in Newark Lane without a gap causing a hazard. Leave Rose Lane alone as it works, although there is a need for better enforcement. Don't swap the bays in the service road as it would require signing on footway as opposed to island and possibly removal of trees, as well as making deliveries more difficult.	The pinch point and traffic lights are outside the scope of this review. The proposal should improve the situation in Newark Lane. The intention in Rose Lane is to rationalise the situation. We have amended the proposal to swap the bays and simply shorten the parking by one bay to improve the sight lines.
30	Mr & Mrs E Strange, 103 High Street, Ripley GU23 6AN	The possible changes are a complete waste of money and do not take into account the residents' needs at Perseverance Cottages. What's the point of swapping the bays in the service road? The traffic in Ripley needs to be slowed down not speeded up.	We have added an on street parking place outside Perseverance Cottages and are no longer proposing to swap the bays. We have shortened the parking bay by one space to improve the sight lines.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
31	Mr D Farmer, Sumac 26 Wentworth Close, Ripley GU23 6DB	Parking outside church should be not be unrestricted. Formalising parking on the south side of Newark Lane will be the opposite to the existing regime and cause issues for traffic coming from the High Street. The facility provided by verge parking will also be lost and traffic coming from the High Street will be less visible for motorists exiting Wentworth Close.	The Church has requested unrestricted parking and it is consistent with the approach in other parts of the village. We have amended the parking in Newark Lane so that the parking is on the North side. The parking on the south side has been removed and that on the north side is far enough away from the junction with Wentworth Close not to restrict visibility.
32	Carol Edwards & Sue Carter, Sally Hair, Health and Beauty, High Street, Ripley	Proposals do nothing to help businesses. The bus lay-by on the High Street should be converted, in part, to provide more parking for cars, in view of there only being 2 buses per hour. The lack of parking has caused the closure of many businesses over the years and the proposals will do nothing to address this. We maybe the next if this goes ahead.	The amended proposals increase parking in the High Street. At the exhibition a number of people claimed that shop workers park in the limited waiting bays and prevent customers accessing the shops.
33	Saillie, Health, Hair and Beauty, Stamford Cottage, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6AA	The parking for clients has steadily got worse. The car park is always full for people working in the village. Increased restrictions will cause further issues. Ripley will become a ghost town if this goes ahead.	The amended proposals increase parking in the high street. At the exhibition a number of people claimed that shop workers park in the limited waiting bays and prevent customers accessing the shops.
34	Richard Amis, The Georgian House, Ripley, GU23 6AF	The main problem are lorries blocking access to his property whilst waiting to access Lovelace Works. Whilst restrictions on the north side of the High Street would help, this will only be the case if they are enforced. However, preventing footway parking adjacent to the cottages would be unfair.	Without restrictions the waiting can not be prevented. How effective enforcement depends on the duration of the contravention as well as the frequency of patrols. The proposals have been amended to include on street parking outside the cottages.
35	Trevor Beale, The Half Moon PH, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6AN	Removal of parking 11 years ago outside the garage and opposite the pub reduced his trade significantly. Whilst this improved sight lines, traffic speeds also increased. Parking outside the Half Moon would increase facilities and naturally calm traffic.	While adding parking on the north side of the High Street would effect traffic flow we have added more parking on the south side.
36	Ms L Grieves, 14 Rose Lane, Ripley	The proposals will make the existing parking situation worse. Parking restrictions around the 'triangle' would unnecessarily remove 5 spaces and the spaces outside the cottages need to be residents' only parking. Doesn't agree with junction protection at White Hart Meadows. Proposals don't accommodate existing situation let alone future demand. Parking signs will detract from conservation area. More parking is required. Leave Rose Lane alone.	We have added parking in the triangle. The restrictions around White Hart Meadows are needed to make the junction safe and ensure access for the emergency services.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
37	Michael Hayward, Transport Office, One Stop, Canberra Road, Nursling Ind. Est., Southampton SO16 0WB	Having to push delivery cages across the road and pavement areas increases the risk of injury to the public. Additionally, having a large delivery vehicle parked on the High Street side of the service road would actually reduce visibility further. The trees would also have to be significantly trimmed and the pub sign possibly relocated to accommodate this. Therefore, leave as is.	The proposal has been amended and the bays will remain on the same side. However one has been removed to improve sight lines.
38	Dr Bob Gale, Chair, Newark Lane Residents' Association, 44 Newark Lane, Ripley, GU23 6BZ	Restricting parking on the north side of Newark Lane would be disastrous for those that currently park there. However, the parking on the south side will reduce the excessive vehicle speeds of those leaving the village. Whilst the enforcement against verge parking would be welcome, this too will cause problems for residents in the area, although it would reveal the true extents of the parking problem. I would support the proposals particularly if residents' parking were to be considered. Nevertheless, parking on the south side could cause traffic leaving the village to back up towards the High Street. Consideration should also be given to the future development of the bottle works. NLRA would like further discussions.	We have amended the proposals with parking on the north. A residents parking scheme is not viable for Ripley.
39	Tony Morrison, The Flat Aberdeen House, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6BZ	Endorse Richardson's view that the parking by in the service road should not swap sides. In Rose Lane, parking should still be allowed around the inside of the 'triangle'. The situation is much better than it has been for years. Much of this is due to the light enforcement. If enforcement is to be increased, please do so gradually. There is a need for a statement of reasons for changes.	We have amended the proposal to swap the parking in the service road . We have added parking in the triangle in Rose Lane. Enforcement resources are being reviewed.
40	Mrs J MacKenzie, 8 Church Row, High Street, Ripley	I do think some parking restrictions are necessary but believe those without off street parking facilities should have a residents' parking permit. Where would all the residents of Perseverance Cottages to park?	We have added on street parking outside Perseverance Cottages. A residents parking scheme is not viable in Ripley.

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
41	Tom Harris, Cedar House, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6AE	<p>No evidence that right hand sight line at junction of Rose Lane is an issue. Make it a 'Stop' junction. Swapping bay would increase danger, delivery problems, result in the need to remove trees and disrupt the sense of place. Parking in the lay-bys should be restricted to 30 mins Limited Waiting to encourage turnover. Proposals do not solve the issues associated with parking on the DYLS outside Watsons. Parking in 'triangle' in Rose Lane should be allowed to continue. Natural calming present in Newark Lane should be allowed to continue, and more parking should be provided in High Street for this and improved facility. Without analysing the present system with better enforcement there is little point in changing the situation, so leave as is until there are clear objectives for the changes and the Ripley Village Action Group and new Parish Council have considered the issue further. Indiscriminate parking on The Green should be addressed and aesthetics of additional controls are an issue.</p>	<p>We have amended the proposal to swap the bays in the service road. Restricting the parking to 30 minutes may help some but hinder others. It will be difficult to enforce. The problem outside Watsons is a matter of enforcement not one of new restrictions. Parking in the Rose Lane triangle has been added. A review was promised after the construction of the car park. Parking on The Green is outside the scope of this review.</p>
42	Ripley Village Plan The Cedar House Gallery , High Street Ripley	<p>The village is in the early stages of revitalisation and changes are expected . The parking review should take these into account. The Ripley Village Plan group are currently analysing the relationship between parking, through traffic, residents car movements, available shops, local business effect to reach a holistic conclusion. Without an analysis of the present system under better enforcement there is little reason to change the existing system. The proposed changes are without any clear and established objective.</p> <p>Specific points are: Indiscriminate parking on the Green and use of the Green "unofficial car parks" as commuter collection points should be addressed at the same time, the implementation of the proposals would simply be a waste of money, the unnecessary daubing of yellow lines is urbanisation, the change of parking in the slip road is ill conceived . The review should be postponed and work done with Ripley Village Plan Action Group and new Parish Council (after the May elections).</p>	<p>There is considerable amount of general data from the survey attached to this response and we are grateful for this information. We have been working with representatives from the Parish Council on these proposals. Parking on the Green is outside the scope of this review. Postponing the review would effect the programme for all other reviews in the Borough.</p>

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
43	Geoff Richardson, Richardsons, High Street, Ripley	Any change in restrictions would be pointless unless enforcement frequencies are increased. Swapping bays would make turning right from High Street more difficult. Shop windows would be blocked out by cars. Deliveries would be made almost impossible. The pub sign and trees would have to be removed to accommodate lorries on other side. Drivers would have to open there car doors into traffic using the service road. The improved visibility would encourage some motorists to drive the 'wrong way' down the service road to avoid the pedestrian crossing. Pinch point causes vehicles to speed towards it. Vehicles currently parked on Newark Lane near the bend cause motorists to be on the wrong side of road approaching the bend. Queuing now makes it more difficult for people exiting Wentworth Close in the morning	We have amended the proposal to alter the bays in the service road and are now proposing to keep them on the same side but remove the last bay to improve sight lines. The proposals for Newark Lane have also been revised.
44	Petition organised by Geoff Richardson, Richardsons, High Street, Ripley	217 signature petition opposed to altering parking outside the shops (the proposal to swap the bays from one side of the service road to the other?).	We have amended the proposal to alter the bays in the service road and are now proposing to keep them on the same side but remove the last bay to improve sight lines.
45	Ms J Carey, 5 Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6AG	Strongly opposed to the changes in the High Street. Footway parking will be prevented for residents who park there all day, in an area that a few years ago had the kerb specifically lowered. Swapping the bays in the service road is impractical. The pinch point in Newark Lane has made the situation more dangerous with traffic speeding up to get through. Present parking along Newark Lane causes huge traffic jams. The proposals do not address the major issues, safety, residents' parking and the vitality of the village. The present restrictions are not enforced causing particular problems on narrow footways and at the junction of Rose Lane (Watsons?). Perhaps the village hall could be turned into a P&D car park. Can GLC meetings about Ripley be held in Ripley.	On street parking has been added outside Perseverance Cottages. The proposal to change the bays in the service road have been revised and they will not move but the last bay will be deleted to improve sight lines. The current restrictions are enforced. The village hall car park is outside the scope of this review. GLC meetings take place at different locations around the borough including Ripley. They have wide ranging agendas. It would not be possible to only consider Ripley issues at the Ripley meeting and visa versa.

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
46	Mr S Carey, April Cottage, Portsmouth Road, Ripley	Strongly opposed to the changes in the High Street. Footway parking will be prevented for residents who park there all day, in an area that a few years ago had the kerb specifically lowered. Swapping the bays in the service road is impractical. The pinch point in Newark Lane has made the situation more dangerous with traffic speeding up to get through. Present parking along Newark Lane causes huge traffic jams. The proposals do not address the major issues, safety, residents' parking and the vitality of the village. The present restrictions are not enforced causing particular problems on narrow footways and at the junction of Rose Lane (Watsons?). Perhaps the village hall could be turned into a P&D car park. Can GLC meetings about Ripley be held in Ripley.	On street parking has been added outside Perseverance Cottages. The proposal to change the bays in the service road have been revised and they will not move but the last bay will be deleted to improve sight lines. The current restrictions are enforced. The village hall car park is outside the scope of this review. GLC meetings take place at different locations around the borough including Ripley . They have wide ranging agendas. It would not be possible to only consider Ripley issues at the Ripley meeting and visa versa.
47	Mr P Rush, Oak Cottage, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6AF	Strongly opposed to the changes in the High Street. Footway parking will be prevented for residents who park there all day, in an area that a few years ago had the kerb specifically lowered. Swapping the bays in the service road is impractical. The pinch point in Newark Lane has made the situation more dangerous with traffic speeding up to get through. Present parking along Newark Lane causes huge traffic jams. The proposals do not address the major issues, safety, residents' parking and the vitality of the village. The present restrictions are not enforced causing particular problems on narrow footways and at the junction of Rose Lane (Watsons?). Perhaps the village hall could be turned into a P&D car park. Can GLC meetings about Ripley be held in Ripley.	On street parking has been added outside Perseverance Cottages. The proposal to change the bays in the service road have been revised and they will not move but the last bay will be deleted to improve sight lines. The current restrictions are enforced. The village hall car park is outside the scope of this review. GLC meetings take place at different locations around the borough including Ripley . They have wide ranging agendas. It would not be possible to only consider Ripley issues at the Ripley meeting and visa versa.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
48	Mr J Walker, Longwood Developments Ltd, Lutidine House, Newark Lane, Ripley, GU23 6BS	The recently introduced traffic calming in Newark Lane has caused accidents, more congestion and acceleration of traffic out of Ripley. The proposed parking in Newark Lane will do little to assist and may in fact cause greater issues of congestion and queuing at the bend / narrow section. Serious congestion will then ensue at the junction with the High Street. Those residents requiring car parking should have considered the issue before purchasing their homes. Some residents with off street parking are presently unable to use it due to those who park on street. Formalising verge parking on south side may assist. The combination of the pinch point and proposed parking will existing issues much worse. There is a need for independent professional assessment of both the traffic calming and the parking proposals.	The proposals for Newark Lane have been revised. The formalising of parking places will deter parking that blocks others access.
49	Mr & Mrs S Ingleton, The Hayloft, Rose Lane, Ripley, GU23 6NE	The changes in the 'triangle' will reduce the already limited parking in the area. Post Office staff use this area as the village car park is unavailable overnight. The lack of enforcement of the existing restrictions outside Watsons is already an issue. If this cannot be addressed the proposals are a waste of time.	We have introduced parking in the 'triangle'. The parking outside Watsons is short term and very difficult to deter. This does not mean that enforcement is not effective generally.
50	Ms Christine Owen, 29 Newark Lane, Ripley	The proposed parking on the south side will cause traffic leaving the village to move into the middle of the road. Whilst not liking verge parking, parking bays on the south side will also prevent these areas being used, thereby increasing the number of vehicles requiring a space.	We have amended the proposals . Footway / verge parking is not permitted. We have moved the parking to the North side.
51	Mr J Pemberton, 19 Rose Lane, Ripley	The proposals will reduce parking in the 'triangle'. Have you considered removing the redundant island and introducing echelon parking? This would maintain parking and tidy up the current messy situation.	We have added parking in the triangle. Echelon parking creates problems with sight lines and would not be feasible.
52	Ms J Moody, 46 Newark Lane, Ripley, GU23 6BZ	The parking bays provided should be switched to the north side to allow parking to continue in the off-street areas (highway verge) on the south side. The proposals will reduce parking by 50%, when there are already problems at certain times of day and weekends.	We have swapped some of the bays. However verge parking is discouraged and the single yellow line will make it a contravention Monday to Friday 8.30 to 6.00.

ITEM 8 : ANNEXE 2

No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
53	Mrs Margaret Field, Farm View, 1 Portsmouth Road, Ripley, GU23 6EJ	Agree with majority of proposals but believes the swap around in the service road will make the situation more dangerous, with high sided delivery vehicles causing more of an issue. The pavement parking outside Perseverance Cottages was specifically designed for parking and should be retained.	The bays in the service road will remain on the same side. On street parking outside Perseverance Cottages has been added.
54	Mr R James, 27 Newark Lane, Ripley, GU23 6BS	Parking should be formalised on the grass verges on the south side. Parking should also be considered on the northern side outside Nos.42-46. Present suggestion show little consideration for current demand and alternatives should be sought.	Parking on the footway / verges is not permitted. The parking bays have been moved to the North side. We can only provide parking where it is practical.
55	Chris Goulding	The reasons for developing the proposals are vague and the possible loss of on street parking should be highlighted.	The proposals look to improve, safety, traffic flow and provide parking where it is practical.
56	Justin Acheson, Wills and Smerdon, Aberdeen House, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6AQ	The recently introduced traffic calming in Newark Lane appears has caused an increase in congestion. Formalised parking on Newark Lane will only exacerbate the issue, particularly at rush hour. Parking on the verges should be formalised.	Parking on the footway / verges is not permitted. The arrangements in Newark Lane have been revised.