



REVIEW OF PARKING IN ASH

**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 Ash.

SUMMARY

This report summarises the responses to initial consultation on proposed changes to parking restrictions in Ash. 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.

Pages 105 & 106

GUILDFORD B.C. WARD(S)

ASH VALE
ASH WHARF
ASH SOUTH & TONGHAM

COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION(S)

ASH
SHALFORD

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to agree:

- (i) that the restrictions relating to Ash outlined in the plans attached as **ANNEXES 3 TO 14** 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 28th 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 in the Ash Centre between the 6th and 8th November and members of the Parish Council staff were available throughout. In addition representatives from the Borough and County Councils attended on the afternoon and evening of the 8th November. On the afternoon and evening of the 8th, 98 people attended the exhibition. 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 1 (northern area)
ANNEXE 4	Key Plan 2 (southern area)
ANNEXES 5 TO 14	Plans 1 to 10 respectively

ISSUES ARISING

- 5 There were 135 comments received and of these 55 were generally supportive. Only 7 people commented on more than one area where changes were proposed. A more detailed analysis given in **ANNEXE 1** and each comment is documented in **ANNEXE 2**.

Ash Vale Railway Station Area

- 6 57 consultees commented on the various issues in this area. 22 were generally supportive.
- 7 **Birch Way / Cypress Grove** - 9 people commented on the proposals to place single yellow lines on one side of the road to improve traffic flow. Whilst the controls in this area were generally considered necessary there was concern that they may displace the problems causing problems for residents elsewhere on the Avondale Estate.
- 8 **Chart House Road** –18 people commented on the proposal to extend the existing double yellow lines around the end of the road. The proposal was generally considered excessively restrictive on residents and their visitors. As a result officers have proposed reducing the whole road to a single yellow line, which operates Monday to Saturday 8.30am to 6.00pm and prevents large number of commuters blocking the road but allows flexibility outside the commuter times.
- 9 **Rosemary Avenue** – 2 people commented on the proposals. Their concern was that the restrictions might cause people to move from the restricted areas and cause issues elsewhere in Rosemary Avenue and Frimley Road. The aim of the restrictions is to stop people parking on the junction.
- 10 **Station Approach** – 2 people commented that the proposal to introduce a limit on the time vehicles park would be to the detriment of office workers who use the spaces to park all day. At the exhibition others commented that it would be helpful to businesses if the bays were available for customers and visitors. The aim is to stop long stay parking in the limited number of parking bays and to provide a turnover of the spaces to support the shops and other businesses.
- 11 **Wentworth Crescent / Close** - 11 people commented on the restrictions and they were generally welcomed but there was concern that they did not go far enough to deal with the problem caused by commuter parking. The need for additional double yellow lines on the bend in Wentworth Close drew particular attention. A double yellow line on the bend of Wentworth Close has been added. The intention of the restrictions is not to prevent commuter parking as this would just lead to the problem moving to other streets.

Wharf Road Area

- 12 There were 74 submissions about 132 different issues. 68 of these issues related specifically to the proposals.
- 13 **Wharf Road** – The proposal for limited waiting in the vicinity of the shops and the junction protect were generally welcomed. However there was considerable concern about the potential for displacement and additional parking, particularly on the east side of Wharf Road, outside the terrace properties where disabled residents lived.
- 14 **Chandlers Road** – The residents of Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive unanimously did not believe the proposals went far enough and suggested that double yellow lines should be introduced throughout. However users of the health centre and ranges considered the proposals would make parking difficult. Residents of Wharf Road were also concerned that removing parking on Chandlers Road would increase the pressure on space in the vicinity of their homes. The initial proposals strike a balance between these two positions by restricting parking around junctions and on one side of Chandlers Road but allow some parking on the other side.
- 15 **Private Roads** - The residents of Woollards Road were very much in favour of junction protection to improve visibility when exiting the road. Other comments in support of the junction protection were also received although residents of Wharf Road were concerned that this proposal would also limit parking in the vicinity of their homes.

CONCLUSION

- 16 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.
- 17 The following changes have been proposed and are shown on the plans:
- **Chart House Road** – a single yellow line is proposed throughout the road.
 - **Wentworth Close** - a double yellow line has been added around the bend.
 - **Wharf Road** – an unrestricted bay has been added to provide parking but prevent double parking.
 - **Underwood Avenue / Shawfield Road** - Double yellow lines added around the junction.
 - **Star Lane / Shawfield Road** - Double yellow lines added around the junction.
 - **Chester Road / Guildford Road** – Double yellow line around the junction

- 18 It is recommended that these proposals are now advertised with a view to amending the Traffic Regulation Order.
- 19 The 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

- 20 The cost of implementing the scheme is estimated at £12,000. This can be covered from the CPZ account. The overall estimate of £27,000 (including the scheme in Ripley 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.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 21 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 – 28th September 2006 – Review of Parking Restrictions in Areas Outside Guildford Town Controlled Parking Zone

SUMMARY OF INFORMAL CONSULTATION COMMENTS – ASH VALE

In total 135 submissions were received. Of these:

Overall

- There were 55 comments in general support for the proposals.
- Only 7 commented on multiple issues (e.g. Ash Vale Station and Wharf Road), although a number of those that commented on single geographic areas did suggest the need for additional restrictions elsewhere.

Ash Vale Railway Station Proposals

- 57 consultees commented on the various issues and proposals in the area.

Wharf Road Proposals

- 74 consultees commented on the various issues and proposals in the area.

Chester Road / Guildford Road Junction Protection

- 1 commented on the possible introduction of junction protection.

Fairview Road / Ash Hill Road Junction Protection

- 0 comments were received about the possible introduction of junction protection.

North Camp Station / Lynchford Road Proposals

- 3 commented on the various proposals in Lynchford Road.

Star Lane / Shawfield Road Junction Protection

- 3 commented on the possible introduction of junction protection.

Vale Road (Fir Acre & Wood Street) Junction Protection

- 2 commented on the possible introduction of junction protection.

Need for Restrictions Elsewhere

- 15 commented on the need for restrictions elsewhere, that were not associated with the proposals.

COMMENTS ABOUT THE PROPOSALS**Ash Vale Railway Station**

The 57 submissions about the above resulted in 125 'themed' comments, 64 of which related specifically to the proposals.

- Of the 57 submissions received:
 - 9 commented on the proposals in Birch Way / Cypress Grove,
 - 18 commented on the proposals in Chart House Road,
 - 2 commented on the proposals in Rosemary Avenue,
 - 2 commented on the proposals in Station Approach,
 - 11 commented on the proposals in Wentworth Crescent / Close,
 - 22 were generally supportive of the proposals.
- 17 specifically stated that rail commuters were a problem:
 - 4 relating to Birch Way / Cypress Grove,
 - 5 relating to Chart House Road,
 - 1 relating to Rosemary Avenue,
 - 2 relating to Wentworth Crescent / Close,
 - 5 were non-road specific.
- 22 comments were generally supportive of the proposals:
 - 5 related to the proposals in Birch Way / Cypress Grove,
 - 6 related to the proposals in Chart House Road,
 - 1 related to the proposals in Rosemary Avenue,
 - 7 related to the proposals in Wentworth Crescent / Close,
 - 3 were non-road specific.
- 13 comments suggested that the proposals would simply move the problems elsewhere and may create additional problems for residents:
 - 5 related to the proposals in Birch Way / Cypress Grove,
 - 1 related to the proposals in Chart House Road,
 - 1 related to the proposals in Rosemary Avenue,
 - 3 related to the proposals in Wentworth Crescent / Close,
 - 3 were non-road specific.
- 7 comments suggested a need for residents' priority measures:
 - 4 related to the proposals in Birch Way / Cypress Grove,
 - 1 related to the proposals in Chart House Road,
 - 2 were non-road specific.
- 2 comments suggested that the number of residents' vehicles was an issue.
- 15 comments suggested the need for additional car park facilities for rail commuters, preferably on MOD land immediately adjacent to the station.
- 12 consultees suggested the need for additional restrictions in other locations within the area:
 - 2 suggested Lysons Avenue,
 - 2 suggested Northcote Road,
 - 2 suggested Sycamore Drive,
 - 1 suggested Station Road East,
 - 1 suggested Station Road West,
 - 3 suggested more extensive controls in Wentworth Close,
 - 2 suggested more extensive controls in Wentworth Crescent.

- 9 Consultees commented on other issues, which included:
 - 4 suggested parking on verges and pavements was an issue,
 - 3 suggested that the present enforcement was inadequate,
 - 3 commented on the poor state of repair of road (1No. Wentworth Crescent, 2No. Chart House Road) and former also commenting on the lack of sweeping in areas which are parked,
 - 1 requested that the Avondale estate become a 20mph Zone,
 - 1 requested all bus stops to be made Clearways,
 - 1 requested a Disabled Bay (109 Wentworth Crescent).
- 1 commented on a need to remove existing restrictions in Station Road East
- Birch Way / Cypress Grove
 - The general feeling was that whilst the controls in these areas were necessary and welcome that the proposals might simply displace parking causing issues for residents elsewhere in the Avondale estate.
- Chart House Road
 - The general feeling was that whilst the controls in these areas were necessary and welcome that the DYLS were excessively restrictive, to the detriment of residents and their visitors.
- Rosemary Avenue
 - The general feeling was that whilst the controls in these areas were necessary and welcome that the proposals might simply displace parking causing issues for residents elsewhere in Rosemary Avenue and Frimley Road.
- Station Approach
 - The limited waiting restrictions on the bays would be detrimental to the office workers who use these spaces for all day parking, although at the exhibition the restrictions were welcomed by some of the other commercial concerns in the vicinity.
- Wentworth Crescent / Close
 - The general feeling was that whilst the controls in these areas were necessary and welcome that they didn't go far enough to resolve safety / access issues and remove commuters from the area. Additional DYLS on the bend in Wentworth Close drew particular attention.

Wharf Road Area

The 74 submissions about the above resulted in 132 'themed' comments, 68 of which related specifically to the proposals. The equivalent of a petition was received from 23 residents of Woollards Road. Similarly, a joint submission was received from 9 households of Wharf Road, although a number of these also commented individually. A letter was also received from the residents of Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive although it was unclear which properties supported the comments and suggestions included.

- Of the 74 submissions received:
 - 8 commented on the proposals for Limited Waiting near the shops,
 - 16 commented on the proposals in Chandlers Road,
 - 9 commented on the junction protection proposals in general,
 - 25 commented on the junction protection proposals around the entrance to Woollards Road,
 - 34 were generally supportive of the proposals,

3 specifically stated that shoppers and employees were a problem.

- 34 comments were generally supportive of the proposals:
 - 2 related to the proposals for Limited Waiting,
 - 2 related to the proposals in Chandlers Road,
 - 3 related to the proposals for junction protection DYLS,
 - 25 related to the proposals for junction protection around Woollards Road,
 - 2 were non-measure/road specific.
- 22 comments suggested that the proposals would simply move the problems elsewhere and may create additional problems for residents:
 - 5 related to the proposals for Limited Waiting,
 - 1 related to the proposals in Chandlers Road,
 - 7 related to the proposals for junction protection (including a letter representing 9 residents of Wharf Road),
 - 1 related to the proposals for junction protection around Woollards Road,
 - 8 were non-measure/road specific.
- 7 comments suggested residents' priority measures:
 - All 7 (including the letter representing 9 residents from Wharf Road) indicated that the proposed restrictions would increase the need for such measures,
 - 3 identified the proposed junction protection measures, and the consequent loss of parking, as being the reason for the need for residents' parking.
- 13 consultees suggested the need for additional restrictions in other locations within the area:
 - 5 suggested restrictions to prevent double parking in the vicinity of Wheelers Solicitors, Wharf Road,
 - 5 suggested that the restrictions should be extended along the entire length of Chandlers Road,
 - 2 suggested restricted parking bays should be introduced for non-residents in Shawfield Road between its junction with Ash Hill Road and Beetons Avenue,
 - 2 suggested measures to improve access for disabled residents living in the terraced houses along Wharf Road,
 - 1 suggested DYLS across the driveways of Nos 29 & 31 although a number of others commented on SYLS along the entire west side of Wharf Road as an alternative to junction protection,
 - 1 suggested extended DYLS in Wharf Road at its junction with Ash Hill Road, outside Vale furnishings,
 - 1 suggested extended DYLS in Vale Road on the north side approaching canal bridge.
- On the other hand 2 commented on the need to keep Chandlers Road unrestricted.
- 10 Consultees suggested that there was a need for more parking:
 - 8 suggested additional facilities were needed in the vicinity of the health centre,
 - 4 suggested additional facilities were needed near the shops,
 - 1 suggested more unrestricted car parking facilities,
 - 1 comment was non-specific.

- 20 Consultees commented about other issues, which included:
 - 13 suggested that the present enforcement was inadequate,
 - 5 suggested lorries should be restricted to access only,
 - 3 suggested that the speed limit should be reduced,
 - 2 suggested raised table should be made a Zebra Crossing,
 - 2 suggested Coronation Gardens car park should be made more user-friendly and better signed,
 - 1 suggested all bus stops to be made Clearways
 - 1 no through road sign introduced at entrance to Woollards Road.
 - 1 suggested that the proposed restrictions would increase traffic speeds,
 - 1 commented about their concerns about the safety of staff if they have to walk further to their vehicles.

- Wharf Road
 - Whilst the proposals for limited waiting in the vicinity of the shops and junction protection were generally welcomed, the consequent displacement that may occur and reduction in the availability of parking, particularly on the east side of Wharf Road, outside the terraced properties was a concern,
 - It is suggested that a number of residents are disabled,
 - The protection of those properties with driveways on the west side of Wharf Road was also a concern.

- Chandlers Road
 - The residents of Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive unanimously oppose the proposals on the basis that they do not go far enough and that DYLS should be introduced throughout,
 - Users of the health centre and ranges, on the other hand, were concerned that the proposals as suggested would impact on their ability to use the facilities in the vicinity. Residents in Wharf Road were also concerned that this too would increase the pressure for space in the vicinity of their homes.

- Private roads
 - The residents of Woollards Road were very much in favour of the junction protection measures to improve visibility when exiting their road,
 - Other comments in support of the junction protection proposals were also received although residents of Wharf Road were concerned that that this too would increase the pressure for space in the vicinity of their homes.

Proposals Elsewhere

- Chester Road / Guildford Road Junction Protection
 - The 1 comment received supported the proposals (Cllr Manning).

- Fairview Road / Ash Hill Road Junction Protection
 - No comments were received about the proposals.

- North Camp Station / Lynchford Road Proposals
 - 3 Consultees commented about the proposals,
 - Whilst 2 suggested general support for the introduction of restrictions in the immediate vicinity of the level crossing, all 3 questioned the need for SYL restrictions elsewhere in Lynchford Road, highlighting its impact on the availability of parking for rail commuters,
 - 1 comment suggested the need for additional car parking at the station.

- Star Lane / Shawfield Road Junction Protection
 - 3 comments were received, all in support of the proposals, although 1 Consultee suggested that the DYLS should extend further into Star Lane.
- Vale Road (Fir Acre & Wood Street) Junction Protection
 - 2 Consultees commented on the proposals,
 - 1 had no objection to the proposals in Wood Street, whilst the other suggested that there was no need for proposals in either location, as there were no issues.

OTHER COMMENTS

- Need for Restrictions Elsewhere
 - 15 Consultees commented about the need for restrictions in areas other than those proposed,
 - 9 suggested that restrictions should be introduced at various points along Prospect Road,
 - 7 suggested that restrictions should be introduced at the junction of Hutton Road and Heath Vale Bridge Road in the vicinity of The Swan PH,
 - 1 suggested that restrictions should be introduced at the junction of Ash Hill Road and View Road,
 - 1 suggested that restrictions should be introduced at the junction of Frimley Road and Stratford Road,
 - 1 suggested that restrictions should be introduced at the junction of Star Lane and Ash Street.
- Other Issues
 - 1 comment suggested traffic calming in Prospect Road.

DETAILED RESPONSES TO INFORMAL CONSULTATION

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
1	Phil Mason 1 Ruscombe Villas Frimley Road Ash Vale GU12 5NN	Would like to see a 10-11am Mon-Fri residents' scheme on Frimley Road. Presently residents have to park some distance away from their homes and repark later.	A residents parking scheme is not viable in this relatively small area. It would simply push a local problem further out.
2	Lucy Hogg 38 Wharf Road Ash Vale GU12 5	Whilst restriction outside shops may be appropriate they are not necessary outside residential properties as they will not resolve problems or improve safety but will make it more difficult for residents to park. Wharf Road and Vale Bridge Road should be access only.	Restricting areas around the shops is necessary to ensure that those who are going to the shops and cannot find parking do not cause a problem in the nearby roads.
3	Garham Lane M&G Services, 1a Station Approach, Ash Vale GU12 5LP	Why? The restriction will penalise business owners and their employees	The restriction on the bays in Station Approach is to allow people to visit the shops and other businesses in the area rather than having a few vehicles parked all day.
4	Nick Harris 2 Cardiff Cottages Frimley Road Ash Vale	Realises that residents' parking is unlikely but couldn't the DYLS in Lysons Avenue be shortened to increase parking?	The double yellow line is needed to protect the junction.
5	Bryan Evans 2 South Western Villas Ash Vale GU12 5NW	What will be the effect on residents of further limiting parking?	Restrictions on parking are being applied where it is considered necessary. The effect of restricting parking in these places may move it to other areas where parking is permitted.
6	Simon Cooper 58 Wharf Road	Agrees that there is a requirement to control parking but concerned that issues elsewhere caused by shoppers and workers will simply migrate up the street, resulting in further difficulties for residents.	Restrictions on parking are being applied where it is considered necessary. The effect of restricting parking in these places may move it to other areas where parking is permitted.
7	Diana Atkinson	Residents and commuters are churning up the grass verges in Station Road East. Wants additional restrictions to prevent this. Suggested that enforcement of this has deteriorated since restrictions were introduced!	Formal restrictions are generally only introduced to deal with issues on the carriageway. In our view to introduce parking restrictions to stop this activity would be over restrictive.
8	Mike Ratcliffe 84 Shawfield Road Ash	Proposals are eminently suitable and have my fullest support.	Noted and thanks

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
9	Linda Edwards	Where will visitors to surgery park without walking considerable distances? The Council keep allowing houses to be built without adequate services and infrastructure being provided.	The restrictions in Chandlers Road and outside the Health Centre are needed to ensure traffic flow and safe movement round the junction.
10	Martin Nee Delia Cottage, 2 Woollards Road, Ash Vale GU12 5DR	Generally supportive of the proposals and introduction of junction protection for Woollards Road .	Noted
11	Helen Kellwick 86 Cypress Grove Ash Vale	Proposed restrictions will cause commuters to use the parking bays outside residents' homes, and also inhibit residents who park on street.	The restrictions will deter people from parking on the junction and on one side of the road. This will enable traffic to flow safely and refuse collection vehicles to pass.
12	Mrs C Green 56 Northcote Road Ash Vale	Proposals for Birch Way and Cypress Grove are excellent but could they be extended further into Station Road East and Northcote Road.	The current proposals cover areas where there are known problems with access. More restrictions will lead to spread of parking to other areas.
13	Mr R Malcolm Little Willow College Road Ash GU12 5DA	Proposals are sensible but wants an overall increase in the spaces provided for visitors to the shops and surgery though the creation of additional parking spaces. Also wants parking to be prevented adjacent to the junction of Vale Road and Ash Hill Road, by the war memorial.	Around the shops we are enabling as much parking as possible. The existing restrictions allow some parking where it is safe on Vale Road and Ash Hill Road. There are two public car parks on Ash Hill Road.
14	Mr & Mrs WH & EA Leal 91 Wentworth Crescent Ash Vale	Support introduction of DYL o/s No.91 Wentworth Crescent as vehicles parked in this location make it difficult for larger vehicles to pass.	Noted
15	Carolyn Sibley Culvers Cottage Littleworth Road The Sands Farnham GU10 1JN	As a dog walker who uses the area on a daily basis, she sees the need for the restrictions in Chandlers Road but suggests that the area beyond ? opposite the surgery that leads to the ranges should remain unrestricted and additional parking created for the surgery, not limited.	The proposed restrictions are considered necessary to improve sight lines and to prevent the road being blocked by parked cars.
16	Maria & Stephen Ball 29 Chart House Road Ash Vale Gu12 5LS	Support the proposed restrictions at end of Chart House Road. Those commuters wishing to avoid charges at the station car park have made parking in the road more of an issue of late.	We have proposed changing the restriction throughout the road to a single yellow line which operates Monday to Saturday 8.30 to 6.00pm.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
17	Tony Richardson 5 Old School Close Ash GU12 5HE	Additional parking needs to be created at Ash Centre and also possibly on MOD land.	This is outside the scope of this review.
18	Phil Buxton 85 Cypress Grove Ash Vale GU12 5QE	Whilst restrictions in Birch Way and Cypress Grove are required those proposed on Cypress Grove should be positioned on the opposite side to that suggested.	There are accesses to garage blocks on both sides of Cypress Grove, although the access on the side with the proposals is the larger of the two and would benefit more by protection with restrictions.
19	Miss S Saunders 36 Wharf Road, Ash Vale GU12 5AY	Seriously concerned about the impact of the junction protection and limited waiting proposals. Also concerned that there are no plans to prevent double parking on eastern side of road outside Wheelers Solicitors. Nevertheless, some of the proposals elsewhere have merit. Subsequently suggested re-engineering of highway to narrow footway outside Nos.34-42 and therefore enable a lay-by to be created to maintain as much parking outside terraced properties.	There may be some displacement but motorists will be prevented from parking where they will have an affect on sight lines or traffic flow. An unrestricted parking bay is now proposed outside Wheelers which will prevent double parking. Re-engineering the highway is outside the scope of this review.
20	Loraine Roles	The proposals for Chandlers Road are ridiculous and will make an awkward situation worse, to the detriment of the old, sick, young and dog walkers, in the case of those suggested around the surgery.	The proposals are to deter parking where it will reduce the traffic flow or cause problems with sight lines.
21	D Stone Silver Birches, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive of the proposals and introduction of junction protection for Woollards Road . Would also like a No Through Road sign at entrance to Woollards Road	The support is noted and the road sign is outside the scope of this review but will be passed on.
22	The Resident, Pinhurst, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
23	The Resident, Woollards, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
24	Neil St Clair-Ford	Additional control should be introduced in Prospect Road in the vicinity of Elleray Court (Gorseland Rd - Dorset Rd) and Hutton Road in the vicinity of The Swan PH, where pavement parking is also an issue. Traffic calming is also needed.	It is not considered practical to extend controls to these areas at this time. There is a limit to how much double yellow line can be effectively enforced.
25	K J Flaxman, Conifers, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
26	The Resident, Dolomiti, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
27	Ms L Coakes, Dorset Villa, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
28	The Resident, Heather Cottage, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12 5QS	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
29	Mrs K W Sirman, Sirando, Woollards Road, Ash Vale GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
30	Mr D Allcock, 1 Elmbridge Villars, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
31	The Resident, Glenwood, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
32	Mr & Mrs T & J Payne, 2 Elmbridge Villas, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
33	Mr D Brooks, Tradewinds, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
34	Mr P Attwood, 4 Rose Villas, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
35	Mr T Batterbee, Kentlyn, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
36	Mr G A Blackman, 46 Wharf Road, Ash Vale, GU12 5AY	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
37	Mr Gillett, 1 Willowdene, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
38	Mr T F Moore, Hillcrest, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12 5DS	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
39	The Resident, Dar es Salaam, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
40	The Resident, The Pines, Woollards Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
41	Claire Richardson, 35 Chart House Road, Ash Vale	Very much opposed to the restrictions in Chart House Road due to the impact that the DYs will have for visitors in the evening and at weekends. Would prefer SYL around turning head, although suggests proposed SYL opposite driveways will cause issues	The proposals have been amended and we are looking to change the whole road to single yellow line restricted to Monday to Saturday 8.30 to 6.00pm.
42	Mrs Hall, 83 Sycamore Drive, Ash Vale, GU12 5JY	Additional restrictions need to be considered in Sycamore Drive and the Restrictions in Birch Way should be NWAAT, and additional car parking is required for commuters.	Sycamore Drive is fairly straight and we do not consider further restrictions are necessary at this time. We also consider the restrictions proposed for Birch Way are adequate. The aim is not to displace commuters but to improve access and safety.
43	Mrs E Stevens 27 Sycamore Drive, Ash Vale, GU12 5JY	Whilst supportive of restrictions, expects that the displacement will make things worse in Sycamore Drive, and therefore would like additional restrictions there and additional facilities for commuters near the station.	Sycamore Drive is fairly straight and we do not consider further restrictions are necessary at this time.
44	Mr & Mrs Philips, Oak Tree Lodge, Woollards Road, Ash Vale GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
45	The Resident, Nuestro, Woollards Road, Ash Vale GU12	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
46	Mr J M Robertson, Brambles, Woollards Road, Ash Vale GU12 5DR	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
47	Mr A C & Mrs L K Smith, "Jalna", Woollards Road, Ash Vale GU12 5DR	Generally supportive and in favour of junction protection around Woollards Road.	Noted
48	Mr R Campbell, 20 Chart House Road, Ash Vale, GU12	Would prefer 1 or 2 Hour Limited Waiting in Chart House Road. Southwest Trains should be approached to provide for their customers. Yellow lines should be a last resort.	1 or 2 hour limited waiting would also affect residents. We have amended the proposal and are now suggesting a single yellow line which would control parking Monday to Saturday 8.30 to 6.00pm but give residents flexibility outside these times.
49	Mr & Mrs R G Wilson, 50 Wharf Road, Ash Vale, Aldershot, Hants GU12 5AY	The proposals will cause displacement. There is a need for residents' only parking on one side of Wharf Road and surrounding streets, with DYs on opposite side. These will need to be enforced.	The proposals may cause some displacement. Residents' parking is not viable for this relatively small area and will simply increase the problem in other areas. We do not believe it is necessary to have a double yellow line on one side.
50	Ms J Bew, 1 Milton Grange, Ash Vale GU12	Further restrictions around health centre and railway station will not assist present issues. There is a need to use MOD land at both locations for car parking. Issues in Prospect Road need to be addressed.	The restrictions are proposed to deter parking on the corners or in a way which restricts traffic movement. It is not considered practical to restrict parking in Prospect Road.
51	Mr G Bailey, Fernwood House, Foxhurst Road, Ash Vale GU12 5DY	Limited waiting will displace long stay parking into residential areas, exacerbating existing issues. Need to create and man a 2-hour limited waiting car park on recreation ground.	The proposals may cause some displacement. There are a number of free car parks already in the area and the proposals should encourage greater use of these.
52	Ms E MacDonald, Penhallow, Enfield Road, Ash Vale GU12	The junction of Prospect Road and Enfield Road is an accident waiting to happen. When is something going to be done to resolve this?	Vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction. There is a limit to how many double yellow lines we can effectively police but the situation will be monitored.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
53	Mr D C Thomas, 10 Gorselands Close, Ash Vale GU12 5EF	The junction of Hutton Road and Heathvale Bridge Road by The Swan PH is very dangerous and double parking needs addressing. Prospect Road has similar issues near undulations and bends. The former compromises emergency access. Enforcement must also be undertaken.	Vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction. There is a limit to how many double yellow lines we can effectively police. We will keep it under review.
54	Mrs J Willingham, 109 Wentworth Crescent, Ash Vale, Surrey GU12 5LQ	Non-resident parking causes access problems. Wentworth Crescent is in a poor state of repair. The road is never swept. Additional parking is badly needed and a 7am-10am commuter ban would help. REQUEST FOR DISABLED BAY.	The proposals will restrict parking around the bend and at the junctions but will allow parking in the rest of the Crescent. A commuter ban will simply move the problem elsewhere. Request for a disabled bay has been passed on.
55	Ms M Moseley, 40 Wentworth Crescent, Ash Vale, Surrey GU12	Fully supportive of the proposals and awaits full implementation.	Noted and thanks
56	Cllr N Manning, 40 Wentworth Crescent, Ash Vale, Surrey GU12	Fully supportive of the proposals including Star Lane and Chester Road, but would like SYL on both sides of Chandler Road beyond Newlands Drive, which MOD would support.	The restrictions are proposed to deter parking on the corners or in a way which restricts traffic movement.
57	Mr J Bragg, 4 Canal Cottages, Ash Vale, Surrey GU12	Restrictions in Star Lane should extend further from junction with Shawfield Road and kerblines adjusted. DYLS in vicinity of canal bridge, Vale Road should be extended 10 m further towards shop.	We have reviewed both suggestions and believe the proposals are adequate.
58	Mr A Bew, 1 Milton Grange, Ash Vale GU12 5DU	The proposals will speed up traffic and displace parking to the detriment of people wishing to visit the health centre. The railway station needs a further 250-500 space car park nearby, possibly on MOD land.	The proposals will improve sight lines and traffic flow around the health centre. Building a car park on MOD land is outside the scope of this review.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
59	Lt. Col. D J E Kallend, 29 Wharf Road, Ash Vale, GU12 5AY	The present situation in Wharf Road is difficult but the proposals will increase the likelihood of the driveways to Nos.29&31 being obstructed. Introduction of advisory driveway protection markings were agreed in Feb 03 but not introduced as the applicant could not afford it. The yellow lines should be extended to protect driveways.	Vehicles should not park causing an obstruction and the situation can be monitored and if appropriate driveway access protection markings can be considered.
60	Mr P B Jones, 54 Wharf Road, Ash Vale GU12 5AY	SYLs should replace proposed DYLS wherever possible. Weekday issues are the main problem, not 24Hr Saturday and Sunday. Uncertain DYLS will be enforced at all times.	We have limited the proposals for double yellow lines to where they are necessary. There is limited enforcement but where it is necessary to restrict parking 24 hours a day DYL have been proposed.
61	Mr A J Clarke, 7 Wentworth Close, Ash Vale, GU12 5NB	Supportive of principles but believes DYLS in Wentworth Close should extend beyond 1st driveways on both sides.	We consider the DYLS are adequate as proposed.
62	Mrs M A Clarke, 7 Wentworth Close, Ash Vale, GU12 5NB		
63	Mr D C Thomas, Oakview, 10 Gorselands Close, Ash Vale GU12 5EF	The lack of enforcement of the existing restrictions is an issue. Additional parking facilities should be created near the health centre to cater for the hugely enlarged practice. The issues around The Swan PH in Hutton Road need to be addressed. SYLs should be applied to one side of road. Supportive of 1-2 hour time limit.	The resources available for enforcement are being reviewed. We are allowing parking where it is safe and practical. Normal SYL would not restrict parking after 6.00pm or on Sundays. The problems around the pub occur outside these times.
64	Mr & Mrs J M Bliss, Merryvale, Grenadier Road, Ash Vale, GU12 5DT	Additional parking is needed in vicinity of Ash Vale railway station. Supportive of junction protection measures although this may displace more parking into Grenadier Road, which is already a problem.	The aim of the proposals is to allow parking where it is safe and practical but to deter parking from junctions and other areas where it causes a problem.
65	Mr D & Mrs F Blake, 183 Vale Road, Ash Vale GU12	No opposition to the proposals in Wood Street.	Noted

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
66	The Proprietors, K & S Hair Studio, No. 7 the Parade, Wharf Road, Ash Vale GU12 5AZ	Limited waiting proposals will inconvenience clients who often stay for longer than 2 hours, as well as those that choose to combine their visit with other shopping. Where will workers park? There are also safety issues for women, particularly when it's dark.	The limited waiting period will make it easier for customers to visit the shops. Those who are staying longer will need to park further away.
67	Mr A Davies, 45 Wharf Road, Ash Vale GU12	Supportive of proposals but would like road / pavement parking outside The Swan PH addressed in Hutton Road.	The problems here occur outside times when we have enforcement staff and we would not be able to enforce it effectively.
68	Mr & Mrs J Day, 24 Prospect Road, Ash Vale GU12 5ED	Problems in Prospect Road are far more of an issue than those in Chandlers Road, and will only get worse if the proposals in the latter are introduced. There is a need for effective enforcement.	We are proposing restrictions around both junctions. Chandlers Road is much narrower than Prospect Road so there is a need for further restrictions to maintain traffic flow.
69	Mr S Cooper, 58 Wharf Road, Ash Vale GU12 5AY	Increased controls will reduce available spaces thereby increasing pressure on those that remain, necessitating a residents' parking scheme.	Increased controls may lead to some displacement but a residents' parking scheme is not viable over such a small area. The problems around the Swan PH occur outside the time enforcement officers are employed and could not be dealt with effectively within existing resources.
70	Mrs D Cooper, 58 Wharf Road, Ash Vale GU12 5AY	Controls are required in vicinity of The Swan PH. The proposals in Wharf Road will not resolve congestion problems near shops but will displace issues into residential areas. Needs residents' parking.	
71	Mr J S Grant, The Birches, Crescent Lane, Prospect Road, Ash Vale GU12 5EE	Restrictions and traffic calming are needed in Prospect Road beyond Hill and Crescent Lane. Problems will be exacerbated by displacement caused by proposed restrictions in Wharf Road.	There is a limit to the extent of restrictions we can effectively police but the situation will be monitored.
72	Mr & Mrs D F Dawson, 27 Charthouse Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	DYLS would be acceptable although SYLS would be preferred.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines throughout the road.
73	Mr K Berryman, 58 Wentworth Crescent, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	Motorway Tyres site in Lysons Avenue should be acquired and converted into a car park for rail commuters. Roads and pavements in Wentworth Crescent are in poor condition and need attention.	These comments are outside the scope of this review but have been noted.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
74	Mr I A Pendleton & Mr J A Evans, 31 Chart House Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	Cars parked on corner of Chart House Road are a problem. SYLs Mon-Fri 8am-6pm would be appropriate for turning head.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines Monday to Saturday 8.30 to 6.00 throughout the road.
75	Mr L P & Mrs E G Gregory, 64 Wentworth Crescent, Ash Vale GU12 5LQ	Generally supportive of proposals in Wentworth Crescent, although areas that remain uncontrolled already have excessive wear and tear, and lack of access for sweeping and gutters. All day parking should not be permitted for non-residents.	Preventing all day parking for non-residents would simply move the problem to other roads.
76	Mr & Mrs Allen, 9 Wentworth Close, Ash Vale GU12 5NB	Generally supportive of proposals in Wentworth Crescent, although additional DYLS need to be considered around bend in Wentworth Close.	We have amended the proposals to include this suggestion.
77	Mr D G Marchant, 175 Avondale, Ash Vale GU12 5SN	No need for restrictions in Fir Acre or Wood Street. Present levels of enforcement inadequate so why introduce more restrictions? Pavement and verge parking in Avondale is a problem and no action is taken against those parked on DYLS, particularly at the weekend.	The proposal is to simply protect the junctions of Fir Acre and Wood Street with Vale Road. We can only take action against a contravention of a parking order, most pavement parking is not covered, but we will look at parking on DYLS at weekends.
78	Ms J Webb	Supports restrictions in Birch Way although consideration should be given to deal with the problem of verge parking in Station Road East, as this problem is likely to get worse as a result. Parking restrictions or physical means should be considered.	The restrictions in Station Road East are considered sufficient. Physical means of stopping verge parking is outside the remit of this review but will be passed to those who can consider it.
79	Mr G B Gilder	Very surprised issues outside The Swan PH in Hutton Road are not addressed by the proposals. Parking close to the junction and on the pavements are major issues. Rigidly applied restraint on parking required.	The problems around the Swan PH occur outside the time enforcement officers are employed and could not be dealt with effectively within existing resources.
80	Mr E & Mrs J Mitchell, 34 Charthouse Road, Ash Vale GU12	Residents are not the problem, so implement SYLs instead of DYLS to improve flexibility for residents and their visitors.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines throughout the road.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
81	Mrs Bridges, Bridge-End, Shawfield Road, Ash GU12 5DL	A 20-min Limited Waiting period should be applied in Shawfield Road adjacent to Wharf Road. Enforcement of existing restrictions in Bus Stop lay-by should be undertaken. The latter makes accessing adjacent properties difficult if cars are parked in the lay-by.	A 20-minute waiting period would be difficult to enforce and out of step with the 2-hour maximum proposed in Wharf Road. The bus stop is already controlled by a DYL. The transient nature of the parking in this location makes enforcement more difficult within existing resources.
82	Mr D H Roser, 1 Newlands Drive, Ash Vale, GU12	SYL required beyond Newlands Drive to prevent obstruction and proposed SYL in Chandlers Road should be on property side. A pipe should be installed to remove surface water, as the blocked ditch is ineffective. If shrubs were cut back more parking could be provided.	The restrictions are proposed to deter parking on the corners or in a way which restricts traffic movement. The single yellow line is being proposed on the property side. Other comments noted.
83	Mr G Talling, 11 Wentworth Close, Ash Vale GU12 5NB	Generally supportive of proposals in Wentworth Crescent, although additional DYLS need to be considered around bend in Wentworth Close, and proposed controls may displace vehicles elsewhere. A much larger car park is required to service the needs of the rail commuters. Access and safety will still be issues in many areas around the station.	We have added a double yellow line round the bend in Wentworth Close. The proposals will improve access and safety. Comment about the car park noted.
84	Mrs J Divers, 8 Newfield Road, Ash Vale, GU12 5LG	Existing and proposed restrictions in Newfield Road need to be extended much further. Restrictions in the Vale Road service road has resulted in vehicles travelling more quickly.	The proposed restriction in Newfield Road will deter parking on the junction with Wentworth Crescent and is considered adequate. Extending the lines would lead to greater displacement of the existing parking and greater problems elsewhere. Sometimes preventing parking does increase traffic speeds.
85	Mrs P Broome, 4 Newfield Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LG	Existing and proposed restrictions in Newfield Road need to be extended much further. The roads is effectively a free car park.	The proposed restriction in Newfield Road will deter parking on the junction with Wentworth Crescent and is considered adequate. Extending the lines would lead to greater displacement of the existing parking and greater problems elsewhere.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
86	Mr F Bridges, Bridge-End, Shawfield Road, Ash GU12 5DL	A time limit should be applied to non-residents in Shawfield Road adjacent to Wharf Road. Enforcement of existing restrictions in Bus Stop lay-by should be undertaken or it should be converted into a parking bay, which is its main use at present.	A 20-minute waiting period would be difficult to enforce and out of step with the 2-hour maximum proposed in Wharf Road. The bus stop is already controlled by a DYL. The transient nature of the parking in this location makes enforcement more difficult within existing resources.
87	Mr A Farrar, 32 Chart House Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	Objects most strongly to DYLS as this will disadvantage residents and their visitors. No consideration of their needs appears to have been given. Wants 'no commuter' signs, residents' parking with free visitors permits. The state of repair of Chart House Road leaves a lot to be desired and the recycling services could learn from Rushmoor BC.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines throughout the road. The controls would apply between 8.30 and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday and would give residents greater flexibility outside these times. 'No commuter' signs would have no force and a permit scheme is not viable for this small area.
88	Mr L King, 82 Cypress Grove, Ash Vale GU12	The proposals will simply displace parking elsewhere in Avondale. The same principle applies to the remainder of Ash Vale. Unless parking in Avondale is prioritised for residents and visitors there will be little benefit.	The proposals will deter parking where it causes the greatest problems but allow it to continue where parking is practical. A residents' parking scheme is not viable and would simply move the problem to other roads.
89	Cllr J Hewlett, 7 College Road, Ash GU12 5BT	Would like yellow line extended beyond access to Newlands Drive. Present proposals would not assist residents of Newlands Drive who already have access problems.	The restrictions are proposed to deter parking on the corners or in a way which restricts traffic movement.
90	Mrs M Court, 24 Chart House Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	Commuters also use Chart House Road at weekends so DYLS would seem appropriate.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines throughout the road applying Monday to Saturday 8.30 to 6.00pm.
91	Mrs J Cato, Carlyon, Northcote Road, Ash Vale GU12	Proposals elsewhere could cause problems in Northcote Road. Therefore a SYL with restricted parking to prevent commuter parking should be considered.	We are restricting parking on bends, at junctions and where it causes greatest problems. The aim is not to prevent commuter parking as this would just displace it into other roads.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
92	Ms S Downing & Mr W Paetz, 34 Wharf Road, Ash Vale GU12	Existing advisory restrictions in Wharf Road need to continue past Wheelers Solicitors. Yellow lines should be painted on one side of Wharf Road Only (those with driveways) to avoid need for restrictions on terraced side. A reduced speed limit should be introduced, lorries should be restricted to access only, traffic calming bump should be converted to zebra crossing, and for everything to succeed there needs to be adequate monitoring and enforcement.	We have amended the proposal to include an unrestricted parking bay outside Wheelers Solicitors which will prevent double parking. The proposal is for double yellow lines around the junctions to protect sight lines but to allow parking elsewhere. The other comments are outside the scope of the review but are noted.
93	The Residents of, 29, 31,32, 32a, 34, 36, 38, 40 & 42 Wharf Road, Ash Vale GU12	Whilst some of the proposals are welcome, those in the vicinity of the terraced properties will reduce the available space for residents. The existing advisory restrictions in Wharf Road already reduce parking, although they are abused by non-residents. The advisory restrictions adjacent to Wheelers Solicitors should be enforced. Yellow lines should be painted on one side of Wharf Road Only (those with driveways) to protect those driveways and to avoid need for restrictions on terraced side. Some residents are disabled and need better access. There is a need for residents' permit parking. A 20mph speed limit should be introduced, lorries should be restricted to access only, and for everything to succeed there needs to be adequate monitoring and enforcement.	We have amended the proposal to include an unrestricted parking bay outside Wheelers Solicitors which will prevent double parking. The proposal is for double yellow lines around the junctions to protect sight lines. The other comments are outside the scope of the review but are noted.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
94	Mrs Sue McKenna, 32A Wharf Road, Ash Vale	Double parking outside Wheelers Solicitors presently causes problems, particularly for lorries. Advisory restrictions in this area should be extended. Yellow lines should be introduced on one side (driveway side) only. A reduced speed limit should be introduced, lorries should be restricted to access only, traffic calming bump should be converted to zebra crossing.	We have amended the proposal to include an unrestricted parking bay outside Wheelers Solicitors which will prevent double parking. The proposal is for double yellow lines around the junctions to protect sight lines. The other comments are outside the scope of the review but are noted.
95	Tim Dixon, 31 Wharf Road, Ash Vale, GU12 5AY	Although generally supportive of the proposals, concerned at the subsequent loss of parking for residents. Nevertheless, the DYL restrictions should be continued outside Wheelers Solicitors to prevent double parking. Provision should be made for the disabled residents living in the terraced properties. The DYLs should also be extended across the accesses for Nos.29&31.	We have amended the proposal to include an unrestricted parking bay outside Wheelers Solicitors which will prevent double parking. The proposal is for double yellow lines around the junctions to protect sight lines and to allow parking elsewhere. We would not normally place restrictions just to protect a driveway. The disabled residents can apply for disabled parking bays and park on yellow lines for up to three hours with a blue badge.
96	Ms C White, 32 Chart House Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	The parked problems caused by commuters who park all day, every day are different to the issues created by residents and their visitors, who come and go. The proposed DYL is too restrictive and unreasonable. The condition of the footways needs to be addressed swiftly.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines throughout the road. The condition of the footway is outside the scope of this review but her concerns have been passed on.
97	Mr Davis, 31 Sycamore Drive, Ash Vale GU12 5JY	Suggests a daytime SYL on both sides along the entire length of Birch Way, and a commuter ban SYL introduced in Northcote Road. Similarly DYLs should be introduced on one side of Station Road West. These restrictions added to those suggested will invariably cause verge parking to increase which needs to be addressed. There is a need for effective enforcement. Could Avondale be a 20mph zone?	We are restricting parking on bends, at junctions and where it causes greatest problems. The aim is not to prevent commuter parking as this would just displace it into other roads. The question of speed limit is outside the scope of this review but will be passed on.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
98	Mr M Leppard, 25 Chart House Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	Whilst DYLS are more restrictive it is workable as residents and their visitors rarely have to park on street. A residents' survey suggested preference for SYLs throughout Chart House Road, providing greater flexibility in the evening and at weekends, particularly as residents park more considerately.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines throughout the road.
99	Ms M Tait, 24 Wharf Road, Ash Vale GU12	Has a survey of parking been undertaken? Concerned that there are no issues to address, but proposals will simply make it more difficult for residents to park. Wants a residents' parking scheme. Planning / parking should be encouraging mixed use not segregation.	Parking in the area has been studied. The feedback clearly shows that there are issues to address. A residents' parking scheme would not be viable in this relatively small area and would simply push the problem elsewhere.
100	Miss J L Goodhand & Mr P R Bampton , Troodos, 1 Foxhurst Road, Ash Vale GU12 5DY	What about providing for long stay parking. Limited waiting in vicinity of shops and restrictions in vicinity of health centre will cause displacement and congestion into side roads. Additional provision needs to be created on the Recreation Ground and on the MOD land. Restrictions also need to be introduced in the vicinity of The Swan in Hutton Road.	There are a number of free car parks in Ash Vale and parking is only being restricted where necessary. Additional off street parking is outside the scope of this review. The problems around the Swan PH occurs outside the time enforcement officers are employed and could not be dealt with effectively within existing resources.
101	Mr P Toates, 15 Rosemary Avenue, Ash Vale GU12	Whilst supportive of the proposals, concerned that they may encourage commuters to park in Rosemary Avenue.	The proposal for Rosemary Avenue is to protect the junction with Frimley Road. It is possible that anyone currently parking on the corner will move further into the road but it is unlikely that commuter parking will spread that far.
102	Chris Burrage	What justification is there for the proposals around North Camp Station ? The present parking does not affect access.	Parking around North Camp Station restricts the bus access and makes the road difficult to pass for both vehicles and pedestrians.
103	Mrs A Ludwig, 17 Chart House Road, Ash Vale GU12	Would prefer Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm SYL as opposed to DYL	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines throughout the road.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
104	Mr I Pendleton, 31 Chart House Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	Generally supportive as parking for residents isn't a problem, but could not 'limited waiting' single yellow (commuter ban be introduced) to deter commuters whilst still allowing residents and visitors to park.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines Monday to Saturday throughout the road.
105	Mr R France, 76 Prospect Road, Ash Vale GU12 5EL	Who will enforce the 2-hour restrictions? There is need for additional facilities to be created in the vicinity of the health centre and couldn't Coronation Gardens be made more user friendly. The proposed restrictions will inhibit parking although there is a need to extend the DYL outside Vale Furnishings and in front of Bridges Estate Agents. Additional restrictions should also be considered in Prospect Road near Elleray Court.	The 2-hour limit will be enforced by the Borough Council on behalf of the County Council. Coronation Gardens is outside the scope of this review. The area outside Vale Furnishings is restricted. We do not consider additional restrictions on Prospect Road are practical.
106	Daniel Hill, 49 Cypress Grove, Ash Vale GU12	Generally supportive, although concerned that it will simply displace the existing problem further into Cypress Grove and elsewhere. A proper residents' parking scheme would be useful. Could something be done to prevent commuters parking on the pavements and verges. Commuters also cause issues for the small number of residential properties in Lysons Avenue, where additional restrictions would be of benefit.	The restrictions may cause drivers to park in other parts of the road but they are intended to keep them away from areas where parking is dangerous or unduly restricts traffic flow. A residents' parking scheme is not viable and pavement and verge parking can only be enforced against by GBC where there are restrictions. Creating a car park on the recreation ground is outside the remit of this review.
107	Mr D S Davison, 49 Cypress Grove, Ash Vale GU12	What will be done to stop commuters who already encroach in unrestricted areas designated for residents. Households with numerous cars are also a problem. Please introduce a permit only scheme across the whole area with a maximum of 2 permits per household and visitors permits. Perhaps a car park could be created at the Recreation Ground for others.	

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
108	Stuart Smith	Whilst generally supportive of the proposals in the immediate vicinity of the level crossing and junction with Lysons Avenue, the restrictions away from these are unnecessary. Reducing parking may encourage it to become a rat run. There is scope to create additional parking near pub.	The proposed restrictions provide space for parking where it is practical. The proposed level of restriction is considered necessary.
109	Mr & Mrs Howes, 7 Exeter Road, Ash	Whilst generally supportive, believe the limited waiting restrictions in Wharf Road should be restricted to 1 hour. The present levels of enforcement are inadequate and the restrictions are flouted. Where will the displaced vehicles go? Better signing is needed to Coronation Gardens car park.	A 1-hour limited waiting period would be harder to enforce and may not provide sufficient time for some shopping trips. The displaced vehicles will have to find suitable alternative parking. The sign for Coronation Gardens is outside the scope of this review but will be passed on.
110	Mr J Glyde, Pitcairn, Grove Road, Ash GU12 5BD	Proposals are good although there is a need to provide alternatives and enforce the restrictions.	The proposal in Grove Road protects sight lines around the junction with Ash Hill Road. Vehicles currently parking on this corner will have to park away from the junction.
111	Mrs J E Ramsay, 33 Charthouse Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	Opposes proposals for Chart House Road. Only the commuters vehicles that park on the bends on the pavements cause issues and the proposed controls are excessive and would inconvenience residents and their visitors. Adequate parking should be provided at the station.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines applying Monday to Saturday 8.30 to 6.00 throughout the road.
112	Mr G D Emms, Ellera Lodge, 31 Prospect Road, Ash Vale GU12 5ED	The problems in Prospect Road and Hutton Road appear to have been overlooked. The proposed restrictions in Wharf Road will simply displace the problems into Prospect Road, exacerbating the existing problems there.	The problems around the Swan PH occurs outside the time enforcement officers are employed and could not be dealt with effectively within existing resources.
113	Mrs C Nichols, 18 Chart House Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	Does not feel DYLS are necessary, preferring to see SYLS (Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm) introduced throughout 'close'.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines Monday to Friday throughout the road.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
114	Residents of Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive, Ash Vale	Unanimously oppose the proposals as they are unworkable. Allowing parking on one side will not resolve the current access / servicing / emergency issues. Therefore DYLS should be introduced on both sides throughout Chandlers Road. The Health Centre should be pressured into providing additional (more adequate) facilities for their facility.	The proposals will improve access to Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive but there is a need for patients to visit the Health Centre.
115	Ms R Thomas & Mr I Wells, 1 Eynsford Villas, Chandlers Road, Ash Vale	If parking is allowed opposite access to off street parking is made extremely difficult and if cars are allowed on both sides impossible.	The proposal is to restrict parking on the residents side.
116	Mrs J Pearce, Conway Cottage, Chandlers Road, Ash Vale GU12 5DX	Access for sick and elderly residents is essential and has not been possible previously.	The proposals will improve access to Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive but there is a need for patients to visit the Health Centre.
117	Ms J Ayres, 2 Newlands Drive, Ash Vale	See 115	
118	Mrs S Clode, 3 Newlands Drive, Ash Vale GU12 5EA	The proposals will not resolve the present issues caused by visitors to the Health Centre, recreational users of the ranges and lorries at all times. DYLS throughout is the only solution.	The proposals will improve access to Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive but there is a need for patients to visit the Health Centre.
119	Mr A and Ms M Pearce, 4 Newlands Drive, Ash Vale GU12 5EA	See 115. Surely the right of access is paramount.	The proposals will improve access to Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive but there is a need for patients to visit the Health Centre.
120	Mr G Davis & Mrs W Davis, 5 Newlands Drive, Ash GU12 5EA	Whilst consideration of the issue is welcomed the proposals will not resolve the present issues. Also See 115	The proposals will improve access to Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive but there is a need for patients to visit the Health Centre.
121	Ms R Edwards & Ms J Edwards, 8 Newlands Drive, Ash Vale	By allowing cars to still park on the ditch side of the road would not resolve the present issues, and may cause issues with the ditch. DYLS on both sides is the best solution.	The proposals will improve access to Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive but there is a need for patients to visit the Health Centre.
122	Mr M V Roser, 9 Newlands Drive, Ash Vale GU12 5EA	Existing parking on one side of Chandlers Road causes access issues for residents.	The proposals will improve access to Chandlers Road and Newlands Drive but there is a need for patients to visit the Health Centre.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
123	Mr D A Ramsay, 33 Chart House Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	The proposals do nothing to assist residents or commuters, reducing the availability of space rather than creating more. Commuters do not generally cause issues in Chart House Road and the minority that do can be dealt with by the Police. Never has emergency / service access been an issue. Only 5 of 17 residents support a complete ban. No change would be preferred.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines Monday to Saturday throughout the road.
124	Ms D Bunch, 2 Wentworth Close, Ash Vale GU12 5NB	As chairman of Wentworth Close Residents' Association fully support the DYLS at the junction with Wentworth Crescent, although would also like to see additional controls on the bend in the Close.	The proposal have been amended to include DYLS on the bend in Wentworth Close.
125	Mr D F Dawson, 27 Charthouse Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	A SYL in Chart House Road would be sufficient, although the proposed length would cause difficulties for larger vehicles. SYL would allow residents' visitors to park legally. Commuters are the problem.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines Monday to Saturday throughout the road.
126	Ms K Simmons	Wants bus stops to be controlled by no stopping clearway restrictions so that enforcement action can be taken against motorists that obstruct buses.	This is outside the scope of this review.
127	Mr D J & Mrs C D Harris, 22 Chart House Road, Ash Vale GU12 5LS	Whilst generally supportive of the proposals, as commuters are a problem, the proposed DYLS in Chart House Road are too restrictive and will inconvenience residents and their visitors. SYLs 8am-4pm are the solution.	We have revised the proposals and written to all residents suggesting single yellow lines Monday to Saturday 8.30 to 6.00pm throughout the road.
128	Mr S Aslett	Additional restrictions need to be considered in Lysons Avenue adjacent to refuges. Restrictions in Birch Way and Cypress Grove will half the already limited parking. Residents' parking is needed to prevent commuter and local business parking.	It is not normal to restrict areas adjacent to pedestrian refuges. Motorists should not and do not normally park adjacent to them. A residents' parking scheme is not viable in this area.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
129	Mr E Jures	Cannot see benefit of the proposed SYL in Lynchford Road as it reduces the amount of parking available. The station car park is small, busy, inaccessible and expensive. It will displace commuters elsewhere or force them to consider driving to their destinations. The DYLS at the level crossing are beneficial.	Parking on both sides on Lynchford Road restricts traffic movement and the ability of the bus to pass. The proposals make it easier for commuters to travel by bus.
130	Mr A Norris, 3 Avon Close, Ash GU12 6NS	Need to create additional space in Ash Vale Station Car Park by introducing bays outside Boat House and flats. Need for restrictions at junction of Frimley Road and Stratford Road, Star Lane and Ash Street, and near bend in Prospect Road. However, restrictions in turning head in Station Road East should be removed to create additional parking.	The road is private with the car park side being owned and run by Guildford Borough Council. The other suggestions have been reviewed and while restrictions could be applied to every junction we have had no reported issues with these junctions nor do we consider it practical to extend controls to the bend in Prospect Road.
131	Miss S Cousins & Mr D Sworn, 166 Avondale, Ash Vale, GU12 5NG	Proposed restrictions can't come soon enough, although is there anything that can be done to prevent commuters from moving further into Avondale estate and parking on verges.	Parking on the verge can only be controlled by our enforcement if there are restrictions in place, and these are not ordinarily introduced to deal with off-carriageway issues.
132	Mr R A Baldwin, 76 Wentworth Crescent, Ash Vale GU12 5LQ	Wentworth Crescent has been allowed to become an overflow car park for railway station. Parking should be prevented opposite drives. DYLS are not the answer and simply displace the issue. Want SYLs with Midnight to 10.30am timing to deter commuters.	Deterring commuters would simply move the problem into other roads.
133	Mrs E Back, 83 Wentworth Crescent, Ash Vale GU12	Whilst supportive of the proposals, concerned that they do not go far enough and restrictions elsewhere will exacerbate the existing access problems in Wentworth Crescent which occur Monday-Friday.	Deterring commuters would simply move the problem into other roads.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2

Number	Name & Address	Comments	Officer Recommendation
134	Mr P J Vickers, 'The Butts', Crescent Lane, Ash Vale GU12 5EE	Welcomes proposals although long term parking should be restricted to car park opposite Victoria Hall, Ash Hill Road, the Centre car park should be restricted to 2 hours, parking in village roads restricted to 30 minutes, and additional yellow lines introduced in Wharf Road to allow 2-way flow. Proper enforcement is also required.	Deterring commuters would simply move the problem into other roads.
135	Ms Shahida Arshad, 2a Wharf Road, Ash Vale, GU12 5AZ	Unlike many flats above the shops No2a does not have off street parking and is therefore reliant on public on street parking in the area. Much of this is taken up by the estate agents.	The proposal will limit parking outside the shops to a maximum of 2 hours 8.30 to 6.00pm Monday to Saturday . Those needing to park for longer will need to use the car park or other parking .