



PARKING IN RIPLEY

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

27th SEPTEMBER 2007

KEY ISSUE

This report presents the representations made in response to a formal advertisement for the introduction of additional parking restrictions and changes to existing restrictions in Ripley.

SUMMARY

Following extensive consultation and revision to initial proposals for parking restrictions in Ripley the scheme agreed by the Committee has been advertised. This report sets out the representations which have been made in response to the advertisement. The number of objections to the scheme has increased since the initial consultation but the issues raised are similar. The report recommends implementing the scheme with a minor reduction in the area covered.

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 objections are not supported other than those relating to the restrictions outside Perseverance Cottages,
- (i) the scheme is implemented with a minor change to the boundary as set out on the plan in **ANNEXE 3**,
- (ii) a traffic regulation order is made under the relevant sections of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 giving effect to the proposals.

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. 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 disabled.
- 2 The proposals were promoted on the Guildford Borough Council's (GBC) website and on signs in the village. Ripley Parish Council (RPC) also helped to promote the consultation.
- 3 An exhibition was held at the Village Hall, Ripley on 7th November 2006 and representatives from RPC, GBC and Surrey County Council (SCC) were available to discuss issues. The exhibition was attended by 72 people and 56 written comments were received relating to the proposals.
- 4 The written responses to the initial consultation were reported to the Local Committee on 22 March 2007. Officers proposed a number of key amendments to the previous plans in response to the comments received. The Committee agreed the recommendation to formally advertise SCC's intention to make an order giving effect to the amended proposals.
- 5 The proposals were advertised in the Surrey Advertiser on 8 June 2007 and on notices throughout the area. The proposals are shown on the 3 plans attached as **ANNEXE 2**. The closing date for comments was 6 July. This report details the comments and objections received as a result of the formal advertisement. The initial consultation is intended to highlight issues so they can be considered before the proposals are advertised. Once proposals are advertised any significant changes to the scheme require the new proposals to be advertised afresh.

ANALYSIS OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 6 75 representations were received from 55 addresses, including multiple representations from a number of addresses. In no case do comments from the same address contradict each other; more often the comments are repeated word for word. Many of the representations made multiple points and are counted in more than one of the areas described below.

- 7 Of the 75 representations, 4 were petitions signed by 123, 15, 14 and 4 people respectively. 52 of the representations were in the form of a pro forma/standard letters.
- 8 A new Parish Council was elected in May 2007 and held its own meeting with residents on the evening of Monday 2nd July 2007, four days before the deadline for comments. All but two of the objections to the scheme were received after this meeting. There was also an objection from the Parish Council itself.
- 9 The details of each representation are set out in **ANNEXE 1** and Members of the Committee are asked to consider these. If Members of the Committee would like to see the original submissions please contact the author. There are four main areas of concern:
- Perseverance Cottages
 - Newark Lane
 - Rose Lane
 - Parking to the east of the village

Perseverance Cottages

- 10 The original proposal was to restrict parking on the highway outside the cottages using a single yellow line which would be controlled 8.30am to 6.00 pm Monday to Friday. This restriction would have enabled Council Parking Attendants to enforce against vehicles parking on the pavement during controlled hours.
- 11 The County Council's policies are designed to segregate vehicles from pedestrians, to encourage people to walk and to improve access. The current standard for a footway recommends a width of 2m. This provides for the use of double buggies, wheelchairs and pedestrians. With vehicles parked on the pavement the width is below the recommended minimum.
- 12 During the initial consultation there were 12 representations against this proposal. Residents of the cottages were particularly concerned about the loss of parking facility and pointed out that the County Council had lowered the kerb in the area 30 years ago to allow parking for vehicles.
- 13 In response to these concerns the amended proposal agreed by the Local Committee proposed a parking place on street to permit parking. Officers tested this by parking vehicles on the highway where the bay was proposed and while traffic speeds entering the village were reduced traffic was able to pass.
- 14 However 60 objections were received in response to the formal advertisement. One of the objections was in the form of a 123-signature petition. The objections stated that the kerb had been lowered to allow pavement parking and that the proposed parking bay on the carriageway was dangerous.

- 15 Officers do not share the view that the proposed bay would be unsafe but in recognition of the level of opposition and the fact that the kerb was previously lowered to allow pavement parking it is recommended that the boundary of the proposed restrictions is moved to exclude the area outside Perseverance Cottages.

Newark Lane

- 16 In the original proposal parking places were suggested on the south side of Newark Lane. These proposals would have had the effect of enabling enforcement by Council Parking Attendants against pavement parking between 8.30am and 6.00pm on Monday to Friday. There was a mixed response to the proposal during the initial consultation. 21 people responded and as a result of concerns about potential congestion the proposals were amended with parking bays only on the North side.
- 17 In response to the formal advertisement there were 48 representations received from 37 addresses. All representations expressed concern about the loss of parking on the pavement and 5 suggested that the proposal would lead to gridlock or make driving less safe.
- 18 Parking on a footway can cause obstruction, reduce the width and break up the surface. It also removes the segregation between motor vehicles on the carriageway and pedestrians on the footway. In Newark Lane the area that is used for parking narrows and parking takes place close to the front doors of houses which lead directly on to the footway.
- 19 There was considerable discussion about Newark Lane during the initial consultation. While road users wanted reduced or no parking, residents wanted more parking. There were concerns about vehicles being stopped from parking on the verge and concern about vehicles driving on the verge presenting a danger to people coming out of their homes. Officers consider the current proposals offer the best compromise.

Rose Lane

- 20 On Rose Lane restrictions were originally proposed to control parking beyond the entrance to Ripley Court School. There were 12 comments following the initial consultation. In response to these the amount of restriction was reduced to stop before the bend near The Cottage. The proposed restrictions around the "triangle" were also revised to allow more parking.
- 21 The formal advertisement resulted in 36 representations from 28 addresses. Generally these suggested that the current situation worked and there was no need for further controls. One representation was in the form of a 4-signature petition and objected to the urbanising effect of controls.

- 22 The original and amended proposals were designed to order the parking and keep vehicles away from driveways and junctions but to allow parking where it is safe. Officers consider that the controls are necessary and with vehicle numbers increasing the need for them will also increase.

Parking Bays to the East of the Village

- 23 In the initial consultation 20 of the 55 submissions mentioned the need for more parking to be created. Officers proposed additional parking to the East of the village in the area around the Talbot Hotel.
- 24 As a result of the formal advertisement 8 representations were received. One representation was opposed to the proposal and 4 others, including a 15-signature petition, suggested that the proposed bay outside York Cottage would compromise safety. One representation supported the proposal and 2 others including a 14-signature petition wanted further parking on the bend between Footbridge House and Ripley House.
- 25 Officers consider that the proposed bays are safe but that the bend is not suitable for parking.

OPTIONS

- 26 Before making a Traffic Regulation Order the proposals have to be advertised and objections considered. The reason for the initial consultation is to establish the issues and to take a view before advertising the proposals. Once the proposals are advertised significant changes cannot be made unless the amendment is advertised. The options are to:
- (i) implement the scheme without change
 - (ii) implement the scheme with a reduced boundary on the west side to exclude restrictions outside and beyond Perseverance Cottages as set out in **ANNEXE 3**.
 - (iii) abandon the proposals,
 - (iv) revise the proposals, consult on the revised proposals and then advertise the new proposals. This would have an effect on timescales for all other work currently being undertaken.

FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 27 The cost of implementing the proposals is estimated at £15,000 including the removal of “no waiting at any time “ signs and posts that are no longer required for double yellow lines.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 28 The report allows for a small number of 'disabled only' parking places to be created.

CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 29 This report has no implications for crime and disorder.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

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

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 31 The number of representations against the scheme has increased but the issues raised are very similar to those highlighted in the initial consultation. Parking restrictions are not always popular and their application needs to be considered in the light of their purpose and not necessarily their popularity. The scheme has been amended and improved as a result of the consultation with road users and residents. The initial consultation and the responses to the formal advertisement shows there are often conflicting points of views which are unlikely to be reconciled.
- 32 It is recommended that the scheme is implemented with a reduced boundary on the High Street to the southwest as outlined in the plan in **ANNEXE 3**. This excludes the area in front of Perseverance Cottages from the proposals.
- 33 The area outside Perseverance Cottages has been excluded as the kerb has previously been lowered to permit parking and the pavement is relatively wide. The remaining restrictions are recommended to improve safety for road users and pedestrians, improve traffic flow, allow parking where safe and practical and improve access for the disabled.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

- 34 If the recommendation is approved the order will be made and quotes will be sought to implement the scheme.

LEAD OFFICER	KEVIN MCKEE, GBC PARKING SERVICES MANAGER
TELEPHONE	01483 444530
BACKGROUND PAPERS	GLC Report - March 2007 – Item 8 - Review of Parking in Ripley

ITEM 9, ANNEXE A : RESPONSES TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

	NAME	COMMENT	OFFICER COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION
2	John Hartley, 186 High Street, Ripley, WOKING GU23 6BB	PETITION signed by 14 signatories, requesting additional on street parking to be provided at the east of the village between Footbridge House and Ripley House, High Street, to slow vehicles down and help local businesses.	Parking on the bend is not practical but we understand that the Parish Council is in discussion with the Talbot Hotel about using some of their space. No change recommended.
15	Ms J Carey, 5 Perseverance Cottages, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AG	PETITION signed by 123 signatories (including the Chairman of Ripley Parish Council and councillors) Opposing proposal outside Perseverance Cottages, High Street. Wishes to retain pavement parking outside cottages, suggesting that the proposed on carriageway bay adjacent will be dangerous.	The report recommends excluding the area outside Perseverance Cottages from the proposals.
26	Ms L Grieves, 14 Rose Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6NE	PETITION signed by 4 signatories, opposing restrictions in Rose Lane due to urbanising affect that it will have. Also opposes proposals for Newark Lane and Perseverance Cottages. The temporary car park in White Hart Meadows is not the solution, due to its uncertain future.	The restrictions in Rose Lane are to prevent vehicles obstructing access, junctions or other parked cars. No change recommended.
59	Ms C Sage, The Green Cottage, William House, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23	PETITION signed by 15 signatories. A permit scheme needs to be developed to allow people who live and work in Ripley to park in the limited waiting parking bays without restriction. A footway should be created from White Hart Meadows car park direct to the shops, and this car parks opening hours should not be restricted. Vehicles entering the village should be slowed down. The proposed parking bay outside York Cottage to the east of the village is dangerous.	A permit scheme would need to cover the whole village and the problems do not justify this. The proposed bay outside York Cottage is more than 22m from the junction and is not dangerous. It will have the effect of slowing traffic down. We are talking to the Parish Council about improving off street parking. The recommendation is to exclude the area outside Perseverance Cottages from the proposals. No other change recommended.
1	John Hartley, J Hartley Antiques Ltd, 186 High Street, Ripley, WOKING GU23 6BB	Although the parking bay outside York Cottage and Talbot Hotel is a good idea, it is still insufficient to meet the needs of businesses at the east end of the village. Parking needs to be provided on the bend between Ripley House and Footbridge House, not only to increase provision, but to also calm traffic.	Parking on the bend is not practical but we understand that the Parish Council is in discussion with the Talbot Hotel about using some of their space. No change recommended.

ITEM 9, ANNEXE A : RESPONSES TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

	NAME	COMMENT	OFFICER COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION
3	Mrs J Gardner, Tanglewood, White Horse Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BB	Whilst supportive of the introduction of parking at the east of the village, feels that the introduction of a formalised bay outside York Cottage is dangerous as it is too close to the junction with White Horse Lane and will restrict visibility for the oncoming, speeding vehicles.	The parking bay is more than 22m from the junction with White Horse Lane. No change recommended.
11	Mr J P Walker, Longwood Developments, Lutidine House, Newark Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BS	Opposes proposals to introduce formalised on street parking in Newark Lane and removed of pavement / verge parking in Newark Lane, suggesting that this will lead to instances of obstruction and increase danger.	The proposed parking in Newark Lane is in areas where parking already takes place. The formalised parking is likely to prevent vehicles travelling at high speeds. No change recommended to the proposals for Newark Lane.
18	Mrs R Hewitt, 'Catbells' 40 Wentworth Close, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6DB	Opposes proposals to remove pavement parking in Newark Lane and Perseverance Cottages, High Street. Suggests that this parking and that in Greenside should be formalised and made residents only, by way of a permit scheme. Charging should also be considered for White Hart Meadows car park, as should a wider residents' parking scheme.	The report recommends excluding the area outside Perseverance Cottages from the proposals. The kerb has previously been lowered to allow pavement parking. However the area in Newark Lane is not suitable for pavement parking. The proposals in Rose Lane formalise and order parking to prevent vehicles being blocked in, vehicles parking too close to a driveway or a junction. No change recommended to the proposals for Rose Lane or Newark Lane.
19	Mr T E Hewitt, 'Catbells' 40 Wentworth Close, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6DB		
20	Mr J Slatford, St Georges's Farmhouse, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AF	Opposes proposals to remove pavement parking outside Perseverance Cottages, High Street and in Newark Lane. Suggest on street bays proposed in both locations will generally make matters worse and compromise safety, in the case of the High Street. Residents' parking should be considered for the pavement parking in Newark Lane.	The report recommends excluding the area outside Perseverance Cottages from the proposals. The area in Newark Lane is not suitable for pavement parking. The bays will not compromise safety. No change recommended to the proposals for Newark Lane.
23	Chris Lee, South View Cottage, Polesden Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6DX	Suggests that proposals for Newark Lane may lead to parking on both sides, severely restricting traffic flow and causing gridlock.	The proposals restrict parking to the North side at busy times. No change recommended.

ITEM 9, ANNEXE A : RESPONSES TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

	NAME	COMMENT	OFFICER COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION
24	Tony & Nicole Vlasto, Footbridge House, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BE	Whilst supportive of the proposals for Ripley large lorries overnight in the layby opposite Footbridge House causing noise. Could formalised, unrestricted parking be introduced in the lay-by, prohibiting large lorries.	This is outside the scope of the current proposals but is noted.
34	Mrs J Marshall, 'Fern Cottage' 54 Newark Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BZ	Opposes the proposals in Newark Lane, suggesting that the present situation works and that the pavement parking accommodates residents' needs safely. Suggests the proposals may lead to greater obstruction, force residents to park in the village or on the Green, and would have an urbanising affect.	Vehicles driving and parking on the pavement cause a danger to pedestrians and reduce the width available for people walking. Some residents may need to park elsewhere. Vehicles parking on the pavement already have an urbanising effect. No change recommended.
35	Mr G A Marshall, (address as 34)		
37	Mr C Mealing, Little Barn, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BB	Opposes the proposed parking bay outside York Cottage, which will result in death and serious accident.	The proposed parking bay is a safe distance from the junction. No change recommended.
38	Mrs L Mealing, (address as 37)	Opposes the proposed parking at the eastern end of the village, particularly the bay outside York Cottage, which will result in death and serious accident for those wishing to turn out of White Horse Lane. Residents should have a proper opportunity to comment.	The bay to the east of the village was added in response to comments in the initial consultation. The proposed parking bay outside York Cottage is more than 22m from the junction.

ITEM 9, ANNEXE A : RESPONSES TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

	NAME	COMMENT	OFFICER COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION
48	Ms C Porter, 21 Newark Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BS	Opposes the proposals in Newark Lane, and whilst indicating there are presently around 2-3 minor accidents per week, suggests that the current situation works and that the pavement parking accommodates residents needs safely. Suggests the proposals may lead to greater rat running and ill feeling between residents competing for the reduced number of spaces. Public transport is insufficient leading to greater reliance of private cars. The car park in White Hart Meadow is closed overnight making it unavailable for residents. The proposed disabled spaces should be relocated or increased in number. Wider M25 / A3 traffic volume and speed issues through village need addressing. Also believes that pavement parking should be allowed to continue outside Perseverance Cottages, or alternatively, lay-bys created both that location and Newark Lane.	There is a difficult balance to be struck in Newark Lane between providing some parking for residents and ensuring the traffic moves. The footway is not suitable for parking. We are talking to the Parish Council about ways to improve off street parking in the village. The issue of traffic volumes and speed, and construction of lay-bys are outside the scope of this review. No change recommended.
51	Ms A Cross, Durslea, The Green, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AJ	Opposes proposals outside Perseverance Cottages and Newark Lane. Wishes to retain pavement parking outside both Perseverance Cottages, High Street and in Newark Lane suggesting that the on carriageway bay outside Perseverance Cottages will be dangerous, and that living in Newark Lane will become difficult and will cause parking problems. There should be a disabled parking space in the centre of the village. Whilst grass verges would be lovely, the reality of the situation is that most households have at least 1 car, and parking must be provided. Verges should be converted into formalised parking bays.	The report recommends excluding the area outside Perseverance Cottages from the proposals. The kerb has previously been lowered to allow pavement parking. However the area in Newark Lane is not suitable for pavement parking. The proposals in Rose Lane formalise and order parking to prevent vehicles being blocked in, vehicles parking too close to a driveway or a junction. No change recommended to the proposals for Rose Lane or Newark Lane.
56	Emma & Jim Morris, 46 Newark Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BZ	Opposes the proposals in Newark Lane, suggesting that the present situation works and that the pavement parking accommodates residents' needs safely. Suggests the proposals may lead to feuds between residents and a displacement of vehicles onto the Green. GBC should be looking to accommodate increased needs not exacerbate the present situation. Like Perseverance Cottages, verge parking should be allowed or a lay-by created in Newark Lane.	Newark Lane is too narrow for pavement parking and houses lead directly on to the pavement. We need to balance the needs of all roads users.

ITEM 9, ANNEXE A : RESPONSES TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

	NAME	COMMENT	OFFICER COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION
63	Mrs S Morrison, 'Ashley Cottage' 63 Newark Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU 23 6BS	In view of the strength of opposition to the proposals, they should be halted. RPC should consult, resolve the residents' parking issues and then consider other parking needs. Having previously written accepting the proposals for Newark Lane, now object to these on the basis that they will urbanise the area.	There has been considerable consultation on these proposals and there are a lot of conflicting interests which will never be resolved. Officers consider these proposals represent the best balance.
66	Mr P Willis, The Barn, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BB	Opposes the introduction of a formalised bay outside York Cottage on safety grounds as it is too close to the junction with White Horse Lane and the garage and will restrict visibility.	The proposed parking bay is more than 22m from the junction. No change recommended.
68	Ripley Parish Council, Ripley Village Hall, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AF	Ripley Parish Council opposes the proposals outside Perseverance Cottages and in broader terms believes the proposals will exacerbate the present issues rather than resolving them. The Talbot Hotel has agreed to make 20 of its parking spaces available for the community. Perhaps signing could be improved in the High Street to advertise the availability of these. Reinstating parking in Newark Lane by the lodges may also assist. The removal of the overnight parking restriction in White Hart Meadows car park would make it available for residents.	The proposals have to balance the needs of residents and the wider interests of road users and pedestrians. Officers consider the proposals represent the best balance. We have met with Parish Councillors and discussed overnight parking in White Hart Meadows. No change recommended.
73	Mr P G Erhardt, Homewood Farm, Newark Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6DJ	The only issues in Ripley that need addressing is the parking situation outside Watsons bakery in Rose Lane, and parking too close to bend in Newark Lane. The rest of the proposals are a waste of money.	Enforcement action is taken outside Watsons bakery and the proposals address parking too close to the bend in Newark Lane. No change recommended.
74	Mrs S Erhardt, (address as 73)	The proposals will do little more than urbanise the area. Why change the signs for 30 minutes? Where will the residents of Newark Lane park?	The restrictions are being changed to remove Saturdays. Parking bays are being proposed for Newark Lane but some may residents have to park elsewhere. No change recommended.

ITEM 9, ANNEXE A : RESPONSES TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

	NAME	COMMENT	OFFICER COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION
4	Mrs S Carter, Fairways, Newark Close, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6DW	<p align="center"><u>STANDARD LETTER A</u></p> <p>Opposing proposals outside Perseverance Cottages, Newark Lane and Rose Lane. Wishes to retain pavement parking outside both Perseverance Cottages, High Street and in Newark Lane suggesting that the on carriageway bay outside Perseverance Cottages will be dangerous, and that living in Newark Lane will become untenable due to the loss of parking. Suggests that pavement parking should be properly formalised in the latter location. Also suggests that the proposed restrictions in Rose Lane are unnecessary and it works well at present. In summary, the above proposals will contribute to disruption, congestion, pollution, accidents, unsightly parking on the green, unsightly road markings / traffic signs, and dangerous for cyclists.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>Why not charge for parking to deter those that use Ripley as a commuter car park (response 10)</p>	<p>The report recommends excluding the area outside Perseverance Cottages from the proposals. The kerb has previously been lowered to allow pavement parking. However the area in Newark Lane is not suitable for pavement parking. The proposals in Rose Lane formalise and order parking to prevent vehicles being blocked in, vehicles parking too close to a driveway or a junction. No change recommended to the proposals for Rose Lane or Newark Lane.</p>
8	Mr E H Strange, 103 High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6DW		
9	Ms C Edwards, 'Sallie Health & Beauty', High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AA		
10	Ms S Hone, 'Sallie Health & Beauty', High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AA		
17	Ms L Elson, 71 Collingwood Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2NU		
22	Ms J Cliff, 16 Newark Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BZ		
27	S Irwin, 14 Rose Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6NE		
29	Mr P S Lea, Talbot Cottage, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BB		
36	Mr S Marshall		
39	Ms M Field, 1 Portsmouth Road, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6EJ		
40	Mr A Trill, Toby Cottage, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AF		
41	Mr Frias, (address as 40)		
42	Mr R Garcia, (address as 40)		
43	Mr R Melache, (address as 40)		

ITEM 9, ANNEXE A : RESPONSES TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

	NAME	COMMENT	OFFICER COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION
44	Mr J M Noakes, Ryde Cottage, The Green, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AR	<p><u>STANDARD LETTER A</u></p> <p>Opposing proposals outside Perseverance Cottages, Newark Lane and Rose Lane. Wishes to retain pavement parking outside both Perseverance Cottages, High Street and in Newark Lane suggesting that the on carriageway bay outside Perseverance Cottages will be dangerous, and that living in Newark Lane will become untenable due to the loss of parking. Suggests that pavement parking should be properly formalised in the latter location. Also suggests that the proposed restrictions in Rose Lane are unnecessary and it works well at present. In summary, the above proposals will contribute to disruption, congestion, pollution, accidents, unsightly parking on the green, unsightly road markings / traffic signs, and dangerous for cyclists.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>Residents' only parking would be beneficial. The restrictions on White Hart Meadows car park mean that it is unavailable for residents overnight. Also fear that the proposals will lead to increased parking on The Green. More enforcement needed. Nevertheless, the parking proposed at the eastern end of the village should help to calm the traffic entering the village (response 53)</p> <p>Parking is already difficult for the farmers market and the proposals will only make the situation worse (response 55)</p> <p>Make Rose Lane residents only parking (response 62)</p>	<p>The report recommends excluding the area outside Perseverance Cottages from the proposals. The kerb has previously been lowered to allow pavement parking. However the area in Newark Lane is not suitable for pavement parking. The proposals in Rose Lane formalise and order parking to prevent vehicles being blocked in, vehicles parking too close to a driveway or a junction. No change recommended to the proposals for Rose Lane or Newark Lane.</p>
45	Mrs L F Noakes, (address as 44)		
46	E A Willott, 100 High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AF		
47	Mr A B Willott, (address as 46)		
50	Mrs J A MacKenzie, 'Constable Cottage' 8 Church Row, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AG		
52	Ms J Moss, 2 Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AG		
53	Mrs J Baker, 5 Grandees Cottages, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AB		
55	The Resident, 8 Farrier Close, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 6NJ		
60	Gloria?, Unknown address		
61	Louise Gilbert		
62	Mr & Mrs S & D Ingleton, The Hayloft, Rose Lane, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6NE		
64	Mr R James, 27 Newark Lane, Ripley, WOKING GU23 6BS		
65	Mr J B Morris, 1 Martindale Road, WOKING, GU21 3PJ		

ITEM 9, ANNEXE A : RESPONSES TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

	NAME	COMMENT	OFFICER COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION
67	Ms I M Bleach, 2 Church Row, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6BG	<p><u>STANDARD LETTER A</u> Opposing proposals outside Perseverance Cottages, Newark Lane and Rose Lane. Wishes to retain pavement parking outside both Perseverance Cottages, High Street and in Newark Lane suggesting that the on carriageway bay outside Perseverance Cottages will be dangerous, and that living in Newark Lane will become untenable due to the loss of parking. Suggests that pavement parking should be properly formalised in the latter location. Also suggests that the proposed restrictions in Rose Lane are unnecessary and it works well at present. In summary, the above proposals will contribute to disruption, congestion, pollution, accidents, unsightly parking on the green, unsightly road markings / traffic signs, and dangerous for cyclists.</p>	<p>The report recommends excluding the area outside Perseverance Cottages from the proposals. The kerb has previously been lowered to allow pavement parking. However the area in Newark Lane is not suitable for pavement parking. The proposals in Rose Lane formalise and order parking to prevent vehicles being blocked in, vehicles parking too close to a driveway or a junction. No change recommended to the proposals for Rose Lane or Newark Lane.</p>
69	Mr D Conquer, Oak Cottage, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AF		
70	Mrs H F Waycott, Howgill, The Green, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AJ		
71	Mr C Hancock, 69 Eve Road, WOKING, GU21 5JS		
72	Mr R Hancock, 126 Westfield Road, WOKING, GU21		
5	Mrs J Creasey, 6 Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6DW	<p><u>STANDARD LETTER B:</u> Opposing proposal outside Perseverance Cottages, High Street. Wishes to retain pavement parking outside cottages, suggesting that the proposed on carriageway bay adjacent will be dangerous.</p> <p>Additional comments: Also opposes proposals for Newark Lane and Rose Lane (responses 14 and 16)</p>	<p>The report recommends excluding the area outside Perseverance Cottages from the proposals.</p> <p>Additional response: The kerb has previously been lowered to allow pavement parking. However the area in Newark Lane is not suitable for pavement parking. The proposals in Rose Lane formalise and order parking to prevent vehicles being blocked in, vehicles parking too close to a driveway or a junction. No change recommended to the proposals for Rose Lane or Newark Lane (responses 14 and 16).</p>
6	Mr J Doddy, 8 Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6DW		
7	Mrs I Doddy (address as 6)		
12	Mr D Hyde, 4 Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AG		
13	Mr S Chipling, (address as 12)		
14	Mr P Rush, 5 Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AG		

ITEM 9, ANNEXE A : RESPONSES TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

	NAME	COMMENT	OFFICER COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION
16	Ms J Carey, 5 Perseverance Cottages, Ripley, GU23 6AG		

ITEM 9, ANNEXE A : RESPONSES TO FORMAL ADVERTISEMENT

	NAME	COMMENT	OFFICER COMMENT & RECOMMENDATION
21	Mr S Carey, April Cottage, Portsmouth Road, Ripley, WOKING GU23 6ER		
25	Mr G Chandler, 4 Church Row, High Street, Ripley, WOKING GU23 6BG		
28	The Resident, Cherry Trees, 3 Island Cottages, Ripley, GU23 6AT		
30	Mrs B D Baker, School View, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AF		
31	Mr M J Baker, (address as 30)		
32	Mr B A Baker, Belle Vue, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AF	<p><u>STANDARD LETTER B:</u></p> <p>Opposing proposal outside Perseverance Cottages, High Street. Wishes to retain pavement parking outside cottages, suggesting that the proposed on carriageway bay adjacent will be dangerous.</p>	<p>The report recommends excluding the area outside Perseverance Cottages from the proposals.</p>
33	Mrs H Harris, 41 Wentworth Close, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6DB		
49	Mr G Jones, 1 Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley, WOKING, GU23 6AG		
54	Mr I E Baker, 5 Grandis Cottages, High Street, Ripley, GU23 6AB		
57	Mr J Moorwood, 7 Perseverance Cottages, High Street, Ripley, WOKING GU23 6AG		
58	Mrs E Moorwood, (address as 57)		
75	Mr E A Sturges, Appletrees, Rose Lane, Ripley, GU23 6NE		