



**PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION
OF THE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE
AND AD HOC CHANGES**

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

11th MARCH 2009

KEY ISSUE

This report considers comments and objections received as a result of publishing formal notices stating the intention to implement an extension to the Controlled Parking Zone together with a number of ad hoc changes.

SUMMARY

The intention to implement the proposed extension to the CPZ has been notified previously and the Committee agreed to overrule the objections. However due to changes to the main order the proposal has been notified again and further representations have been received. Both the earlier objections and the more recent objections are attached in **ANNEXE 3**. The ad hoc changes have also been notified twice and a summary of representations is included in **ANNEXE 2**. The recommendation is to implement both sets of proposals.

Report by

GBC HEAD OF OPERATIONAL
SERVICES

Surrey Atlas Ref.

Page 131, A8

GUILDFORD B.C. WARD (S)

CHRISTCHURCH

COUNTY ELECTORAL DIVISION (S)

GUILDFORD SOUTHEAST

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to agree:

- (i) that change 7, Bury Street and change 41, Yvonne Arnaud Access road described in **ANNEXE 1** not be progressed,
- (ii) that the objections summarised in **ANNEXE 2** to the changes detailed in **ANNEXE 1** be not supported,
- (iii) that the changes described in **ANNEXE 1** be confirmed, with the exception of those referred to in (i) above and that an amendment order be made to give them effect with the minor amendment to change 21 so that the restriction only extends to the northern edge of the pedestrian island
- (iv) that the objections received to the proposed extension and summarised in **ANNEXE 3** to the proposed extension of the Controlled Parking Zone shown on the plan in **ANNEXE 4** be not supported,
- (v) that the proposed restrictions shown on the plan in **ANNEXE 4** be confirmed and that an amendment order be made to give them effect.

PROPOSED AD HOC CHANGES

- 1 The Ad Hoc changes come about due to issues being raised on a day-to-day basis and are matters that are considered not to need a full review to resolve. When a driveway vehicle crossover is introduced which conflicts with a parking place an amendment to the bay is proposed at the next review. Similarly, where it is recommended that a disabled bay should be introduced in a residential area to improve access for a particular resident an amendment to the restrictions is proposed at the next review.
- 2 There are also areas where it becomes apparent that the markings on the ground are not fully reflected in the maps, which form part of the Traffic Regulation Order, and changes are proposed. There are further issues where it is considered a situation can be improved by a minor change to the existing restrictions.
- 3 The changes proposed in **ANNEXE 1** have been advertised using public notices on two occasions due to the change in the main order and both sets of representations are summarised in **ANNEXE 2** together with officers' comments. Members of the Committee who would like to see the full text of the representations should contact the report's author.
- 4 The area which has attracted considerable correspondence is the proposal to change an unrestricted parking place in Cranley Road adjacent to Lanesborough School to a four hour limited parking space and to make a four hour parking place further up Cranley Road into an unrestricted parking place (change 11 in **ANNEXE 1**). The intention is to try to reduce the parking pressure outside the school by making more safe parking available.

- 5 Officers met with the head teacher at the time the change was originally proposed. However since then over a hundred standard letters and a number of other representations have been received mainly from parents but also from teachers and some residents suggesting that the proposal should go further and more limited waiting parking bays should be placed around the schools. Officers are concerned about further increasing the amount of traffic movement around the school by concentrating more parking adjacent to it. It is not possible to implement further changes without first advertising the change but the issue could be discussed and considered during a future review.
- 6 The Yvonne Arnaud Theatre do not want the disabled parking place limited to 3 hour (see change 41 **ANNEXE 1** and representation 2 in **ANNEXE 2**). The trustees of the charity who look after the Almshouses in Bury Street had objected to the parking bays in front but now want these parking places maintained (see change 7 in **ANNEXE 1** and representation 7 in **ANNEXE 2**). It is recommended that these changes are not pursued.
- 7 Furthermore four residents of Lancaster Avenue have objected to the extent of the double yellow lines proposed for the junction and it is recommended to reduce these 4 metres to be level with the northern edge of the pedestrian island (see change 21 in **ANNEXE 1** and representations 8,11, 12 & 19 in **ANNEXE 2**).
- 8 With omissions described in paragraph 6 and minor change highlighted in paragraph 7 it is recommended that the objections against other changes be not supported and the changes are implemented.

PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION OF THE CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE

- 9 The proposal to extend the Controlled Parking Zone to include St Omer, Tangier Roads and the remaining part of Warren Road has already been considered at the meeting 8th October 2008 (Item 8) and the Committee agreed decided to not support the objections and implement the scheme. However as the main Traffic Regulation Order changed and was consolidated it has been necessary to re-advertise the scheme and further objections have been received.
- 10 Members are referred to Item 8 on the Committee agenda from its meeting on 8th October and the comments given in response to previous comments. There are three new households making representations and a number of objections and comments from those who have previously written. The comments received as a result of both notifications are presented in **ANNEXE 3** together with officer's comments. Members of the Committee who would like to see the full text of the representations should contact the reports author.

- 11 Many of the representations received as a result of both notices question the need to include Tangier Road between St Omer Road and Warren Road in the scheme. Levels of parking in the area have not reduced since the review of the area started and controls in St Omer Road. There has been a history in east Guildford of not extending the CPZ far enough to deal with the displacement effect caused by new restrictions. This has led to the continuing need to review the area; in 2001 Maori Road was affected, in 2003 Aldersey & Hillier Roads and in 2006 St Omer Road.
- 12 Officers consider that it is clear from the level of parking in St Omer Road that there will be displacement into Tangier Road and if controls are introduced in Tangier Road parking could be spread to Warren Road at peak times. If controls were not introduced in Tangier Road there would be dense parking at the boundary.
- 13 It is important that if the scheme is implemented it not only addresses the problems in St Omer Road but also the problem of displaced parking it is would cause in Tangier Road if there were no controls in that road.
- 14 Pressures elsewhere, due to developments and parking charges are unlikely to lead to a reduction in the pressure on areas with uncontrolled parking. It is therefore strongly recommended that the objections are not supported and the previous decision to implement the scheme as a whole is confirmed.

OPTIONS

- 15 The extension to the Controlled Parking Zone has been subject to considerable consultation and discussion before the intention to implement it was advertised. The intention to make the ad hoc changes have been notified by street notices as well as public notices. While careful consideration should be given to any objections received all but the most minor amendments to the proposed scheme or individual changes would need to be re-advertised before being implemented.
- 16 The decision is to consider the objections and decide whether to implement the particular changes or defer them for further consideration. If Members wish to see a change to the recommended course of action please contact the author of the report or SCC's Local Transportation Manager as soon as possible so legal advice can be taken.

FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 17 The estimated cost of implementing the change is £7,500.
- 18 The estimated cost of implementing the ad hoc changes is £3,000.

EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 19 There are no equality or diversity implications.

CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

20 There are no crime and disorder implications.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

21 That the objections to the proposals be over ruled and the proposed changes are implemented with the omission of two of the ad hoc changes detailed in the report.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

22 To give effect to the proposals which in the case of extension to the Controlled Parking Zone will address the problems in St Omer Road and ensure that the displaced parking will be ordered, that there will be a balance of parking and that parking round junctions will be prohibited.

23 With regard to the ad hoc changes each proposal is made for particular reasons but mainly to allow access to properties, facilitate the introduction of disabled bays in residential areas, promote better use of space and correct anomalies between markings on the road and those in the order.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

24 Subject to the Committee's agreement amendment orders will be made and the changes implemented.

LEAD OFFICER

KEVIN MCKEE,
PARKING SERVICES MANAGER GBC

TELEPHONE

01483 444530

EMAIL

kevin.mckee@guildford.gov.uk

CONTACT OFFICER

ANDREW HARKIN,
ON STREET CO-ORDINATOR GBC

TELEPHONE

01483 444535

EMAIL

andrew.harkin@guildford.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Reports to the Guildford Local Committee

- 14 June 2007 Item 14
- 27 September 2007 Item 10
- 12 February 2008 Item 10
- 18 June 2008 Item 13
- 8 October 2008 Item 8
- 10 February 2009 Item 15

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 1 : PROPOSED AD HOC CHANGES

Ref No.	ROAD	LOCATION	AMENDMENT
1.	Aldersey Road	Outside No.1	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover and replace with a Single Yellow Line.
2.	Artillery Terrace	Adjacent to No.29 Church Road	Introduce a 2-hour Limited Waiting or Permit A parking place.
3.	Bray Road	Outside No.2	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover, extending adjacent Single Yellow Line.
4.	Bray Road	Outside Nos.21 & 23	Extend the existing parking place by 4 metres in a northerly direction.
5.	Bridge Street	Outside YMCA	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so it shows the true extent of the no waiting at any time restriction.
6.	Bury Street	Outside No15	Extend the existing parking place by 7 metres in a southwesterly direction.
7.	Bury Street	Outside the Almshouses	Split the existing parking place introducing a 10-metre length of Single Yellow Line to allow elderly residents to be picked up by the dial-a-ride bus and others.
8.	Clifford Manor Road	Outside No 11a	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover extending adjacent Single Yellow Line.
9.	Cranley Road	Outside Shortlands	Introduce a parking place outside Shortlands.
10.	Cranley Road	Outside No.53	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground and the presence of a length of Single Yellow Line.
11.	Cranley Road	Outside Lanesborough School and adjacent to No.6 Fielders Green	Convert the existing Unrestricted parking place outside Lanesborough School to 4-Hour Limited Waiting or Permit I and convert the existing 4-Hour Limited Waiting or Permit I parking place adjacent to No.6 Fielders Green to Unrestricted.
12.	East Meads	Opposite No.14	Shorten existing parking place slightly to ease access, extending adjacent Single Yellow Line.
13.	Friars Gate	Outside No 6	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover and replace with a Single Yellow Line.
14.	Guildown Road	Outside No. 7a	Amend Traffic Regulation Order to reflect what is on street by removing parking place and replacing with a single yellow.
15.	Harvey Road	Outside Mt. Alvernia Hospital	Replace the Single Yellow Line with Double Yellow Line on the south side of the Harvey Road, lengthening the existing adjacent Double Yellow Line restriction, so that it extends 10 metres east of the junction with Jenner Road.
16.	Irwin Road	Outside Nos.3 to 5	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground and the presence of a 2-Hour Limited Waiting or Permit F parking place.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 1 : PROPOSED AD HOC CHANGES

Ref No.	ROAD	LOCATION	AMENDMENT
17.	Josephs Road	Outside No.11	Amend existing parking place, converting part of it into a disabled only parking place for one car.
18.	Josephs Road	Outside No.39	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover extending adjacent Single Yellow Line.
19.	Josephs Road	Outside No.53	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover and replace with a Single Yellow Line.
20.	Kings Road	Adjacent to No.86 Nightingale Road	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground, replacing the 2-Hour Limited Waiting or Permit E parking place with a Permit E Only parking place.
21.	Lancaster Avenue	Both Sides Outside Nos.1 & 2	Introduce Double Yellow Line at roundabout junction with Warren Road to start of first lay-by, a distance of approximately 17 metres.
22.	Mareschal Road	Outside No.6	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover extending adjacent Single Yellow Line.
23.	Maori Road	Outside Nos.10 & 12	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground, amending the position of the parking places and the Single Yellow Line.
24.	Millmead Terrace	Outside No.10	Extend the existing Permit B Only parking place in a northerly direction to 10 metres from the bend.
25.	Mountside	Outside No.1	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground, extending the existing parking place towards the garages and reducing the length of the Single Yellow Line.
26.	Mountside	Outside Nos.3 & 5	Extend the existing Permit F only parking place in a northeasterly direction towards the garages.
27.	Old Court Road	Outside No.23	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover and replace with a Single Yellow Line. Introducing a 4-hour limited waiting or Permit J parking place by removing Single Yellow Line.
28.	Pentreath Avenue	Outside No.12	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover and replace with a Single Yellow Line.
29.	Pentreath Avenue	Outside Nos.1 & 3	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground, altering position of parking place and adjacent Single Yellow Lines.
30.	Pewley Way	Adjacent to Mt. Alvernia Hospital	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground, changing the dual-use Pay & Display and permit holders parking place to Pay & Display Only parking place with a 2-Hour Maximum Stay.
31.	Semaphore Road	Outside No.11	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground, splitting the parking place with short stretch of Single Yellow Line to protect fire hydrant.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 1 : PROPOSED AD HOC CHANGES

Ref No.	ROAD	LOCATION	AMENDMENT
32.	Sandfield Terrace	Opposite Nos.16 & 18	Remove Double Yellow Line, extending adjacent Permit D Only parking place in a southerly direction so that it abuts the 2-Hour Maximum Stay Pay & Display or Permit D parking place.
33.	Sycamore Road	Outside No.31	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover and replace with a Single Yellow Line, shortening the 2-Hour Limited Waiting or Permit E parking place, but extending the Permit E Only parking place.
34.	St Johns Road	Adjacent to No.119 Raymond Crescent	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground, but introduce a 4-Hour Limited Waiting or Permit J parking place, avoiding fire hydrants.
35.	St Luke's Square	Both Sides Outside and Opposite Knightsbridge House	Introduce Double Yellow Line at junction with Warren Road for a distance of 15 metres.
36.	The Mount	Outside Nos.33 & 35	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground, converting the existing Permit F Only parking place to a Permit B Only parking place.
37.	The Mount	Outside Nos.34 & 36	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground, splitting the existing Permit F Only parking place and introducing a short section of Double Yellow Line to protect the access to the steps.
38.	Upper Edgeborough Road	Outside Chaucer House & Edgehill	Remove Single Yellow Line, extending adjacent Unrestricted parking places so that they combine.
39.	Wodeland Avenue	Outside No.20	Amend existing parking place to allow for a vehicle crossover extending adjacent Single Yellow Line.
40.	Wodeland Avenue	Opposite No.104	Amend existing parking place to allow for access to allotments and replace with a Single Yellow Line.
41.	Yvonne Arnaud Theatre Access	Outside Old Town Mill	Amend Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground, introducing a formalised Disabled Only parking place with a 3-Hour Maximum Stay.
42.	Chestnut Avenue	Outside No.1 Police Houses	Amend section of Permit G Dual-Use Parking Place to a Single Yellow Line to reflect the situation on the ground
43.	Cranley Road	Outside Nos.1-12 Cranley Manor	Amend section of Double Yellow Line to a Single Yellow Line to reflect the situation on the ground
44.	Josephs Road	Outside new development site at No.60	Amend section of Permit E Dual-Use Parking Place to a Single Yellow Line to accommodate newly created vehicle crossovers
45.	Lido Road	Access to Bowls Club	Extend existing Double Yellow Line to reflect the situation on the ground

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 1 : PROPOSED AD HOC CHANGES

Ref No.	ROAD	LOCATION	AMENDMENT
46.	Mareschal Road	To rear of No.1 Wodeland Avenue	Amend section of Double Yellow Line to create a Permit F Dual-Use Parking Place
47.	Pewley Hill	Outside No.16	Amend section of Pay and Display or Permit D Dual-Use Parking Place to a Double Yellow Line to reflect situation on the ground
48.	The Oval	Outside No.43	Amend section of Permit J Dual-Use Parking Place to a Single Yellow Line to accommodate newly created vehicle crossover
49.	Walnut Tree Close	Outside Nos.162-168	Amend Permit A Only Parking Place to a Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm Permit A Only Parking Place (Technicality)
50.	Warren Road	Outside Nos.1-3	Amend Permit C Dual-Use Parking Place to a Permit I Dual-Use Parking Place
51.	Warwicks Bench	Outside Nos.16-18	Amend section of Single Yellow Line to a Permit H Dual-Use Parking Place
52.	Church Road	Outside No.27	Amend section of Permit A Only Parking Place extending Double Yellow Line to 10 metres from junction with Artillery Terrace to assist traffic movement at junction
53.	Church Road	Outside No.30	Amend section of Permit A Limited Waiting Dual-Use Parking Place extending Double Yellow Line to 10 metres from junction with Artillery Terrace to assist with traffic movement at junction
54.	Millmead Terrace	Outside No.30	Amend section of Permit B Only Parking Place extending Double Yellow Line to accommodate newly created vehicle crossover
55.	Onslow House Access	Carriageway Underneath Onslow House	Amend schedule to Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground (Technicality)
56.	Onslow Street	Carriageway Underneath Pedestrian Walkway to Friary Shopping Centre	Amend schedule to Traffic Regulation Order so that it reflects the situation on the ground (Technicality)

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : AD HOC CHANGES

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
1	Gillian Tjia-McMurray, 14a Warwicks Bench, GUILDFORD, GU1 3TG	<u>Warwicks Bench (Change 51)</u> Written to previously about need to increase the set-back distance at the vehicular access to 14a&b Warwicks Bench. Concerned that the proposed bay will further exacerbate the issues she already has in existing / accessing the highway from her own driveway.	The proposed parking bay is around 30 metres from the representee's driveway and therefore is likely to have negligible impact.
2	Nick White, Yvonne Arnaud Theatre, Millbrook, GUILDFORD, GU1 3UX	<u>Yvonne Arnaud Theatre Access (Change 41)</u> Want disabled parking to be time restricted, to prevent them from being used all day, but feels that the 3-hour limit is too restrictive. Wants 5-hour limit. Also believes a no right turn sign should be introduced to stop right hand turns into Millbrook and the area should be pedestrianised with access only for service vehicles and blue badge holders.	The disabled bays elsewhere within the CPZ are either unrestricted in terms of duration of stay or limited to 3 hours to encourage turnover. This time period also correlates with the period of time that blue badge holders can wait on yellow lines. It is doubtful whether 5 hour limit would have the desired effect and it would be non-standard in terms of duration. The proposed bay is on private land co-managed by the Theatre and Guildford Borough Council. As such, there has to be agreement for the change to take place. Therefore, abandoned proposal at the present time and give further consideration to the issue during a future review. Other issues raised are beyond the scope of this parking review although they have been noted.
3	Mig & Nikki Vale, 17 Maori Road, GUILDFORD	<u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> The proposals around the school are not far-reaching enough. The bays outside No17-19 Maori Road should be very short stay (30mins-1Hr) to facilitate the school bus and delivery vans and the school run. Presently parent have to pull up on SYLs, DYLS and zig-zags to collect their primary school aged children. Present school run issues cause danger and obstruction and there is never parking near my home for visitors or trades people. The unrestricted bays at the Cranley Road end of Maori Road should be swapped with time limited ones elsewhere within the road and should be limited to 1hr max stay.	The time limited parking bays in Maori Road, and some of the other roads in the vicinity, are centrally located so the short-stay visitors have a reasonable chance of parking quite close to their destination, regardless of which end of the road they are visiting. If they were concentrated at one end of the road, in the vicinity of the school, those wishing to visit properties at the other end of the road would have further to walk. Whilst the proposal to swap an unrestricted bay in Cranley Road aims to increase the availability of short-stay parking in the vicinity of the school, to assist with the school run, making all the parking short-stay in the immediate vicinity would reduce flexibility for visitors to the school and elsewhere. It would also tend to concentrate traffic and parking associated with the school run in one particular area, rather than spreading it out. It must also realised that parking associated with the school run often exceeds the supply of space, regardless of the positioning of the various types of bay. Limiting the maximum stay within the bays to 1 hour would greatly reduce flexibility and would not be an effective use of kerb space for the vast majority of the control hours.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : AD HOC CHANGES

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
4	Claire Phipps, c.phipps1@ntlworld.com	<p><u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> The proposals should be extended with the unrestricted bays outside No17 Maori Road and Markham House being swapped with 4-hour limited waiting bays elsewhere in Maori Road. Parents have to park illegally on SYLs, zig-zags etc... in order to collect their primary aged school children.</p>	<p>The time limited parking bays in Maori Road, and some of the other roads in the vicinity, are centrally located so the short-stay visitors have a reasonable chance of parking quite close to their destination, regardless of which end of the road they are visiting. If they were concentrated at one end of the road, in the vicinity of the school, those wishing to visit properties at the other end of the road would have further to walk. Whilst the proposal to swap an unrestricted bay in Cranely Road aims to increase the availability of short-stay parking in the vicinity of the school, to assist with the school run, making all the parking short-stay in the immediate vicinity would reduce flexibility for visitors to the school and elsewhere. It would also tend to concentrate traffic and parking associated with the school run in one particular area, rather than spreading it out. It must also realised that parking associated with the school run often exceeds the supply of space, regardless of the positioning of the various types of bay.</p>
5	Rebecca & Hunter Finlayson, 'Timbers', 15 Maori Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2EG	<p><u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> The proposals should be extended to include Maori Road, with the unrestricted bays at the Cranley Road end being swapped with limited waiting bays at the Epsom Road end. Moreover, the bays should be restricted to 1-2 hours limited waiting to ensure that they are available for the school run. This should be applied to several similar roads in the area. Parents regularly block my driveway or make access extremely difficult / dangerous. Further consultation with Maori Road residents is essential before finalising the changes.</p>	<p>The time limited parking bays in Maori Road, and some of the other roads in the vicinity, are centrally located so the short-stay visitors have a reasonable chance of parking quite close to their destination, regardless of which end of the road they are visiting. If they were concentrated at one end of the road, in the vicinity of the school, those wishing to visit properties at the other end of the road would have further to walk. Whilst the proposal to swap an unrestricted bay in Cranley Road aims to increase the availability of short-stay parking in the vicinity of the school, to assist with the school run, making all the parking short-stay in the immediate vicinity would reduce flexibility for visitors to the school and elsewhere. It would also tend to concentrate traffic and parking associated with the school run in one particular area, rather than spreading it out. It must also realised that parking associated with the school run often exceeds the supply of space, regardless of the positioning of the various types of bay. Limiting the maximum stay within the bays to 1-2 hours would greatly reduce flexibility and would not be an effective use of kerb space for the vast majority of the control hours.</p>
6	Oonagh Monckton, 18 Warwicks Bench, GUILDFORD	<p><u>Warwicks Bench (Change 51)</u> Oppose the proposals on the basis that there isn't a shortage of parking and the bay will significantly increase danger when accessing / exiting my driveway. If more parking is required, the bay to the west of 14a&b should be extended, whilst that to the east should be shortened. Speeding traffic in Warwicks Bench is a problem and if the planning permission in Chantry View Road is approved the situation is only likely to worsen. Speed cameras rather than speed bumps should be considered.</p>	<p>The proposal was developed after it was suggested that residents and visitors already had to park on yellow lines, and in the prospect that additional vehicle crossovers maybe constructed which would further reduce the number of parking spaces. The proposed parking bay is situated so as to have the maximum standard 2-metre setback distance from adjacent driveways. Other issues raised are beyond the scope of this parking review although they have been noted.</p>

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : AD HOC CHANGES

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
7	Christopher Hodgson, Perran House, New Park Road, CRANLEIGH, GU6 7HL	<u>Bury Street (Change 7)</u> The Trustees of Caleb Lovejoy Charity has instructed us to write regarding the above. They wish to see the existing parking bay arrangements maintained. In the past the charity has requested a disabled parking bay to serve both disabled visitors and residents.	Although originally objecting to the parking bays when first introduced in October 2006, the trustees now want them all to be retained. Therefore, take no further action and do not implement proposal.
8	Philip Benson, 'Merlin House', 67 Lancaster Avenue, GUILDFORD, GU1 3JR	<u>Lancaster Avenue / St Lukes Square (Changes 21 & 35)</u> The street notice is ambiguous and the proposals need to be amended so that the proposed DYLS at the entrance of Lancaster Avenue go no further south than the north end of the pedestrian island near the roundabout. There is no point having them adjacent to the island as no-one would park there. Also objects to the proposed restrictions at the entrance of St Lukes Square, and doesn't feel the need for any further extension of proposals into the development.	The construction of the roundabout at the entrance of the development resulted in the restrictions in Warren Road being reinstated in an odd fashion and beyond what one could reasonably call the extents of the public highway associated with Warren Road. The proposal aims to regulate this and extend the existing restrictions to protect the entry / exit arms from Lancaster Avenue. Even so, the point about the pedestrian refuge has been noted and the restrictions will only be implemented to the northern edge of the island. Parking at the entrance of St Lukes Square has been raised on a number of occasions and the proposal merely serves to protect the junction. Implement St Lukes Square proposal without change.
9	Mr M Newell, 'Kalayas', 13 Maori Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2EG	<u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> The proposals should be extended to include Maori Road, with the unrestricted bays at the Cranley Road end being swapped with limited waiting bays at the Epsom Road end. Since the introduction of the CPZ there has been a general improvement in traffic flow, but this has led to the roads becoming 'rat-runs'. As there are 3 schools in the area, the roads in the immediate vicinity should be a 20mph zone.	The time limited parking bays in Maori Road, and some of the other roads in the vicinity, are centrally located so the short-stay visitors have a reasonable chance of parking quite close to their destination, regardless of which end of the road they are visiting. If they were concentrated at one end of the road, in the vicinity of the school, those wishing to visit properties at the other end of the road would have further to walk. Whilst the proposal to swap an unrestricted bay in Cranley Road aims to increase the availability of short-stay parking in the vicinity of the school, to assist with the school run, making all the parking short-stay in the immediate vicinity would reduce flexibility for visitors to the school and elsewhere. It would also tend to concentrate traffic and parking associated with the school run in one particular area, rather than spreading it out. It must also realised that parking associated with the school run often exceeds the supply of space, regardless of the positioning of the various types of bay. Other issues raised are beyond the scope of this parking review although they have been noted.
10	Nigel A Tanner, Asset Security Construction Ltd, 157 High Road, BYFLEET, KT14 7RL	<u>Warwicks Bench (Change 51)</u> Understands that proposed changes to the parking bays may block the planned access to No.14a.	The proposed parking bay is situated outside Nos.16/18 and therefore does not conflict with any proposals for No.14a.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : AD HOC CHANGES

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
11	Hendrik & Jeanine de Groot, 'Holland House', 11 Lancaster Avenue, GUILDFORD, GU1 3JR	<p><u>Lancaster Avenue (Change 21)</u> The street notice is ambiguous and the proposals need to be amended so that the proposed DYLS at the entrance of Lancaster Avenue go no further south than the north end of the pedestrian island near the roundabout. There is no point having them adjacent to the island as no-one would park there.</p>	<p>The construction of the roundabout at the entrance of the development resulted in the restrictions in Warren Road being reinstated in an odd fashion and beyond what one could reasonably call the extents of the public highway associated with Warren Road. The proposal aims to regulate this and extend the existing restrictions to protect the entry / exit arms from Lancaster Avenue. Even so, the point about the pedestrian refuge has been noted and the restrictions will only be implemented to the northern edge of the island.</p>
12	Ms A Speed, 59 Lancaster Avenue, GUILDFORD, GU1 3JR	<p><u>Lancaster Avenue / St Lukes Square (Change 21 & 35)</u> Oppose the proposals as a resident of Lancaster Avenue and flat-owner of St Lukes Square. In respect to Lancaster Avenue, the island on the approach to the roundabout prevents anyone from parking there, so the restrictions serve no purpose. Nor is there any need for controls at the entrance of St Lukes Square as no-one parks there, and even if they did, it is illegal and lines are not necessary.</p>	<p>The construction of the roundabout at the entrance of the development resulted in the restrictions in Warren Road being reinstated in an odd fashion and beyond what one could reasonably call the extents of the public highway associated with Warren Road. The proposal aims to regulate this and extend the existing restrictions so as to more adequately protect the entry / exit arms from Lancaster Avenue. Even so, the point about the pedestrian refuge has been noted and the restrictions will only be implemented to the northern edge of the island. Parking at the entrance of St Lukes Square has been raised on a number of occasions and the proposal merely serves to protect the junction. Implement St Lukes Square proposal without change.</p>
13	Mrs Femke Chopping, 15 East Meads, GUILDFORD, GU2 7SW	<p><u>East Meads (Change 12)</u> Opposes the proposal on the basis that the proposed change will reduce the length of the bay sufficiently to prevent it from being used by an average car. It would also seem that the street notice and information on the website contradict each other. The notice suggests complete removal whilst the website suggests partial removal. I object to both on the grounds that the proposed changes are not necessary because no new vehicle crossover is being proposed, no disabled bays created, and if there is a discrepancy in the traffic regulation order, it would make sense to change the order rather than the markings on the street. Traffic movement is not hampered by the existing length of bay and it provides a valuable parking space.</p>	<p>The current bay is sized according to the distance between adjacent driveways, and not the minimum size required to accommodate one vehicle. Therefore, there is scope for the bay to be reduced in size, thereby improving access for No.14 opposite, whilst also maintain the availability of parking.</p>
14	Mr Ewan Moore, 15 Pentreath Avenue, GUILDFORD, GU2 7TA	<p><u>Pentreath Avenue (Change 28 & 29 – but general comment)</u> The current and proposed restrictions operate Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm. They were introduced to prevent student parking and there has never been a problem in finding a space. Therefore, why change them, and surely if students are the reason for the controls, they do not have to apply on Saturdays. The restrictions are no more than a money-making exercise as there are no problems to resolve.</p>	<p>The proposal to remove part of the parking bay outside No.12 is to accommodate a recently constructed vehicle crossover. The technical amendment merely changes the TRO so that it reflects the markings on the ground. The issue of Saturday controls was considered during the last CPZ review, when residents of the area expressed no clear desire to see the control hours shortened.</p>

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : AD HOC CHANGES

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
15	Mr P Nicols, 15 Millmead Terrace, GUILDFORD, GU2 4AT	<p><u>Millmead Terrace (Changes 24 & 54)</u> Oppose the proposal on the basis that the plans showing the proposed changes are inaccurate and that if the private access is constructed, why have residents not had an opportunity to object to it through the planning process. Allowing private accesses denies motorists the ability to park on-street. The proposed bay extension outside No.10 should have been done years ago, and is pointless as the area has been occupied by a skip for over a year. Residents' parking in Millmead Terrace is a disgusting shambles with the bay outside the School of Acting constantly suspended, amongst others. An unauthorised vehicle access has also recently been created outside No.29.</p>	<p>The proposal to remove part of the parking bay outside No.30 is to accommodate a recently constructed vehicle crossover, although it is noted that the road markings have already been change (by a third party) without the necessary processes being followed. There is a right to gain access onto the public highway. No such right exists to park on the public highway, and therefore the former takes precedence. The proposal to extend the bay will offset the loss caused by the creation of the vehicle crossover. Although the bay adjacent to the School of Acting is suspended from time to time, prior to the last review, this area was subject to DYL controls and, as such, was unavailable for parking at any time.</p>
16	Mrs Christa Jones, 1 Mountside, GUILDFORD, GU2 4JD	<p><u>Mountside (Change 26)</u> Enclosed a letter from Sue Taylor (former Parking Manager) suggesting that it had been agreed to increase the set back distance by 1 metre, as a result of Mrs Jones having twisting her neck whilst reversing out of her garage onto the public highway.</p>	<p>This was proposed as a technical change so that the TRO reflects the markings on the ground. However the present setback distance on the ground between the bay and the access is only 1 metre. Therefore we propose to change both the order and markings on the ground so there is the standard setback distance to 2 metres. The setback distance will be similar to others in the vicinity and will not affect the number of vehicles that can park within the bay.</p>
17	Paul Taylor, 7Uk Services, 27 Holywell Row, LONDON, EC2A 4JB	<p><u>Mareschal Road (Change 22) Also listed as an objection to the boundary change in Wodeland Avenue</u> Oppose the proposal to change the boundary in Wodeland Avenue on the basis that it will allow residents from the Wherwell Road-Mareschal Road section of Wodeland Avenue to park in Mareschal Road and lower Mountside, both of which are heavily parked, and this will lead to conflict between residents. The boundary should be positioned so that residents of Wherwell Road and Wodeland Avenue can only park in the remainder of Wodeland Avenue. Additionally, the space outside No.4 Mareschal Road should be maintained, and not removed as proposed. These objections include those from residents who are unable to respond in writing as they are on holiday.</p>	<p>During the control hours of the scheme there are often spaces in the Area F section of Wodeland Avenue, Mareschal Road and Mountside. Whilst creating smaller and more numerous areas would further reduce the potential for intra-zonal car use, it would also reduce the flexibility and availability of space for those living in the vicinity. The space outside No.4 Mareschal Road is being removed to accommodate a recently introduced vehicle crossover at No.6. It would not be possible to retain the bay outside No.4 and maintain an adequately sized parking bay with the appropriate setback distance from the access at No.6. Additional parking bays are proposed elsewhere in Mareschal Road and Mountside, which will more than compensate for the loss of space associated with the creation of this access.</p>

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : AD HOC CHANGES

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
Additional representations received after the first advertisement and as a result of the second advertisement			
18	16 Warwicks Bench, GUILDFORD, GU1 3TG	<p><u>Warwicks Bench (Change 51)</u> Has off-street parking which can only be driven into and reversed out of. Visibility is already restricted by the existing parking bay to the north-west of this access and is dangerous. The proposed bay to the south-east will only worsen the existing situation. No.16&18 Warwicks Bench are Grade II listed. Therefore, encouraging more parking will detract from the setting and visual amenity. It's just a shame that the proposed second access to No.14b was allowed, with the consequent loss of parking. Surely parking bays could be introduced elsewhere. Strongly object on the grounds of safety.</p>	The existing parking bay is situated over 10 metres to the north-west of the access to No.16. The proposed parking bay will be situated so as to have the maximum standard 2-metre setback distance from adjacent driveways. Although it is suggested that the off-street parking at No.16 can only be driven into and reversed out of, the highway code recommend that the public highway should be entered in forward gear.
19	Mr & Mrs Jacob, 6 Lancaster Avenue, GUILDFORD, GU1 3JR	<p><u>Lancaster Avenue (Change 21)</u> Request that the proposed DYLS are extended even further than suggested to outside No.3 and No.6 Lancaster Avenue. The proposed eastward extension of the CPZ may lead to more parking in Lancaster Avenue. The lay-by at the entrance to the road is constantly used and makes it difficult for deliveries and visitors.</p>	The proposed measures are primarily aimed at junction protection. The representee suggests that they should be extended significantly further. DYLS are not appropriate in such circumstances, and would overly restrict use of the lay-by. In light of other representations received, the proposed restrictions will only be implemented to the northern edge of the pedestrian island and not the southern edge as originally intended.
20	Gillian Tjia-McMurray, 14a Warwicks Bench, GUILDFORD, GU1 3TG	<p><u>Warwicks Bench (Change 51)</u> Further to previous representation (see Ref. No.1) concerned about amount and speed of traffic in relation to the existing parking bays adjacent to her driveway, and the impact these spaces have on visibility. High-sided vehicles which regularly park there are a particular issue. The proposed spaces will further reduce visibility, thereby increasing danger. Fail to see the need for these spaces. Provided photos of the existing situation and a previous incident.</p>	See Recommendation for Ref. No.1
21	Doreen Kite, doreen.kite@ntlworld.com	<p><u>East Meads (Change 12)</u> The bay in question does cause tremendous difficulties for visitors arriving and departing at No.14 East Meads. Although it would be preferable for the whole bay to be removed or relocated elsewhere, the shortening of the bay should assist.</p>	The current bay is sized according to the distance between adjacent driveways, and not the minimum size required to accommodate one vehicle. Therefore, there is scope for the bay to be reduced in size, thereby improving access for No.14 opposite, whilst also maintain the availability of parking.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : AD HOC CHANGES

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
22	Clare Turnbull Head Teacher of Lanesborough School & 125 others mainly parents but also teachers and residents	<p><u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> Further to previous representation (Ref. No.5), Standard Letter: The proposals could be extended further to include Maori Road, with the unrestricted bays nearest Lanesborough School being made short stay, whilst those that are located further away from the school, but currently short stay, being made unrestricted. This would increase the likelihood of spaces being available for short-stay visitors to the school, traffic flow would be improved as there would be fewer instances of double parking, the safety of the children would improve and the inconvenience for residents living near the school reduced. The availability of space for long-stay commuters would be maintained.</p>	<p>The time limited parking bays in Maori Road, and some of the other roads in the vicinity, are centrally located so the short-stay visitors have a reasonable chance of parking quite close to their destination, regardless of which end of the road they are visiting. If they were concentrated at one end of the road, in the vicinity of the school, those wishing to visit properties at the other end of the road would have further to walk. Whilst the proposal to swap an unrestricted bay in Cranley Road aims to increase the availability of short-stay parking in the vicinity of the school, to assist with the school run, making all the parking short-stay in the immediate vicinity would reduce flexibility for visitors to the school and elsewhere. It would also tend to concentrate traffic and parking associated with the school run in one particular area, rather than spreading it out. It must also be realised that parking associated with the school run often exceeds the supply of space, regardless of the positioning of the various types of bay.</p>
23	Ms Philippa Green, philippa_curtis@ tiscali.co.uk	<p><u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> The proposals could be extended further to include Maori Road, with the unrestricted bays nearest Lanesborough School being made short stay, whilst those that are located further away from the school, but currently short stay, being made unrestricted. This would increase the likelihood of spaces being available for short-stay visitors to the school, traffic flow would be improved as there would be fewer instances of double parking, the safety of the children would improve and the inconvenience for residents living near the school reduced. The availability of space for long-stay commuters would be maintained. I wholeheartedly support plans to improve the parking arrangements near the school, to the benefit of the local residents and school alike. The extension to the proposed amendments outlined in the attached letter would, I believe, significantly increase the traffic flow, safety of the children and ease of use of the school, while also improving the current situation for the local residents.</p>	<p>As Recommendation for Ref. No.22</p>

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : AD HOC CHANGES

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
24	Mr D and Mrs A Humphries, The White House, 7 Ennismore Avenue, GUILDFORD, Surrey, GU1 1SP	<p><u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> The proposals could be extended further to include Maori Road, with the unrestricted bays nearest Lanesborough School being made short stay, whilst those that are located further away from the school, but currently short stay, being made unrestricted. This would increase the likelihood of spaces being available for short-stay visitors to the school, traffic flow would be improved as there would be fewer instances of double parking, the safety of the children would improve and the inconvenience for residents living near the school reduced. The availability of space for long-stay commuters would be maintained. We currently walk our children to school there every school day, and occasional other days, and are very aware of the parking problems in the area. I occasionally have to use the car to pick up the children if we are going on elsewhere, or if one of them is ill. The parking could be improved immensely for parents, visitors to Lanesborough School and the local residents if parking restrictions in Maori Road were changed too.</p>	As Recommendation for Ref. No.22
25	Doug Scott, Chairman of Cranley Road Area Residents' Association, Drumlin House, Maori Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2EG	<p><u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> The proposals could be extended further to include Maori Road, with the unrestricted bays nearest Lanesborough School being made short stay, whilst those that are located further away from the school, but currently short stay, being made unrestricted. This would increase the likelihood of spaces being available for short-stay visitors to the school, traffic flow would be improved as there would be fewer instances of double parking, the safety of the children would improve and the inconvenience for residents living near the school reduced. The availability of space for long-stay commuters would be maintained. Also keen to see residents of Maori Road and Cranley Road treated equally, by moving short-term parking closer to the school in both roads.</p>	The time limited parking bays in Maori Road, and some of the other roads in the vicinity, are centrally located so the short-stay visitors have a reasonable chance of parking quite close to their destination, regardless of which end of the road they are visiting. If they were concentrated at one end of the road, in the vicinity of the school, those wishing to visit properties at the other end of the road would have further to walk. Whilst the proposal to swap an unrestricted bay in Cranley Road aims to increase the availability of short-stay parking in the vicinity of the school, to assist with the school run, making all the parking short-stay in the immediate vicinity would reduce flexibility for visitors to the school and elsewhere. It would also tend to concentrate traffic and parking associated with the school run in one particular area, rather than spreading it out. It must also be realised that parking associated with the school run often exceeds the supply of space, regardless of the positioning of the various types of bay. There are distinct differences between Cranley Road and Maori Road, the former being a bus route and used as access to/from Tormead School. Therefore the uniform treatment of roads is not always appropriate.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : AD HOC CHANGES

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
26	Doug Scott, Drumlin House, Maori Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2EG	<p><u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> The proposals could be extended further to include Maori Road, with the unrestricted bays nearest Lanesborough School being made short stay, whilst those that are located further away from the school, but currently short stay, being made unrestricted. This would increase the likelihood of spaces being available for short-stay visitors to the school, traffic flow would be improved as there would be fewer instances of double parking, the safety of the children would improve and the inconvenience for residents living near the school reduced. Previously given assurances that moving the short term parking bays in both Maori and Cranley Roads would be considered. Maori Road has been excluded again.</p>	<p>The time limited parking bays in Maori Road, and some of the other roads in the vicinity, are centrally located so the short-stay visitors have a reasonable chance of parking quite close to their destination, regardless of which end of the road they are visiting. If they were concentrated at one end of the road, in the vicinity of the school, those wishing to visit properties at the other end of the road would have further to walk. Whilst the proposal to swap an unrestricted bay in Cranley Road aims to increase the availability of short-stay parking in the vicinity of the school, to assist with the school run, making all the parking short-stay in the immediate vicinity would reduce flexibility for visitors to the school and elsewhere. It would also tend to concentrate traffic and parking associated with the school run in one particular area, rather than spreading it out. It must also be realised that parking associated with the school run often exceeds the supply of space, regardless of the positioning of the various types of bay. The situation in both Cranley Road and Maori Road has been considered as part of the present review. However, it must be realised that there are distinct differences between the two. This and consideration of the two locations together means that uniform treatment of both is not considered appropriate.</p>
27	Dr & Mrs J A Croghan, 81 Pullman Lane, Godalming, Surrey, GU7 1YB	<p><u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> As parents, believe the proposals could be extended further to include Maori Road, with the unrestricted bays nearest Lanesborough School being made short stay, whilst those that are located further away from the school, but currently short stay, being made unrestricted. This would increase the likelihood of spaces being available for short-stay visitors to the school, traffic flow would be improved as there would be fewer instances of double parking, the safety of the children would improve and the inconvenience for residents living near the school reduced. The availability of space for long-stay commuters would be maintained.</p>	<p>As Recommendation for Ref. No.22</p>
28	Lisa and Tony Forrest, Millfield, School Lane, Ockham, Surrey, GU23 6PA	<p><u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> Welcome the proposed changes. Nevertheless, the proposals could be extended further to include Maori Road, with the unrestricted bays nearest Lanesborough School being made short stay, whilst those that are located further away from the school, but currently short stay, being made unrestricted. This would increase the likelihood of spaces being available for short-stay visitors to the school, traffic flow would be improved as there would be fewer instances of double parking, the safety of the children would improve and the inconvenience for residents living near the school reduced. The availability of space for long-stay commuters would be maintained.</p>	<p>As Recommendation for Ref. No.22</p>

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 2 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : AD HOC CHANGES

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
29	Mrs N Vale, 17 Maori Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2EG	<p><u>Cranley Road (Change 11)</u> Further to previous representation (Ref. No.3), Standard Letter: The proposals could be extended further to include Maori Road, with the unrestricted bays nearest Lanesborough School being made short stay, whilst those that are located further away from the school, but currently short stay, being made unrestricted. This would increase the likelihood of spaces being available for short-stay visitors to the school, traffic flow would be improved as there would be fewer instances of double parking, the safety of the children would improve and the inconvenience for residents living near the school reduced. The availability of space for long-stay commuters would be maintained.</p>	As Recommendation for Ref. No.22
30	Mrs Christa Jones, 1 Mountside, GUILDFORD, GU2 4JD	Further to previous representation (see Ref. No.16), wants set-back distance of bay next to garage to be extended from 1 metre to 2 metres to improve access.	See Officer Comment for Ref. No.16

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
1	John Wortt, 23 Rosetrees, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HS	Further to previous objections, no-one believes the proposals bring any benefits, and by reducing the availability of parking will simply move the problem elsewhere. There generally are no problems in Tangier, Warren and St Omer Roads but issues will occur if the proposals go ahead. The formalisation of parking in Warren Road will needlessly reduce the amount of space available by 5 cars in the section between Rosetrees and Tangier Rd and lead to displacement into Rosetrees. The proposed extension of the restrictions at the bottom of Tangier Road are of merit but other than this please leave things as they are.	Many residents support the introduction of formalised controls in the area. While restrictions may prevent drivers parking too close to junctions or access points they create a better balance in the use of the road. The CPZ already extends past Rosetrees and we do not consider there will be significant displacement into the road.
2	Mr J Martin, 'Beechfield', 54 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HH	Proposals grievously disappointing. The protection of the Tangier Road / Warren Road junction remains inadequate. The introduction of SYLs suggests that the danger only exists between 8.30am-6pm. Parking should not be allowed opposite driveways.	The no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres from the junction. The proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. Warren Road is sufficiently wide to permit parking opposite driveways, and where it can and does already take place without restriction.
3	Robert F Smyth, 3 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DE	Whilst broadly in agreement with the proposals, object to the unrestricted parking bay nearest the junction with Epsom Road which is still too close and will cause problems, and likewise with the bay nearest the junction with Warren Road.	The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The parking bay on Tangier Road closest to the junction with Warren Road is 15m away from the junction and because of the proximity of Kyngeshene Gardens access extensive additional lengths of no waiting at any time restriction are proposed. We consider these measures are sufficient without being overly restrictive on the availability of parking.
4	Mrs Margaret Thompson, 1 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DE	There should be no parking allowed at either end of this busy road for safety reasons. The turn from Warren Road is very sharp and with a car parked near the junction presents an unnecessary hazard. The danger at the Epsom Road junction is perhaps greater. Cars turn in sharply and with a parked car can be met by a car or a lorry in the middle of the road with a queue of cars behind. Parked vehicles also cause issues for residents that live near the junctions. The likelihood of a serious accident would be lessened if yellow lines were added up to the first two drives on both sides of the road.	The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The parking bay on Tangier Road closest to the junction with Warren Road is 15m away from the junction and because of the proximity of Kyngeshene Gardens access extensive additional lengths of no waiting at any time restriction are proposed. We consider these measures are sufficient without being overly restrictive on the availability of parking.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
5	Dr Bayliss, 58 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HH	Support the positioning and size of the proposed unrestricted bays in Warren Road, but would prefer to see more unrestricted parking in St Omer Road and Tangier road to minimise displacement, and further extensions to the proposed DYs at the bottom of both roads.	<p>The proportioning of the bays in St Omer Road and Tangier Road already provides significant amounts of unrestricted parking in those roads whilst also prioritising areas for residents and their visitors. We consider this will achieve the right balance. The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest.</p> <p>The parking bay on Tangier Road closest to the junction with Warren Road is 15m away from the junction and because of the proximity of Kyngeshene Gardens access extensive additional lengths of no waiting at any time restriction are proposed. We consider these measures are sufficient without being overly restrictive on the availability of parking.</p>
6	Drs Katherine & Andrew Pink, 4 Kyngeshene Gardens, GUILDFORD	Wholly disagree with the proposal. Not only will the controls have a detrimental visual impact on a beautiful residential region but also the lack of permit eligibility for residents of private roads will make it difficult for them and their visitors, particularly those with young children or the elderly. These views are shared by everyone on the development.	The objective of the proposals is to order parking particularly from non-residents across the area so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. Signs will be kept to a minimum and sensitively positioned. Residents of private roads, which do not form part of the public highway or the controlled parking zone are not eligible for permits. To accommodate their needs, the spaces in the immediate vicinity of Kyngeshene Gardens are unrestricted to enable residents there to use them without restriction.
7	Ms Julia Plunkett, 10 Kyngeshene Gardens, GUILDFORD	Concerned about lack of permit eligibility for residents of Kyngeshene Gardens (private).	Residents of private roads, which do not form part of the public highway or the controlled parking zone are not eligible for permits. To accommodate their needs, the spaces in the immediate vicinity of Kyngeshene Gardens are unrestricted to enable residents there to use them without restriction.
8	Mr & Mrs Langley, 'Hilgay', 50 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HG	There are two points that should be considered before the scheme is introduced: The unrestricted spaces in Warren Road opposite Nos.48-50 should be 4-hour limited waiting to prevent all-day parking and, larger vehicles such as vans and campervans should be prevented from using the spaces.	The objective of the proposals is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area. Presently all-day parkers generally use the uncontrolled areas in Warren Road during the day. If some of these spaces were prioritised for shorter-stay users and residents, this would increase the possibility of displacement all-day parkers elsewhere. The parking bays will be a maximum of 2 metres wide, and vehicles within them limited to 5-tonnes in weight. Whilst this will not preclude their use by larger vehicles such as vans and caravanettes, it will prevent larger vehicles, such as HGVs, using the spaces.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
9	Mrs A P Monks, 'Toft House', 13 Downside Road, GUILDFORD, GU4 8PH	Parking should not be allowed in Warren Road either side of the junction with Tangier Road as the present visibility at this junction is poor due to parking and consequently dangerous for cyclists, pedestrians and drivers. Therefore, a decision to allow more parking is illogical and dangerous and should be rescinded for safety reasons. The situation at the bottom of Tangier Road at its junction with Epsom Road is also dangerous and parking should not be allowed on both sides. There is not room for cars to pass.	The no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres from the junction. The proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction in Warren Road will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The spaces proposed in Warren Road are situated away from junctions and points of access, and where it can be safely accommodated, unlike the present situation, which is uncontrolled. At the junction of Epsom Road and Tangier Road parking will only be permitted on one side of the road between 8.30 and 6.00pm Monday to Saturday. We consider this will overcome the present problems and allow two-way traffic flow.
10	Mr & Mrs DG & SM Peters, 30 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	As far as road safety is concerned the proposals for the top part of Tangier Road are unsatisfactory. The proposed bays should be on the east side of the road to ensure traffic coming into Tangier Road from Warren Road has a clear view of the cars already parked in Tangier Road. Vehicles coming from the top end of Warren Road frequently cut the corner. Vehicles coming from the lower end of Warren Road turning left into Tangier Road have restricted vision. Bays on the east side would be nearer the new Kyngeshene properties whose parking facilities are inadequate. The houses on the east side are protected from the road by high hedges whereas on the west there are open frontages. Do not consider controlled parking is necessary in upper Tangier Road and if bays must be added they should be limited to 4 hour waiting Mon to Sat.	The spaces are proposed on the western side of the road to afford greater visibility for vehicles exiting Kyngeshene Gardens into Tangier Road. Additionally, by having the bays on the western side, and whilst still allowing two-way flow, priority is given to those vehicles driving up the hill. This combined with the bays further down Tangier Road create a chicane effect, which may assist in calming traffic. It would be confusing to omit upper Tangier Rd if Warren Road and lower Tangier Road are controlled. In addition we consider there will be displacement into the upper part of Tangier Rd if the dense parking in St Omer is regulated.
11	Peter & Elizabeth Wix, 'Crockett House', Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	It is essential that the yellow lines at both ends of Tangier Road are substantially increased as parking whether on one or both sides is dangerous. Cars backed up trying to get onto the Epsom Road make it impossible for emergency vehicles to get through. At the Warren Road end cars parked on one or both sides make it very difficult to see on coming cars turning into Tangier Road. The restriction on the parking bays should not apply on Saturdays or Sundays. All residents of Tangier Road should be entitled to parking permits regardless of their off-street parking provision.	The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the eastern side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. At the Warren Road end extensive additional lengths of no waiting at any time restriction are proposed. Residents of Tangier Road, like those within the existing area of Area I will be entitled to one residents' permit irrespective of their off-street facilities. The existing CPZ is restricted Monday to Saturday. Similarly, concerns about Saturday restrictions were raised during the last CPZ extension but have not proved to be a problem. There are no proposals to restrict Sunday parking. The proposed measures are sufficient without being overly restrictive on the availability of parking.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
12	Mr & Mrs Hummel, 8 The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	Strongly support proposed double yellow lines in Tangier Road although suggest that those at the junction with Epsom Road should be extended by a lorry-length rather than a car-length.	The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest.
13	T & A Carney, 13 St Omer Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DA	My wife and I wish to register an objection to this proposal. We see no need for the extension which will have a detrimental effect on our ability to park outside our own home. Your data is flawed in that the surveys were undertaken during a period when building works were ongoing. Parking has now returned to normal. If the scheme does proceed, the bays should be more conveniently located for our property.	The suggestion that there is no need for the extension is not the majority view expressed previously by residents of St Omer Road. The combination of unrestricted and 4-hour limited waiting bays spread throughout the road, albeit on the even numbered side, should provide ample opportunity for residents and their visitors to park.
14	Brigid Jackson, jackson@kingstonhospital.nhs.uk	Happy with proposals to improve safety around the junctions but do not see the need for 4 hour restricted parking bays so far from the town centre as there is little parking and no problems. It will have an adverse affect on residents who only have one parking space and may have to park a second car on the road at times. If permit charges are introduced it just seems a means by which the council can obtain more money from residents.	There is a substantial amount of non-residents parking in St Omer Road and one objective of the proposal is to regulate this and spread it over a wider area. If this parking is allowed to displace naturally, without being properly managed, issues can arise in the nearest uncontrolled sections of carriageway, as occurred previously when the scheme was introduced in roads adjacent to St Omer Road. Residents will not necessarily need permits, as there are unrestricted parking places and 4 hour limited bays.
15	John H Rowe, 23 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Support the proposals with the exception of the parking bay at the bottom of Tangier Road. The parking which already takes place there often causes a queue of traffic waiting to get onto Epsom Road. Cars need to pull out directly into the path of vehicles entering Tangier Road, which to them is a blind corner.	The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest.
16	Patricia East, Mzima, Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HQ	Rate payers living in the roads affected are having their residential area turned into a free car park. Whilst residents of St Omer Road maybe pleased by the proposal the problem is merely being moved around the corner. Traffic speeds up and down Warren Road making it increasingly difficult to exit properties safely and the parked cars make it more difficult. The plan to increase the DYs at the bottom of Tangier Road is necessary, the proposed yellow line restrictions should be extended from Tangier Road to One Tree Hill Road.	One objective of the proposal is to spread the non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in roads like St Omer Road are resolved. Nevertheless, road space has to be managed equitably for all road users, whether they are residents or not. Warren Road is sufficiently wide between Tangier Road and One Tree Hill to allow parking. If this area were restricted throughout, the potential for displacement into Downside Road would increase, and would vehicle speeds. The proposed spaces in this section, if occupied, may also assist in respect to traffic calming.
17	D & J Cade, 'Michaelmas House', 28 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	There is no need to extend the CPZ to include upper Tangier Road as there simply isn't a problem. Nevertheless, we are please with the proposal to extend the DYs at both the top and bottom. However, if the proposals do go ahead the unrestricted bays at the top should be converted to 4-hour limited waiting and swapped to the eastern side of the road with its higher hedges, to minimise visual intrusion.	One objective of the proposals is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in roads like St Omer Road are resolved. We consider that if parking is controlled in St Omer Road and the Lower part of Tangier Road there will be an increase in parking in upper Tangier Road. It would be confusing to exclude upper Tangier Road if the lower part and Warren Road was included.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
18	Mr & Mrs S & B Parker, 1 The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	Strongly against inclusion of Tangier Road as there is not a problem. The number of cars parked in Tangier Road is low and we do not believe that there will be sufficient displacement parking to create a problem. We have done counts and the numbers are low. Making the CPZ extension and policing it is costly and a waste. There should be no costs attached with visitor parking and the markings and signs will detract from the appearance of the road. Whilst St Omer Road and some in lower Tangier Road support inclusion, upper Tangier Road should be excluded. 14 of the 18 residents in upper Tangier Road oppose the scheme but their views have been ignored. The scheme should not be imposed and the practical solution is to exclude the upper part of Tangier Road.	One objective of the proposal is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. Resolving these issues and improving the situation around junctions, through the formalisation of parking, invariably reduces the amount of parking available. If this parking is allowed to displace naturally, without being properly managed, issues can arise in the nearest uncontrolled sections of carriageway, as occurred previously when the scheme was introduced in roads adjacent to St Omer Road. If uncontrolled, the section of Tangier Road between St Omer Road and Warren Road would be most at risk. It would also be confusing to exclude upper Tangier Road if the lower part and Warren Road was included. Although a useful means of gauging opinion and identifying potential issues, the informal and formal stages of consultation are not a referendum on parking. The highway authority is tasked with the managing the public highway in an equitable manner and in the best interests of all road users.
19	Dr R Seebold, 6 St Omer Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DB	Completely against the extension as there isn't a serious problem in St Omer Road. There will be no benefit for residents of the road, and the inclusion of Saturdays is completely unnecessary.	The suggestion that there is no need for the extension and it will be of no benefit to residents is not a widely held view in St Omer Road. Indeed many residents, including the representee, took the previous opportunity to have a driveway protection marking placed across the entrance to their driveway. Concerns about Saturday restrictions were raised during the last CPZ extension but there has not been a problem. The proposed measures are sufficient without being overly restrictive on the availability of parking.
20	T & MA Lux, Morston, St Omer Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DB	Support the proposals as the character and nature of the road has changed significantly since the previous extension, with non-resident vehicles consistently parking in the road. Problems have included blocked driveways, loss of sightlines whilst existing driveways and driving along the road, nowhere for residents to park, cars being dumped, increased risk of injury for pedestrians and single file traffic increases the risk of traffic accidents. Representation I have made to SEEDA, SCC and other companies whose staff park in St Omer Road have had little or no effect, and the subsequently introduced driveway protection markings have been ineffective. The redevelopment of the DEFRA site will only exacerbate issues. Please implement ASAP.	Noted

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
21	John & Doreen Yaxley, 'Tinkers Wood', 29 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Having lived in the road for nearly 40 years the situation has deteriorated. The nature of the road encourages speeding. The 4-hour parking bays being proposed should be repositioned as they affect sightlines and will add further danger for those exiting adjacent properties. Therefore, the number of parking bays should be reduced by removing those close to driveways.	Whilst still allowing two-way flow, the proposed parking bays have been arranged so as to create chicanes, which may assist in calming traffic. The bays will be setback sufficiently from driveways, as is the case elsewhere throughout the existing CPZ.
22	Julia & Juan Coto, 'Walnut Lodge', 9 St Omer Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DA	Strongly in favour of the proposals to extend the CPZ into St Omer Road and nearby roads. The present situation raises safety issues, making it difficult to exit driveways because of the level of parking in the road.	Noted
23	Mr & Mrs D Varns, 5 The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	Agrees with the proposals and would like to see a balance of 4-hour and all day bays, DYs at the exit of The Ridgeway, and extended DYs at Tangier Roads junctions with Epsom Road and Warren Road.	We consider the proposal offers these elements.
24	Ms Helen Bernard, 33 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HQ	Concerned about the affects of the proposals on the basis that they share a driveway with No.31a and this results in up to 6 vehicles using the driveway daily. This is significantly more than for an average property, and as a result, the position of the proposed parking bays and displacement from elsewhere will make the present, extremely dangerous situation, even worse. DYs should protect visibility at the junction and around points of access to at least Downlands. Failure to do so will lead to accidents and injury. Could the Police carry out speed checks?	The proposed parking bays are set back 1.8m on each side from the edge of the driveway. We have visited the area and assessed the situation and consider this is sufficient.
25	Mr B & Mrs C Dilbey, 'Kingsworthy', 26 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Strongly agrees with the need for the extension of the DYs and SYs at Tangier Road's junctions with Epsom and Warren Road, also those in St Omer Road and at the entrance of The Ridgeway. Does not think that the top of Tangier Rd should be restricted at this stage but feels the restriction on parking at the lower end could lead to traffic migrating to the top end and causing a problem when the DEFRA site is developed. The proposed SYs do not protect driveways in the evenings and on Sundays. The unrestricted parking bays also allow cars to be 'dumped' for unlimited periods.	One of the objectives of the proposal is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in road St Omer Road are resolved. We estimate this is likely to lead to displacement parking in the top part of Tangier Road. It would be confusing for motorists to leave the top of Tangier Road unrestricted if the lower part and Warren Rd had restrictions. The proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm single yellow line restrictions, prevent parking when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. There is always a small risk cars will become abandoned but this could occur now.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
26	Mr & Mrs E Tyers, 'Ravenswood', 22 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Do not want to see any extension of the CPZ into Tangier Road and strongly question if there is a need for such measures as there is currently no parking problem. Disagrees with the surveys in previous Committee reports suggesting that the closure of DEFRA has had little impact parking on levels of parking. Contends that there is no longer a parking issue. Enclosed a number of photographs taken on Saturday 5 th July and Tuesday 8 th July. Suggests another yes / no survey is conducted now the DEFRA site has closed to ask whether residents believe there is a problem. Residents also need to be made aware of the cost of permits, restrictions on visitor permits etc... as this has not been communicated. Despite the above, if the proposals do go ahead, they should only apply Monday-Friday.	One of the objectives of the proposal is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. Parking levels in St Omer Road have remained similar since the closure of DEFRA, so if it remained uncontrolled, Tangier Road would be most at risk from displacement. Concerns about Saturday restrictions were raised during the last CPZ extension but have proved unfounded. A leaflet explaining the permit scheme and permit charges was included with the informal consultation letter distributed in July 2007.
27	Andrew Whiddett, 41 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	It seems almost inevitable that this unnecessary scheme is foisted upon us. Concerned about the environmental impact of street furniture, notices and bright yellow lines. The extension of the junction protection measures is proportional and appropriate. The amount of unrestricted parking allowed at the top end of Tangier Road and Warren Road is grossly inadequate for the flats in Warren Road and from the sale and redevelopment of old house potentially into higher density flats. The proposals reduce parking space when this will increase demand. The proposals will merely displace the problem, as they have done so before, and will greatly inconvenience residents, visitors and trades people. Parking would be almost continuous if moved to the east side of the road rather than the west, although the existing parking on both side should be allowed to remain. If the purpose of the proposal is to stop commuters from parking in St Omer Road, why not adopt an 11am-2pm commuter ban, and remove Saturdays from the scheme. The random parking in Tangier Road presently calms traffic. This benefit will be lost through formalisation. The proposals will also have a detrimental visual impact. The Council should not charge residents for permits and use of the spaces. Resolving a minor issue in St Omer Road should not mess my road up too. High density development and multi-car ownership has to be accommodated.	One of the objectives of the proposal is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. Parking is likely to displace into Tangier Road and controls are needed to ensure there are not problems The spaces are proposed on the western side of the road in this section to afford greater visibility for vehicles exiting Kyngeshene Gardens into Tangier Road. Additionally, by having the bays on the western side, and whilst still allowing two-way flow, priority is given to those vehicles driving up the hill. This combined with the bays further down Tangier Road create a chicane effect, which may assist in calming traffic. Commuter bans only tend to be introduced around railways stations, where the commuters have no means of returning to their vehicles during the day. It also places additional burdens on enforcement by requiring it to be undertaken in specific locations at specific times. It could increase the likelihood of vehicles parking on both sides of the roads, particularly around junctions when the commuter ban isn't in force, whereas the no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restrictions would prevent parking in these areas throughout the period when traffic flows are generally greater. A commuter ban would increase the need for signing and consequently the visual impact. Although the use of road markings is unavoidable, signs will be kept to a minimum and sensitively positioned. Concerns about Saturday restrictions were raised during the last CPZ extension but have not proved to be a problem. The permit charges cover the cost of administering the scheme and the proposals accommodate present demand and potential issues.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
28	Elizabeth Whiddett 41 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD GU1 2DF	Cars park in the lower part of St Omer Road but the upper does not have a problem. There is not a problem in the lower part of Tangier Rd. Parking may have increased as a result of restrictions in adjacent roads but never felt that it represents a danger. Extending the CPZ will move the problem and cause issues in areas that do not have a problem. If parking were stopped in lower St Omer Road and cars distributed between upper St Omer and Tangier Rds there would not be a problem. Residents in Upper Tangier Rd and Warren Rd have a need for parking on street. The inconvenience the scheme will cause them needs to be balanced against the scale of the problem. The problem is being moved closer to the Surrey Hills which are attractive for their lack of lines. The cost also needs to be considered. Does not see the need to extend lines at the Tangier / Warren Rd junction as people park safely but if experts considered it was would not object to this part only.	Parking problems in St Omer Road have been highlighted and the scheme has been designed to deal with these. The proposed restriction will cause displacement in to adjacent roads and the controls seek to control this to ensure a balance between unrestricted parking and limited parking which can be used by residents and their visitors. We have looked at the levels of parking in the area and consider the controls are needed. To avoid moving the problem of displaced uncontrolled parking that occurred in St Omer Road.
29	Kevin and Jane Everden 'Fairwinds', 29 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HG	This representation is made on safety grounds. Although welcoming the proposed SYL from Warren Road's junction with Tangier Road and across No.29s driveway, protest that its length is insufficiently short and does not provide safe access out of the drive. The SYL needs to be extended by a car length towards Rosetrees. An additional car length would have no impact on residents or non-residents. The representation has been made on the basis that despite concerted efforts having been made to resolve the issues on an informal basis no progress has resulted. There has been a history of safety issues on either side of our drive. Vans are a particular problem and Surrey Police consider those that park in close proximity to the driveway (where they will be formally allowed) to be causing danger / obstruction. The proposed SYLs take no account of the specific circumstances. Our safety has not been considered or supported by the Council, and representative are invited to undertake a site visit. Formal action will be taken if representation is declined to protect the safety of our family.	The no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres from the junction. The proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. We have visited the site and are satisfied that the bay will be setback sufficiently from the driveway. The parking bays will be a maximum of 2 metres wide, and vehicles within them limited to 5-tonnes in weight. Whilst this will not preclude their use by larger vehicles such as vans and caravanettes, it will prevent larger vehicles, such as HGVs, using the spaces.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
30	Mr Chris Shorter, Thomasons, 86 Epsom Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2BX	Oppose the proposal for all the same reasons expressed previously. The proposals are a direct consequence of previous actions in adjacent roads and central governments desire to displace motorists onto non-existent public transport. It would be more useful for you to 'target' driving schools who use this road despite the test centre having close, and who regularly 'dump' unused cars. If controls are introduced some logic should be employed and that parking should be prevented in the unlimited bays before 9.30 or 10am and Saturday should be omitted. The suggestion that Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm should be employed does not hold water. Those who park in the area are local regulars, so they would only be confused once by non-standard restrictions.	One objective of the proposal is to spread the non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. The previous extension of the scheme was introduced to deal with safety issues and at the request of residents in those locations. The needs of all motorists have to be considered in an equitable manner. Commuter bans tend to be introduced around railways stations, where the commuters have no means of returning to their vehicles during the day. It also places additional burdens on enforcement by requiring it to be undertaken in specific locations at specific times. It could increase the likelihood of vehicles parking on both sides of the roads, particularly around junctions when the commuter ban isn't in force, whereas the no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restrictions would prevent parking in these areas throughout the period when traffic flows are generally greater. A commuter ban would increase the need for signing and consequently the visual impact. Concerns about Saturday restrictions were raised during the last CPZ extension but have not been a problem.
31	Richard Sinker, 2 The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD	Strongly support proposed double yellow lines in Tangier Road in vicinity of The Ridgeway as intermittent speeding and poor sightlines in Tangier Road continue to cause issues when exiting The Ridgeway.	Noted.
32	Colin Mealor, 16 Rosetrees, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HS	In relation to the junction of Rosetrees and Warren Road, the DYLS need to be extended much further to improve sight lines and the proposed first parking bay should be removed and bus stop relocated to that area. In respect to the junction of Tangier Road and Warren Road this junction also suffers from poor sight lines. There should be no parking bays prior to the first driveway to the left, so the first proposed parking bay should be removed. Additionally, the DYLS to the right should be extended much further to protect the access and No.29 and movements at the junction.	The no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres from both the Rosetrees and Tangier Road junctions. In both cases proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The spaces proposed in Warren Road will be situated away from junctions and points of access, and where it can be safely accommodated, unlike the present situation, which is uncontrolled.
33	Ian & Helen Wells, 3 Rosetrees, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HS	This is the 6th opportunity we have had to write regarding the above! Whilst supportive of certain elements of the proposals, such as the principal of improved junction protection, concerned that DYLS have not been used to extend the junction protection in Warren Road. The inconsiderate parking in Warren Road is often worst in the evenings and at weekends. Therefore the precedent of DYLS set in Tangier Road should be extended to Warren Road. Additionally, Rosetrees must be included in the scheme, with at least the upper half involved, due to the present obstruction of driveways, the difficulties caused to residents who have visitors and carers, the lack of access for emergency vehicles caused by parked vehicles, breaches in the restrictive covenants on the houses and the disturbance caused by on-street parking late at night.	The no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres from both the Rosetrees and Tangier Road junctions. In both cases the proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The spaces proposed in Warren Road will be situated away from junctions and points of access, and where it can be safely accommodated, unlike the present situation, which is uncontrolled. The residents, and not non-resident motorists, principally cause the parking issues in Rosetrees. The introduction of the parking scheme during the day would have little impact in dealing with these issues.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
34	David & Rosalind Hanna, 37 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Oppose the proposal in upper Tangier Road on the basis that it will compromise the safety of residents, particularly small children, living in Kyngeshene Gardens. If non-residents park in the unrestricted bays in upper Tangier Road, there will be no space for residents' with two cars, their visitors or tradesmen. This may tempt people to park within the development, increasing danger there and difficulties for emergency vehicles if access were required. Therefore it is important that residents of the development have reasonable access to parking on the public highway and be eligible for permits. Kyngeshene Gardens must be reclassified as a shared access and not a private road, to avoid a situation where some of the properties in the development are eligible for permits whilst others are not. Additionally, one of the nearby parking bays should be prioritised for permit holders.	One objective of the proposal is to spread non-resident parking over a wider area, so that particular problems apparent in St Omer Road are resolved. Resolving these issues and improving the situation around junctions, through the formalisation of parking, invariably reduces the amount of parking available. If this parking is allowed to displace naturally, without being properly managed, issues can arise in the nearest uncontrolled sections of carriageway, as occurred previously when the scheme was introduced in roads adjacent to St Omer Road. If uncontrolled, the section of Tangier Road between St Omer Road and Warren Road would be most at risk. Because of the proximity of Kyngeshene Gardens' access to Warren Road, additional lengths of no waiting at any time restriction are proposed. Nevertheless unrestricted spaces are proposed on the western side of the road in this section to afford greater visibility for vehicles exiting Kyngeshene Gardens into Tangier Road. These will be available for residents of Kyngeshene Gardens to use. Management of parking within Kyngeshene Gardens would be a matter for the organisation responsible for managing that area.
35	John Twining, 8a The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	Supportive of the proposal for double yellow lines in Tangier Road at the exit from The Ridgeway. Disappointed that the double yellow lines at the Tangier Road junction with Epsom Road are only proposed to be lengthened by one cars length. Does not think this is sufficient to overcome the road safety problems arising from competition between vehicles from Tangier Road seeking to turn into Epsom Road and vehicles travelling westward along Epsom Road seeking to turn into Tangier Road. A further extension of the double yellow lines in Tangier Road would reduce this road safety problem.	We have studied the junction Tangier Road/Epsom Road junction. The proposed double yellow lines will extend 20 metres and consider that introducing a single yellow line on the east side will improve access.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
36	<p>John Twining, (On behalf of the Downsedge Residents Association) 8a The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG</p>	<p>Views of members of the association differ according to the area in which they live. St Omer Road members want the scheme implemented as soon as possible. In Lower Tangier Road the majority of residents recognise this area is likely to suffer displacement and support inclusion. However residents and road users are disappointed that only a small extension to the double yellow lines at the junction with Epsom Road is proposed. Vehicles turning in and out the roads are forced into the middle by the angle of the junction. The small extension will not stop this as it occurs when vehicles are parked two spaces from the current double yellow lines.</p> <p>In upper Tangier Road we understand that there is virtually unanimous opposition to the inclusion of this length of road in the CPZ. This stretch of road is very steep which may deter commuter or shopping parkers. The present uncontrolled pattern of parking suggests an overflow of domestic parking from the Kyngeshene development. We are concerned that the evidence of “snapshots” of parking as presented at the local Committee on 18 June, i.e. four morning counts does not provide a full picture of the situation on the ground. Some residents in upper Tangier Road have also asked that if the CPZ is to be extended to this stretch of road that the unrestricted parking place closest to Warren Road be eliminated as it will force traffic turning into Tangier Road into the middle of the road. Residents have also asked that the unrestricted parking bays proposed for the west side of the road be moved to the east.</p> <p>The Ridgeway are in favour of the proposed double yellow lines in Tangier Road at the exit from the Ridgeway.</p> <p>In Warren Road the residents want longer double yellow lines at the Warren Rd/Tangier Rd junction as the angle is particularly difficult. Parking in Tangier Road along the flank wall of No 29 Warren Rd exacerbates the situation.</p>	<p>The proposed double yellow line at the Epsom Road junction will extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction so that parking is not permitted within 20 metres of the junction. Additionally, parking will be prevented on the opposite side of the road by the introduction of a no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction, preventing parking there when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. Similarly, the no waiting at any time restrictions already extend 15 metres in Warren Road from its junction with Tangier Road. The proposed no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction will effectively double the length of kerb where parking will be prevented, when traffic flows and the pressure on parking from non-residents is at its greatest. The upper part of Tangier Road is likely to have displacement parking. The omission of the upper part of Tangier Road will be confusing for motorists. The 4-hour bays are generally located centrally within the road, so that if certain spaces become fully occupied, the alternative prioritised spaces are located nearby rather than at the opposite end of the road. The spaces are proposed on the western side of the road to afford greater visibility for vehicles exiting Kyngeshene Gardens into Tangier Road. Additionally, by having the bays on the western side, and whilst still allowing two-way flow, priority is given to those vehicles driving up the hill. This combined with the bays further down Tangier Road create a chicane effect which may assist in calming traffic</p>

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
37	Gillian & Mark Hawken, 31 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Strongly object to the inclusion of upper Tangier Road. Speeding is an issue in Tangier Road. Providing spaces to allow cars to park in the road will significantly reduce visibility for those exiting their drives, increasing danger. The proposals do not account for this. There is only a limited parking problem in Tangier Road, and those that park in the road are generally residents. The displacement effects will be negligible and the basis for the proposals out of date due to the closure of DEFRA. Residents will be expected to pay for visitors' parking despite there not being a problem. As there is some support for the scheme in St Omer Road and lower Tangier Road, the obvious solution is to exclude upper Tangier Road, to meet the wishes of its residents.	Following the closure of DEFRA surveys undertaken suggest the proposed unrestricted spaces in St Omer Road and lower Tangier Road are unlikely to accommodate the all-day parking demand within the area. Therefore, if unrestricted parking were permitted in upper Tangier Road, the problems of inconsiderate parking on both sides of the road, and reduced visibility for those exiting driveways, would be more likely to occur, rather than if parking were only permitted where it is safe to do so. A balance of 4-hour limited waiting and unrestricted spaces are proposed. If there is minimal displacement, as suggested by the representee, then there will be ample unrestricted parking available to accommodate the needs of residents' visitors, without them having to use visitor permits. The cost of visitor permits covers their cost of issuing. There are practical reasons, as well as legal considerations, which make it appropriate for the whole of Tangier Road to be included within the CPZ.
Additional Comments received as after the first advertisement and as a result of the second advertisement			
38	Mr V C Abel, 15 Rossiter Lodge, Rosetrees, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HU	The proposed parking bays in the vicinity of the Warren Road / Tangier Road junction will obstruct visibility for drivers turning into Warren Road. No.29 has unofficial strictly no parking signs on their fence but cars continue to park there. The DYLS should be extended further.	The parking bays are at least 15m away from the junction and on Warren Road considerably more than this. These distances are more than adequate.
39	Peter Gordon (on behalf of Windacres Ltd), 27 Warren Road, GUILDFORD	Concerned that formalisation of parking may reduce ability of residents of Windacres to park in Warren Road. Would prefer some of spaces to be prioritised for residents' use.	During the day demand tends to be from non-residents whereas demand from residents tends to come towards the end of the day when there will be fewer other users. The number of spaces proposed broadly matches existing usage and therefore provision is considered adequate.
40	Mr & Mrs Hummel, 8 The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	Pleased that representation made previously (see Ref. No.12) will be considered again.	See comment under Ref. No.12.
41	David & Julia Cade, 'Michaelmas House', 28 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Further to previous representation (see Ref. No.17), feel that there is no need to extend restrictions into upper Tangier Road, but do agree with the proposals to extend junction protection measures at Tangier Road's junctions with Epsom and Warren Roads. If the proposals do go ahead, the bay outside Nos.28/30 should be transferred to the opposite side of the road, to minimise visual intrusion, and restricted to 4-hour limited waiting.	See comment under Ref. No.17

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
42	Mr & Mrs DG & SM Peters, 30 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Further to previous representation (see Ref. No.10), the proposed parking zone will increase the risk of accidents as no account has been taken of the fact that most vehicles parking belong to the new houses on the east side of the road. The parking bays effectively reduce the width of the road to all traffic. Formalising parking in Tangier Road will make it more attractive to non-residents than the Spectrum Park & Ride.	See comment under Ref. No.10. Formalised controls are unlikely to make Tangier Road more attractive to users of the Spectrum Park and Ride site but they would offer controlled parking if drivers who used the Park and Ride site decided to park elsewhere.
43	Dr Shiva Khalafpour & David Morse, Tyler House, Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Object to extension of CPZ into Tangier Road. Since the closure of DEFRA parking pressure has diminished and therefore there is no need, and will only incur additional cost for taxpayers and residents alike. The CPZ would create a much more hazardous situation with cars having to move to the centre of the road in order to negotiate parked vehicles. Can't understand why Saturday controls are required. Please retain existing situation.	There has been no significant change in the number of vehicles parking in the area being considered since the closure of DEFRA. There is currently considerable parking in St Omer Road and controls here will spread the number of parked vehicles out and lead to displacement into Tangier Road and potentially Warren Road. It is proposed for the restrictions to form part of the Controlled Parking Zone which is controlled Monday to Saturday.
44	Mr B & Mrs C Dilbey, 'Kingsworthy', 26 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Further to previous representation (see Ref. No.25), would like to add to comments. Traffic flow at peak times will be delayed by the each proposed parking bay, as is already the case in Warren Road. Tangier Road is not wide enough and this could lead to danger. The CPZ is unnecessary as there is very little parking in Tangier Road other than at the Warren Road end.	See comment under Ref No.25. Tangier Rd is wider than Warren Road and with parking bays it will still be possible to have two-way traffic flow. The presence of parked places is likely to have the effect of reducing vehicle speeds. There is currently considerable parking in St Omer Road and controls here will spread the number of parked vehicles out and lead to displacement into Tangier Road and potentially Warren Road.
45	Mr & Mrs I Tyers, 'Ravenswood', 22 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Further to previous representation (see Ref. No.26), object to the whole scheme on the basis that there are no longer problems in either St Omer or Tangier Roads. Since the closure of DEFRA the numbers of cars parked in St Omer Road has diminished considerably. Frustrated that this data wasn't presented previously. There is no justification for spending council funds on a scheme that will bring no benefit to local residents and indeed will only create ongoing maintenance and enforcement costs.	See comment under Ref. No.26. There has been no significant change in the number of vehicles parking in the area being considered since the closure of DEFRA. There is currently considerable parking in St Omer Road and controls here will spread the number of parked vehicles out and lead to displacement into Tangier Road and potentially Warren Road.
46	Sam & Bridget Parker, 1 The Ridgeway, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DG	Further to previous representation (see Ref. No.18), strongly object to the extension of the Controlled Parking Zone to Tangier Road. Objected on the grounds additional vehicles parking in Tangier Road will make a positive contribution to slowing traffic which is the major issue in Tangier Road. Also that there is a perfectly practical alternative. Now object on additional grounds that, (1) with the CPZ the vehicles being parked will cause addition danger by having to swing into more confined spaces created by the bays, (2) cars will have to cross onto the opposite side of the road in order to park in the more limited spaces being provided increasing danger, (3) the cost of enforcement will lead to higher Council Tax for no benefit and (4) the scheme will cause residents to incur additional and totally unnecessary additional costs in difficult economic conditions.	See comment under Ref. No.18. Agree that parking in Tangier Road will help slow down the traffic but uncontrolled parking will lead to the problems such as those currently experienced in St Omer Road since 2006 and those that were evident in Aldersey Road when the CPZ was extended in 2003 and Maori Roads when the controls were put in adjacent roads in 2001. The presence of significant levels of uncontrolled parking presents higher risks than that of ordered parking. The benefits experienced in Maori and Aldersey Roads are clear with greater visibility round junctions, set back distances for driveways and passing places. The cost of enforcement is not met from Council Tax but is more or less self-financing with any deficit being from the surplus on pay and display. The cost of the permit is set to cover the administration of the scheme and in this area there is a high level of off street parking and the take up of permits is likely to be very low.

ITEM 9 : ANNEXE 3 : OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS : PROPOSED EASTWARD EXTENSION

Ref. No.	Name & Address	Summary of Comments	Officer Recommendation
47	T J Lux, Morston, St Omer Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DB	Further to previous representation (see Ref. No.20), continue to support the proposal. The DEFRA housing development may impact on the area and result in overflow parking which will need to be managed. Therefore there is a need to implement the proposals as soon as possible, particularly as the opening of the Merrow Park & Ride does not appear to have had any impact on the present situation.	See comment under Ref. No.20.
48	Kevin and Jane Everden, 'Fairwinds', 29 Warren Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HG	Further to previous representation (Ref. No.29), reiterate previous comments and wants meeting to resolve the situation. The health and safety issues are genuine, as acknowledged by the police. Small additional lengths of yellow line to make our access safe should be considered and will have no impact on the proposals.	See comment under Ref. No.29. The site has been visited on a number of occasions and we are satisfied with the distance the proposed parking place is set back.
49	Prof Ian and Mrs Helen Wells, 3 Rosetrees, GUILDFORD, GU1 2HS	Further to previous representation (Ref. No.33), wants this to be considered again. Reiterate desire to see Rosetrees included within CPZ, particularly to maintain access to existing parking bays and garages. The minimum recommended 3.5 metre access width for emergency vehicles is not being maintained. Wants to know why restrictive covenants restricting parking by residents of the flats are ignored.	See comment under Ref. No.33. Whilst not part of the CPZ Rosetrees is already within the area covered by the CPZ. The main problem in Rosetrees occurs at night when residents come home and past the proposed hours of control. Any covenants relating to properties are not relevant to this scheme.
50	Andrew Whiddett, 41 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Further to household's previous representations (Ref. Nos27 & 28), believes it has become even more apparent that this proposal is being foisted upon Tangier Road by the residents of St Omer Road. The opposition in upper Tangier Road is being ignored. Why can't the scheme be modified to reflect the residents' stated opinion? If the scheme does go ahead, the provision of resident and visitor parking in upper Tangier Road is grossly inadequate for residents' needs on evenings and at weekends. Additionally, Saturdays and Bank Holidays should be removed from the control hours. Multiple car ownership in Kyngeshene Gardens and Warren Road is a fact of life that must be catered for. Why do Tangier Road residents' views count less than the opinions of those from St Omer Road?	If controls are introduced in St Omer Road there will be displacement parking into Tangier Road and if there are controls in the lower part of Tangier Road this parking is likely to go beyond the junction with St Omer Road. There will be significant parking places to accommodate the level of evening and weekend parking but single yellow lines will be unrestricted. It is our recommendation that if controls are applied to St Omer Road the effects of displacement into Tangier Road should also be addressed. The proposal is an extension to the existing controlled parking zone and includes Saturday and Bank Holidays.
51	David Rolph and Audrey Wilson, 20 Tangier Road, GUILDFORD, GU1 2DF	Object on the basis that there is not a parking problem in Tangier Road, or expectation of one if St Omer Road and lower Tangier Road is included. It's a complete waste of money. The proposed parking bays will cause motorists and pedestrians to have to cross the road, increasing danger, particularly as speeding cars come over the crest of the hill. The road markings and signs will have a detrimental visual impact.	If controls are introduced in St Omer Road there will be displacement parking into Tangier Road and if there are controls in the lower part of Tangier Road this parking is likely to go beyond the junction with St Omer Road. There will be significant parking places to accommodate the level of evening and weekend parking but single yellow lines will be unrestricted. It is our recommendation that if controls are applied to St Omer Road the effects of displacement into Tangier Road should also be addressed. Making the scheme an extension of the existing Controlled Parking Zone reduces confusion and minimises the number of signs necessary.