

**ITEM 8: WAVERLEY PARKING REVIEW 2011/12
SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

ANNEX 1

Waverley Parking Review 2011/12 - Summary of objections to parking review

Plan number/ Page number	Road/Location	Number of objections	Status
Farnham			
24120	Shepherd & Flock Roundabout (Moor Park Road), Farnham <i>*52 letters of support received*</i>	None	Proceed as advertised
24110	Lynch Road, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24038	Ridgway Road, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24029, 24034 Page 6	Extension of Farnham (Railway) Controlled Parking Zone (Tilford Road) <i>*24 letters of support received*</i>	3	Proceed as advertised
24029	St Georges Road, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24034, 24029, 24030	Longley Road, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24034, 24030	Menin Way, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24034, 24111, 24121	York Road & Lancaster Avenue, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24033	Arthur Road, Farnham <i>*Petition, 16 Signatures asking for additional restrictions*</i>	None	Proceed as advertised
24033	Alfred Road, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24032	Weydon Lane, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24031	The Chantrys, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24030	Waverley Lane, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24030	Old Compton Lane, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24027	Crosby Way & Pengilly Road, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24023 Page 7	Middle Church Lane, Farnham	2	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24018	Castle Street, Farnham <i>*28 letters of support received*</i>	None	Proceed as advertised

24015	St James Avenue, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24015 <i>Page 7</i>	Adams Park Road, Farnham,	1	Proceed as advertised
24126	Bankside, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24014 <i>Page 8</i>	Extension of Farnham (Town Centre) Controlled Parking Zone. Wykeham Road. <i>*6 letters of support received*</i>	8	Proceed as advertised
24014 <i>Page 10</i>	Extension of Farnham (Town Centre) Controlled Parking Zone. Sumner Road <i>*2 letters of support received*</i>	1	Proceed as advertised
24014	Extension of Farnham (Town Centre) Controlled Parking Zone. Beaufort Road <i>*4 letters of support received*</i>	None	Proceed as advertised
24014	Upper South View, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24011	Lower Weybourne Lane, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24011 <i>Page 10</i>	Badshot Lea Road, Farnham	1	Proceed as advertised
24119	Heath Lane, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24009	Alma Way, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24122	Lodge Hill Road, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24039 <i>Page 10</i>	Burnt Hill Road, Farnham <i>*1 letter of support received*</i>	22	Do not proceed
24121	Great Austins, junctions with Little Austins & Mavins Road, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24035	Weydon Lane, Farnham	None	Proceed as advertised
24025 <i>Page 14</i>	Bridgefield, Farnham <i>*2 letter of support received*</i>	1	Proceed as advertised

Cranleigh			
24101 <i>Page 14</i>	St James's Place, Cranleigh <i>*1 letter of support received*</i>	8	Proceed with minor amendments
24102	High Street, Cranleigh	None	Proceed as advertised
24102	Victoria Road, Cranleigh	None	Proceed with minor amendments

Godalming, Milford, Wormley and Witley			
24062 <i>Page 15</i>	Church Lane, Witley	1	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24061, 24123 <i>Page 16</i>	Combe Lane, Wormley <i>*42 letters of support received*</i>	3	Proceed as advertised
24124	Tuesley Lane, Godalming	None	Proceed as advertised
24073	Ockford Road, Godalming	None	Proceed as advertised
24073, 24076	Busbridge Lane, Godalming	None	Proceed as advertised
24084 <i>Page 17</i>	Deanery Road, Godalming	1	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24071	Crownpits Lane, Godalming	None	Proceed as advertised
24069	Church Road, Milford	None	Proceed as advertised

Farncombe			
24125 <i>Page 17</i>	More Circle, Farncombe	1	Proceed as advertised
24093, 24095 <i>Page 18</i>	Summer's Road, Farncombe	2	Proceed as advertised
24090	Upper Manor Road, Farncombe	None	Proceed as advertised
24090	Farncombe Street, Farncombe	None	Proceed as advertised
24088	Hare Lane, Farncombe	None	Proceed as advertised
24086	Catteshall Road junction Grange Close, Farncombe	None	Proceed as advertised
24085	Hallam Road, Farncombe	None	Proceed as advertised
24085	Wolsey Road junction Marshall Road, Farncombe	None	Proceed as advertised
Haslemere			
24059 <i>Page 18</i>	College Hill and College Hill Terrace, Haslemere	3	Proceed as advertised
24058	Hedgehog Lane, Haslemere	None	Proceed as advertised
24056 <i>Page 19</i>	Lion Green, Haslemere	1	Proceed as advertised
24056	Junction Place, Haslemere	None	Proceed as advertised
24056	Liphook Road, Haslemere	None	Proceed as advertised
24054	West Street, Haslemere This is the loading restriction proposed in Sept report	None	Proceed as advertised
24051	Farnham Lane, Haslemere	None	Proceed as advertised
24127	Park Road junction Hill Road, Haslemere	None	Proceed as advertised
24127	Half Moon Hill junction Hill Road, Haslemere	None	Proceed as advertised
24050, 24117	Derby Road, Haslemere This is the waiting restriction proposed in Sept report	None	Proceed as advertised
	Amended residents and visitor permit criteria for Waverley Borough	None	Proceed as advertised

Detailed consultation responses to parking review proposals

Drawing No's 24029, 24034. Extension of Farnham (Railway) Controlled Parking Zone (Tilford Road)		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I agree in principle to the scheme and when I purchased the property 7 seven years ago paid a premium to park a vehicle across the foot of my drive. I object and fight any proposal that changes the status quo outside my property.	
2	I object vigorously to the proposals. I believe those in favour all live up the hill end of Tilford Road. This scheme will do nothing for those of us closer to the station; it may make the situation worse. The scheme you propose will enable a resident from uphill to park their car outside our home permanently. Commuters have rights as well as residents. I have heard of residents parking schemes elsewhere where apparently the council sells more permits than there are spaces and then enforce fines when all residents' places are full. You say that no home will be allowed more than 120 visitors per year, this is outrageous. I am much better off with commuters as compared with your scheme.	Up o 120 visitor permits are available each year, however not all resident are likely to need this number.
3	We are writing to object. We paid to increase our off street parking provision to 2 vehicles, widening our drive. This enables us to allow family, friends & tradesman to park across our drive way. We object, there is an incorrect assumption by some residents that the general problem affects all residents. Secondly, the proposed single yellow line discriminates against us during operating hours as we are not entitled to residents permits, or the ability to park across our own drive. Thirdly, the inadequate number of parking bays for the number of properties. We also object to the environmental intrusion and expense. We object to the times of operation and on road safety grounds in relation to St Polycarps School.	Parking across the driveway will still be permitted outside the operational hours (0800-1800, Mon – Fri) and visitor permits will be available during these hours.
		Despite the above objections, there is over whelming support for the extension of the controlled zone, and it is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No's 24023. Middle Church Lane, Farnham

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I wish to object because you must have visited Middle Church Lane during the week when the zone is enforced and no vehicles are parked. At weekends and evenings vehicle park up along the opposite side of the road, adjacent to the church wall. Putting a bay outside the houses will result in a loss of space and a chicane effect or potential road block with vehicles parked both sides.	
2	I welcome the idea of a parking bay for permit holders, however your bay is on the wrong side of the road. Mothers with children use the footpath which is narrow, cars parked could get scratched. Cars from Lower Church Lane take the corner sharply into Middle Church Lane and accidents could result. How will emergency service vehicles get through with potentially vehicles parked on both sides? Please take these 'pleas' into account.	
		These are valid concerns. It is recommended to defer the introduction of this parking bay and instead consider introducing a parking bay on the opposite side. Further consultation will be carried out and reported to the committee in June.

Drawing No's 24015. Adams Park Road, Farnham

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I live in Hale House Apartments. I am quite unhappy about this plan to extend the double yellow lines to opposite The Pippins. I want to be able to park near where I live, as I am a shift worker and get up early or return late at night.	
		It is recommended to proceed as advertised

Drawing No 24014. Extension of Farnham (Town Centre) Controlled Parking Zone. Wykeham Road.

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	The current situation is not ideal, the reduction in parking spaces that the new scheme would result in would make it very difficult to park in the road. I believe controlled parking would make the situation worse than it is at the moment.	
2	The proposed limited zone will severely limit space for all residents. The increase in the number of cars is part due to the fact that 5 or more properties are now rented by professional people with 2 or more vehicles. As an elderly resident of the road I am concerned that difficult though it is to park anywhere at present, the new plan will totally inhibit parking or access for myself, visitors and tradesman.	Parking will be permitted in a new bay adjacent to No.1 Beaufort Road.
3	I am very concerned by a number of items in your letter and object to your proposal. The road is full in the evenings and this plan will decrease the space available to park. During the day, non-residents will still take although to a lesser extent space. Residents will be required to pay for parking for themselves and visitors. The map attached to your letter is out of date. The ban on parking down the eastern side of Wykeham Road will increase traffic speeds. I would suggest the introduction of Residents Only parking and the use of delineated pavement parking as used in London.	
4	The parking plans for Wykeham Road will worsen, not improve the parking situation. I agree with the above objection reasons.	
5	I object because Wykeham Road is a different situation to surrounding streets. There is a higher concentration of houses and only 3 have off street parking. The street should clearly be resident's only parking, with delineated footway parking on both sides. The 2-hour limited waiting would be detrimental to our street, particularly on Saturdays.	
6	The points you raise in your letter are concerning and the maps supplied is out of date. It would appear that parking will be restricted on one side of Wykeham Road and it is clear there will not be enough space for all residents. This doesn't appear to be fair or practical. In some areas they have resident's only parking and delineated footway parking, This	Permits will be valid for Beaufort Road. It may be the case that residents will on occasion have to park in Beaufort Road.

	would enable parking on both sides of the road.	
7	I wish to object to the proposal. I believe that extending the zone will have a negative effect on relations in the street, with neighbours competing for limited parking spaces. I appreciate that a permit allows you park in other roads in the zone, but many of these streets will also be full. Although parking in the area can be difficult, residents don't have to pay to compete for a parking space.	
8	I am objecting to your proposal because the number of parking spaces allowed in your proposal will be insufficient for the number of resident's cars and there is a strong likelihood of paying and being unable to park. This does not account for visitors or the 2-hour limited waiting.	
		Formalising footway parking would be possible with a TRO, however this will require expensive footway strengthening works and consultation with utility companies. Although these residents concerns are acknowledged, there is support for this proposal. With residents of adjacent streets also favouring an extension of the zone, failing to proceed with Wykeham Road will isolate the street and could result in a worse parking situation than the residents experience at the present time. It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No 24014. Extension of Farnham (Town Centre) Controlled Parking Zone. Sumner Road

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	We object. We own a house on East Street, where no parking is possible so we rely on Sumner Road and adjacent streets for parking. We have nowhere else to park and so need to be included in the CPZ scheme.	
		We cannot include properties that were not included in the advertised proposal at this stage. It is recommended to proceed as advertised and then consider amendments when the scheme is reviewed.

Drawing No 24011. Badshot Lea Road, Farnham

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	The parking situation on Badshot Lea Road has worsened recently as a result of the extension of the School Keep Clear marking outside Badshot Lea school. The removal of additional parking space will undoubtedly make matters even worse. This is not the answer, what are you going to do to alleviate the parking problems?	The parking restriction is considered necessary to maintain traffic flows, particularly at school times.
		It is recommended to proceed as advertised

Drawing No 24039. Burnt Hill Road, Farnham

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I am a resident of Burnt Hill Road and strongly oppose parking restrictions outside my home. I don't understand where on earth you expect people who live here and their visitors to park? I have lived here over 10 years and have never known a problem. Cars have to wait 30 seconds or so, which is quite frankly a good thing as it slows down vehicles. What is needed is speed humps, not parking restrictions.	
2	I am writing to object to the proposed restrictions. There is already far too little parking around south Farnham Infant School and this will only get worse if the school expands. Restrictions would force 30 or so toddlers to walk further along the road and at collection/ pick up times the congestion will be worse.	
3	We believe that undue consideration has been given to the few residents on the north side of Burnt Hill Road, who suffer slight inconvenience when entering/ exiting their drives. While the amended order no longer extends to directly outside our property (The Royal British Legion Club), we would still be affected by it. Those vehicles that currently park on the south side will simply move further down the road, opposite the club creating a potential problem for our users. We have a fairly	

	small car park and our functions and those of the nursery school naturally generate significant parking requirements.	
4	I would like to object to the proposal. It would mean that the only parking left is the little unmade area or on the opposite side of the road where there are few spaces due to drives and no pavement. This would really limit parking for residents and be extremely hazardous for drivers with small children disembarking from their car.	
5	We live in Burnt Hill Road and our son attends The Bourne Nursery School. We object because Burnt Hill Road is often used as a cut through from Shortheath Road to Frensham Road and having cars parked along it slows traffic speeds. If parents couldn't park on Burnt Hill Road to drop off/ collect from the nursery we would have park further away and walk our children along the roadside where there is not a continuous pavement. If parking restrictions were imposed the residents of Burnt Hill Road would have to park on the gravel area opposite the nursery, limiting space for parents.	
6	I am strongly opposed to your proposal. I work at the Bourne Nursery School, there are 8 members of staff and 5 parking places. With parent drop off/ collections we require all available space along the road. If double yellow lines go ahead where will we park and where will parents drop off and collect? Going ahead with your plans will endanger the safety of staff, parents and their children.	
7	We are directly affected by this proposal and have previously been in support of parking restrictions. It can be extremely difficult to get in/out of our drive. However we have a major reservation regarding excessive speed. As much as we would prefer not to have cars parked opposite, speeding is more of a concern, especially travelling directly past our hedge (there is no footway). We feel traffic calming measures are required, not just parking restrictions on their own.	
8	I strongly object to the proposals for Burnt Hill Road. Parking currently works well. Placing double yellow lines on the even numbered side will force people to park on the opposite side of the road where there is no footway and driveway access. There is not sufficient additional parking in this area to support the proposed change. We have concerns for the speed that some people drive down this road and the parked vehicles act as traffic calming.	
9	We object to the proposals. In this time of austerity, cutbacks	

	and scrutiny of council budgets we find it hard to believe that time and money can be wasted on fiddling about with parking arrangements in a quite lane far distant from Farnham station. The proposal is also clearly not put forward on the grounds of safety, as the introduction of such parking restrictions would certainly lead to faster and possibly more traffic on this part of Burnt Hill Road.	
10	On behalf of residents of Burnt Hill Road we would like to object to your proposal. Most of the residents have children and grandchildren and not being able to park outside our houses would compromise safety and security. There is a lack of alternative parking. Cars speed on Burnt Hill Road on a nightly basis. Parked cars reduce speed. If two-way traffic encouraged the residents opposite would find it virtually impossible to pull out of their driveways. This would have negative impact on The Bourne Nursery and parents would have nowhere to park.	
11	I am strongly opposed to the proposed new 'no waiting at any time' plans for the following reasons: Having two young children and shopping I need to park outside my house for the safety and security of my children. The only area we could park is the gravel area down the hill and this would bring us into conflict with parents dropping off/ collecting nursery children. Speeding traffic at night. Parked vehicles reduce the speed of through traffic.	
12	We object to the planned introduction of parking restrictions. It will increase traffic speeds, and parked cars act as a traffic calming measure. Trying to cross the road with faster traffic speeds will be dangerous.	
13	I wish to object to the proposal with regard to the double yellow lines along Burnt Hill Road. I see no benefit or good reason for this proposal. It will have a big impact on families and visitors. Where are people supposed to park?	
14	I wish to register strong opposition to these proposals. Extended parking restrictions are unnecessary. They will create serious safety problems. They will create serious inconvenience. These proposals are not needed, will create inconvenience and generate more safety issues than they are designed to address.	
15	I object to the proposed parking restrictions. It is a complete nightmare to park and if you introduce yellow lines there would be no parking at all apart from some waste ground opposite	

	the bowls club and legion. This road does not need yellow lines, it needs traffic calming.	
16	I wish to register strong opposition to these proposals. Extended parking restrictions are unnecessary. They will create serious safety problems. They will create serious inconvenience. These proposals are not needed, will create inconvenience and generate more safety issues than they are designed to address	
17	I strongly object to this proposal. We have limited parking in front of our property and this proposal will make it almost impossible for visiting relatives and friends to park within a quarter of a mile of our house. Parking is also necessary for the Lower Bourne British Legion club in which there is a mother & toddler group. The existing arrangements cause no problems or accidents in the 8 years I have been here, I fail to understand why change is necessary.	
18	I would like to lodge a formal objection to the proposal. The house I live in is terraced, with no off street parking or garage. The only other parking is further along Burnt Hill Road opposite the Legion. It is rough unmade area with potholes not suitable for elderly people to walk across. The proposed changes would cause great difficulties for my elderly visitors and me.	
19	I object. The 150m of Burnt Hill Road is already double yellow lined and not enforced, what is the point of doing more? The speed of traffic is a concern to residents and to remove the obstacle will only increase speeds.	
20	The proposal of no waiting at any time seems a little harsh on properties that have no possibilities of parking space unless the council grants off road parking to the front of houses. When cars are parked one does have to stop to let other pass by, but it is a good way of calming traffic.	
21	I oppose the proposed double yellow line parking enforcement. I regularly visit my friend who lives there and would have huge problems if you install and enforce these lines. I would have to get my small out into the middle of the road. Please leave Burnt Hill Road alone.	
22	I write as secretary of the Bourne Royal British Legion. The club building is used everyday by the nursery and road space is required to drop off/ pick up children due to our small car park facility. We also believe undue consideration has been given to the few residents on the north side of the road, who	

	suffer a slight inconvenience when entering and exiting their driveways. Those vehicles now parked on the south side of Burnt Hill Road will simply move further down the road, opposite the club, creating a potential problem for our users.	
		It is recommended not to proceed with this proposal at this time. Councillor Munro will speak to residents and any new proposal will be included in the next Waverley parking review.

Drawing No 24025. Bridgefield, Farnham		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I object. This change will make the road clear for people taking the corner at a faster speed. Cars regularly travel at what seems to be excessive speeds. Children regularly play in the street.	Parking is considered to make it more hazardous entering adjoining properties in this location.
		It is recommended to proceed as advertised with this proposal

Drawing No 24101. St James's Place, Cranleigh		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I would like to register a strenuous objection to the proposed parking restrictions in St James Place. We live in the High Street and have a 1-hour limited parking bay outside our house. If this scheme is progressed we will have nowhere to park, except the expensive Sainsbury's car park This is forcing us into a very unfair position. Can we not be issued with a residents permit?	
2	I would like to object to the current restrictions being imposed and feel that we should be allowed at least 1 parking permit. This is not what I agreed to. The scheme will prevent me from parking in my own street. We have so called space for two cars off street, but if we park two vehicles it prevents us using our front door.	

3	Where am I supposed to park? I live and work in the High Street and can only park in St James Place, where will I go if the scheme comes in to place? You can't park overnight on Cranleigh High Street without risking vandalism to your car.	
4	My brother & I do not agree with residents parking scheme for our road. We will not have anywhere to park our cars. We have two off road spaces used by our parents. 120 visitor permits would not last us very long.	The permit criteria can be relaxed to provide additional permits as follows for residents with more than 2 vehicles. The permit allocation will be the number of vehicles less the number of off street parking spaces.
5	We applied for residents parking on the understanding it would cover the weekend as well. Workers and shoppers park all day and everyday in our road. The scheme proposed is not what we were expecting. You have failed to recognise that there may be more than two adults with vehicles in each house and therefore the proposed scheme would penalise us, not assist us. What do suggest additional residents do, should the scheme go ahead?	The restrictions will be in place 0800-1800, Mon to Sat.
6	I was appalled to read the circular that came through our door. When we applied for resident's permits it was on the understanding we would be able to apply for two residents permits. This scheme removes the right to park in my own street.	
7	I was appalled to read the circular that came through our door. When we applied for residents' permits it was on the understanding we would be able to apply for two residents permits. This scheme removes the right to park in my own street.	
8	I was appalled to read the circular that came through our door. When we applied for residents' permits it was on the understanding we would be able to apply for two residents permits. This scheme removes the right to park in my own street.	
		It is recommended to proceed with minor amendment as described above.

Drawing No 24062. Church Lane, Witley

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	Church Lane is a rural country lane, which happens to be heavily used at certain times of the day due to the school and church. The pinch point can become blocked at certain times, but this is an historic area with Grade I and II listed buildings and yellow lines seem a rather heavy handed way of dealing with this issue. We would ask you reconsider the plan and come up with other options instead that is more sympathetic to the local environment. If you do go ahead we would ask that the double yellow lines on our side of the road are not installed for as long as shown, and only run for 3 metres from the left of our pedestrian gate towards the main road, as there is no pavement to speak of on the Old Vicarage side and lines will be unnecessary.	
		After discussing the situation with the resident and viewing the photographs provided with the objection letter, it is proposed to reconsider the extent of restrictions and defer a decision until the June 2012 committee.

Drawing No's 24061, 24123. Coombe Lane, Wormley

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I understand the need for parking restrictions in the immediate vicinity of the station, around the junctions of Station Approach and New Road but strongly oppose having restrictions down the length of Coombe Lane. It's simply pushing a parking problem further down Coombe Lane to an area where it would have a far greater day-to-day impact on local residents. Why don't the parking restrictions run from Evergreens and stop at Stone Cottage? The road south of Stone Cottage has no houses either side and no junctions. Parking here would have	It was not easy to decide where to stop the restriction in this rural location. Parking displacement will be monitored.

	minimal impact, why push the problem down the road to an already congested area.	
2	The imposition is not in the interests of safety and apart from leaving adequate eye line around the junctions there is no reason to stop us parking here.	
3	I am writing to disagree with the proposed parking restrictions around Witley station. This is a rural station and difficult to access by public transport. Cars are required to access the station and the proposed restrictions will just push the cars further down the road. The consultation was held in the dark, no streetlights to see the notices. An inclusive approach should have been considered with sensible enforced on street parking away from dangerous junctions and entrances.	
		With 42 letters of support received it is recommended to proceed as advertised with this proposal.

Drawing No. 24084. Deanery Road, Godalming

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I own a property on Deanery Road and notice that you are planning on putting parking restrictions further up the road to prevent people leaving their cars all day whilst using Godalming station. I am concerned that you are not solving the problem, just moving it up the congestion down the road.	
		It is recommended to defer the introduction of this parking restriction, and consider a longer length of 'no waiting at any time' along Deanery Road.

Drawing No 24125. More Circle, Farncombe

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	As a resident in More Road, I am writing to object to the proposal to make changes to on street parking at the junction	Rule 243 of the Highway Code states 'do not park or stop within 10 metres of a junction'. The intension of the double yellow lines is to

	with More Circle. Installing double yellow lines for 10m down More Circle will remove existing space available for the parking of 4 vehicles, which we forced to park elsewhere. A precedent of 5m has been set at the junction of Perrior Road and More Road, so 5m of restriction should be installed on this junction as well. The installation and enforcement of 10m of DYL will have a direct and considerable impact.	improve access and visibility on the junction.
		It is recommended to proceed as advertised with this proposal.

Drawing No's 24093, 24095. Summer's Road, Farncombe

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	Having viewed the proposals, I have concerns that the overall problem will not be dealt with. There should be extended restrictions (double yellow lines) from the Broadwater Park access to ensure adequate sightlines are achieved. Summers Road should have limited waiting, say 2 hours to prevent all day commuter parking, without restricting on-street parking for school visitors. If these proposals are not included, the whole problem of commuter parking will only be shifted up the road along a safe route to school part of Summers Road	The problems of obstructive parking have been considered here a number of times. Although parking displacement could be an issue for the school, this will be monitored after implementation. It is felt the proposals are need to maintain traffic movement on this road.
2	As a resident of Brookfield we would like to say of the new proposed parking restrictions at the railway end of the road will only push the parking up to the school end of Summers Road. The restrictions need to come up to the school end.	
		It is recommended to proceed as advertised with this proposal.

Drawing No. 24059. College Hill and College Terrace, Haslemere

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I have looked at your proposals for College Hill and College Hill Terrace and would like to make a point, that unless you live here it is unlikely you will have picked up on. Your proposals are insufficient. When you turn into College Hill	The proposed extension of the 'at any time' restriction in College Terrace is considered adequate to prevent obstructive parking near the junction. Extending it further would reduce parking for residents

	Terrace from College Hill you have Timbers Nursery entrance on the left hand side. At present cars often park on the left and right hand side of College Hill Terrace, and then you get cars queuing to drop off and pick up children during the day and there are times when you can't get in or out of College Hill Terrace. If you are going to install restrictions, please install adequate ones, this is insufficient and will not solve the issue.	and visitors.
2	We are writing to object to the changes proposed. We live in College Hill Terrace a dead end lane of 11 houses. It is proposed to put double yellow lines on the top half of College Hill. My family regularly walk and drive up and down College Hill. It is a narrow road bordered by hedges and banks with no footways. Currently cars park on the right hand side of the hill on the top half of the hill, mainly town centre workers. This is effective traffic calming. The parked cars provide refuges for pedestrians. It reduces the number of people using it as a Shepherds Hill bypass because it is awkward. It also provides parking for those that need it. The proposal would result in speeded up traffic down the hill, encourage more cars to use College Hill and reduce road safety. Displace parked cars to other locations when there is no need to do so.	College Hill already has double yellow lines up to College Hill Terrace. The Parked vehicles cause pedestrians to walk in traffic lane and as a consequence need to take refuge from passing vehicles. Removal of the parked cars would provide more space for car and pedestrians to pass.
3	Putting double yellow lines along College Hill will only encourage faster traffic, which is undesirable at the top of College Hill. It will force those who work in the town to park further away, causing congestion elsewhere. Effective enforcement is the answer.	See above.
		It is recommended to proceed as advertised with this proposal.

Drawing No. 24056, Lion Green/Junction Place, Haslemere

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	There has been no consultation with the church or groups who use the building. We do not feel it is necessary to prohibit parking on Sundays. This road is not used by commuters for parking, and parking by the church does not interfere with traffic movements at the petrol station opposite. The church as insufficient space to park all cars off street for big events, weddings etc. Many of the visitors to the chemist are elderly or	The proposed restrictions in Lion Green are needed to maintain traffic flows on the B2131 in this location, near the busy petrol station access. Fewer waiting restrictions are now proposed in Lion Mead and Lion Lane, meaning there will be more parking for church visitors nearby.

	infirm and cannot walk far.	
		It is recommended to proceed as advertised with this proposal.

Summary of comment and objections to on street charging proposals

Plan number/ Page number	Road/Location	Number of objections	Status
24017, 24018	Castle Street, Farnham <i>*28 letters of support received*</i>	None	Proceed as advertised
24017, 24023 Page 22	The Hart, West Street, Long Garden Way & Falkner Road (collectively Farnham Town Centre)	2	Proceed as advertised
Haslemere			
24055, 24118 Page 22	Beech Road, Haslemere <i>*2 letters of support received and a 34 signature petition supporting residents parking but with detail changes</i>	14 1x petition 34	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
4054, 24050 Page 22	Bridge Road, Haslemere	6	Do not proceed
24054	Chestnut Avenue, Haslemere <i>*3 letters & 1 petition 13 signatures of support received*</i>	None	Proceed with amendments
24051 Page 25	Bunch Lane, Haslemere	5	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24050 Page 26	Church Road, Haslemere	1	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24058, 24053 Page 26	Courts Mount Road, Haslemere <i>*3 letters of support received*</i>	7	Proceed as advertised
24058, 24127 Page 28	Courts Hill Road, Haslemere <i>*10 letters of support received*</i>	4	Proceed with minor amendment
24057, 24058, 24052 Page 29	Kings Road, Haslemere <i>*1 letter of support received*</i>	16	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments

24056 Page 30	Lion Mead, Haslemere	1	Proceed with minor amendments
24051, 24056 Page 31	Lion Lane, Haslemere	27	Do not proceed with parking charges
24058 Page 32	Longdene Road, Haslemere <i>*4 letters & 1 petition 32 signatures of support received*</i>	13	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24059 Page 33	Petworth Road, Haslemere	3	Do not proceed with blue badge bay
24054 Page 33	Popes Mead, Haslemere <i>*4 letters of support received*</i>	1	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24053 Page 34	Sandrock, Haslemere <i>*1 letter of support received*</i>	8	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24050, 24052, 24116, 24117 Page 36	Derby Road, Haslemere <i>*1 letter of support received*</i>	36	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24057	St Christophers Green, Haslemere <i>*1 letter of support received*</i>	None	Proceed as advertised
24057 Page 37	St Christophers Road, Haslemere	5	Deferred until June 2012 for amendments
24053, 24054, 24050 Page 39	Tanners Lane, Haslemere <i>*1 letter of support received*</i>	4	Proceed with amendments
24052, 24116, 24117, 24128 Page 40	Weydown Road, Haslemere <i>*4 letter of support received*</i>	1	Proceed with amendments
24057 Page 41	Wey Hill, Haslemere	6	Do not proceed
	Non street specific, (Town Centre) Haslemere		See below
	On Line/ paper copy petitions	3	See below
	Carers permit for resident parking schemes	None	Proceed as advertised (carers permits to be issued in residents parking schemes for a charge of £10)

Detailed summary of objections to on street parking charges

Drawing No's. 24017, 24023. The Hart, West Street, Long Garden Way and Faulkner Road (collectively known as Farnham town centre)		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I strongly object to the proposed on-street parking charges in Farnham, this will only serve to drive more people away from the town centre. The small independent shops are already suffering in this financial crisis and this proposal will 'kill off' potential trade.	The benefits of parking charges we highlighted in the report to the Committee on the 16 th December. The percentage of on street spaces in Farnham is very small compared to the number of existing paid for car park spaces. The introduction of charges is more likely to make on street spaces free up more quickly to benefit passing trade. Regular visitors will be encouraged to use car parks rather than searching out a free on street space.
2	I am compelled to voice my objections. It is widely acknowledged by experts that town centre parking charges need to be removed to ensure regeneration of our towns. Surrey beyond the M25 is a rural county, and we depend upon our cars, whether we like it or not. It is not the County Councils job to impose punishment fines in the form of charges because of this. Do not discourage people from parking on the street by excessively charging them. Instead get them to use the car parks. Once in place, parking metres will never be removed, only slowly extended across town.	The benefits of parking charges we highlighted in the report to the Committee on the 16 th December. The percentage of on street spaces in Farnham is very small compared to the number of existing paid for car park spaces. The introduction of charges is more likely to make on street spaces free up more quickly to benefit passing trade. Regular visitors will be encouraged to use car parks rather than searching out a free on street space.
		It is recommended to proceed as advertised.

Drawing No's. 24055, 24118. Beech Road, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
13	13 individual objections received, the main objection points are:	The proposals can be adjusted to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the operational hours to 10am to 14.00 pm Monday

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restriction on tradesman working in Beech Road. • Significantly affect clients visiting private business. • Will turn a residential road into an extension of the hospital/ health centre car park. • Legitimises, rather than solves on-street parking. Nowhere for visitors to park without incurring charges. • Residents not consulted personally. • Out of character for the street and excessive. • Will result in conflict between vehicles parked all day and those visiting short term. • We are all agreed, we don't want this. 	<p>to Friday.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the double yellow lines at both ends around junctions • Provide a 'resident permit holders only' restriction along length of road.
Petition	<p>34 Signatures, calling for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Beech Road to become a Controlled Zone. 2. Double yellow lines to be marked on both sides and at both ends of Beech Road. 3. Controlled Zone entry/ exit signs to be erected. Permit holders only Mon- Fri 11.30 – 14.00 (for example). 4. In return for vigorous enforcement residents buy permits and visitor permits. 5. Residents request visit from Road Safety Officer to agree additional road safety measures in the area by the hospital and elsewhere in Beech Road. 	<p>The residents of Beech Road sent in a response collectively to the proposals. Adjustments can be made as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the operational hours to 10am to 14.00 pm Monday to Friday. • Retain the double yellow lines at both ends around junctions • Provide a 'resident permit holders only' restriction along length of road to minimise road markings and signing. 'Permit holders beyond this point' restriction signing.
		<p>It is recommended to defer at the present time and report back in June with the above amendments.</p>

Drawing No's. 24054, 24050. Bridge Road, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	If this scheme goes ahead it will be the wrong decision for residents of Bridge Road. We have spent money creating our own off street parking and will now be penalised by not be eligible for permits.	
2	The plans you have used are out of date. A large proportion of the proposed parking spaces in Bridge Road are shown in front of drives and dropped curbs. You show Bridge Road having 13 spaces, I say a maximum of 5/6. The potential number of eligible permits far outstrips any possible parking	

	spaces. I object as it will be detrimental to the economy of Haslemere and puts it future prosperity in doubt.	
3	I feel introducing this parking will do nothing but cause problems amongst neighbours, nobody is guaranteed a parking space where they live and may have to park some distance away. What happens when there are not enough spaces to park? Why should family and friends have to pay to visit me?	
4	I object to the proposed plans for residents parking permits to be issued in Bridge Road, Chestnut Avenue and the surrounding area. The proposals do not help the residents in this part of town. A walk up and down Bridge Road would show only 7 spaces, the rest are in front of drives and dropped curbs. Should every house without parking apply for just one permit there are clearly insufficient spaces for the residents. Therefore we could pay for a permit and have nowhere to park, incurring additional charges by being forced to use a public car park. This whole scheme is badly thought out.	
5	At the moment your plan shows parking bays for residents of Bridge Road on the right hand side (looking from Popes Mead towards Tanners Lane). The majority of properties on this side have dropped curbs, leaving only a little space for parking bays. Where as if you moved the bays over to the other side of Bridge Road there would be double the amount of parking space available.	There are a number of drop kerbs on this side of the road as well so swapping the parking bays to this side would provide little advantage and make parking on the side currently proposed more difficult.
6	The residents have our own agreement with parking on the road and it works well, everybody can park there no problem. Problems only occur when non-residents park opposite. I think the majority of residents would be happy to see double yellow lines on the west bound side of the road, I don't think you have been along this road and looked at the situation properly. Your plans do not reflect the number of parking spaces in Bridge Road due to dropped curbs and driveways.	
		It is recommended not to proceed with resident parking proposals in Bridge Road due to the high number of drop kerb accesses and the resident's unwillingness to have parking bays running in front of their driveways.

Drawing No. 24051. Bunch Lane, Haslemere

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	<p>I object to the proposed changes for Bunch Lane, on the following grounds.</p> <p>I agree that on street parking of cars are an inconvenience and sometimes a hazard; I do not accept this proposal will make any difference. It will just push the vehicles further down Bunch Lane. It is facile to suggest that commuters and others would be encouraged to use other stations or alternative forms of transport. Attention should be focused on reducing the inconvenience and danger caused by all day parkers.</p> <p>Residents whose properties are affected will not be able to provide parking for friends, visitors and tradesman without paying.</p>	
2	<p>I live just off Bunch Lane, which has been subject to extensive parking by station commuters. The parking is dangerous in a narrow lane with bends and driveways. Your proposals will not solve this; merely raise revenue for the council. The general problem is a lack of parking places; your plan will do nothing to solve this.</p>	<p>The proposals are intended to regulate parking in Bunch Lane to make the road safer and reduce obstructive parking.</p>
3	<p>I object due to the lack of consultation, we were given no prior notice about these proposals. In Bunch Lane you are proposing 7 pay and display spaces, at present we have 23 cars parked in Bunch Lane. Where will the extra 16 vehicles go?</p>	<p>It is proposed to provide a limited amount of additional long term parking space in Bunch Lane. See comments about 'displacement' below.</p>
4	<p>Whilst reducing, perhaps almost eliminating parking in Bunch Lane and the top end of Derby and Widow, these primary commuter parkers will just be displaced somewhere else, further away.</p>	
5	<p>My main concern is that there will be displacement of parking into Bunch Way from Bunch Lane, where there are currently no restrictions. This could lead to access and obstruction problems. We've had problems with the refuse wagon not being able to access our road in the past. In my opinion the last length of double yellow lines installed in Bunch Lane were put on the wrong side of the junction, since when exiting Bunch Way the view to the right is clear. It is the view to the right that is blocked by parked cars. I cannot understand the</p>	<p>See comments about displacement below.</p>

	motivation behind these proposals. Surely a simple single yellow line with no parking between 10.00am and 11.00am for example would achieve the same objective.	
		It is recommended to provide additional parking bays in safe locations in Bunch Lane and defer the detailed proposals until June.

Drawing No. 24050. Church Road, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	We notice from your map, proposals for restricted parking in Church Road to continue on both sides. In the interests of safety the (Church Road Haslemere Resident's) association would urge you to reconsider your proposal and eliminate parking bays on the left of the entrance to our close (1-11 Church Road), and thereby eliminating the bottleneck.	
		It is recommended to reduce the pay and display parking bay opposite 'Derby House' by 15m at its northern end and replace with a single yellow restriction.

Drawing No's. 24058, 24053. Courts Mount Road, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	We object to the proposed parking restrictions in Courts Mount Road. The only times when we have ever seen cars parked alongside our garden in Courts Mount Road or on the opposite side are: On the day of the Sunday Christmas Market, when tree surgeons need to work from the road using a cherry picker. When other essential work is being done. We have never seen commuters cars parked all day or for long periods in this section of Courts Mount Road. The lower end of the road is in a conservation area and unblighted by insensitive signage or unnecessary signs and road markings. Putting in	Courts Mount Road is not wide enough for parking. A parked vehicle would prevent emergency and service vehicles from passing. Double yellow lines are proposed to prevent obstruction, however loading and unloading will still be possible at all times of day, as would other maintenance work to properties.

	restrictions would be 'overkill'.	
Petition	<p>13 Signatures, objecting to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed double yellow lines on both sides of the western end of Courts Mount Road. Parking is much needed by residents, visitors and tradesman. Being forced to park in Courts Hill Road or a distant car park is not a viable option. • Double yellow lines along both sides of the whole length of Courts Mount Road would remove the parking spaces that are vital to the social and business life of the road. If implemented, this SCC proposal would be detrimental to the quality of life of all of us. 	
3	We strongly object to this proposal. It would be completely out of character. Not all properties have enough off street parking. It is not fair or practical to suggest visitors could all park in Courts Hill Road. We believe it is possible to allow some parking on the non-pavement side of the street. Your proposal would make the street more dangerous and less safe with increased traffic speeds.	
4	We are appalled at the proposals to have 'no waiting at any time' on Courts Hill Road. It will seriously affect the welfare of our family life; it will make it very difficult for family and friends to visit. This will not solve the parking problems for commuters, it will just penalise hard working families. It will also turn Courts Mount Road into a death trap. Putting down double yellow lines will result in an increase in traffic speeds.	
5	I object to the proposal of painting double yellow lines down both sides of Courts Mount Road. It is essential there is some parking for visitors and tradesman. Double yellow lines down both sides would exacerbate what is already a worrying speeding problem. Some parking on the non-pavement side should be permitted. We suggest you leave Courts Mount Road as it is.	
6	I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the double yellow lines both sides of Courts Mount Road. It will turn a rat run into a racetrack by giving clear and unfettered access as a short cut. I wish to be able to have friends and family visitors to be able to park outside my property. It is inconceivable that a small country road like Courts Mount Road, that is purely residential should be isolated by double yellow lines to suit a problem that needs strong councillors to stand up and resolve	

	to fix it at source.	
7	We are writing to object to parking matters proposed for the lower part of Courts Mount Road. It is within a conservation area. Currently there is a lack of signage and other detritus that litter most streets. There is very little area where vehicles could park on street with causing an obstruction; consequentially parking on the lower end of Courts Mount Road is already prevented. Double yellow lines are not needed here. The one exception being opposite the garages and forecourts.	
8	Our objections to the proposals are as follows: The uses of double yellow lines in Courts Mount Road are completely unnecessary. There will be no visitor parking on street. Putting double yellow lines down both sides will encourage drivers to speed up on the long straight part of Courts Mount Road. Enforcement. There is likely to be very little revenue generated. However we recognise that with new restrictions elsewhere it may displace commuters onto Courts Mount Road.	
		It is recommended to proceed as advertised. Courts Mount Road is insufficient in width to formally allow parking through the installation of parking bays.

Drawing No's. 24058, 24127. Courts Hill Road, Haslemere

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	We would like to express our objection to pay and display as a means of parking control for Haslemere and Courts Hill Road is particular. We understand the need for parking control, but a single yellow line would be sufficient. If the choice is between pay and display and leave things along, then we vote for leaving things as they are.	
2	Our objection relates to access and egress our property. We have poor visibility on to the road and know from experience that a car parked in this space impedes safe entry to our drive from the west and exit. You are proposing to install parking bays either side of my drive.	
3	I would like to object to the parking charges, especially those	

	proposed for Courts Hill Road. We have grown up children, 3 cars and only 1 parking space. What will we do? We don't have any guest spaces. You should think of residents first, not visiting commuters with a pay and display ticket.	
4	An objection with notes from Public meeting	
		It is recommended to reduce the parking bay opposite number 15 to allow for better access to and from the driveway to this property. Otherwise proceed as advertised.

Drawing No's. 24057, 24058, 24052 Kings Road, Haslemere

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
	<p>15 individual objections received, the main objection points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to strongly object to the current proposals for no waiting At Anytime Monday to Friday 08.30 – 20.00. This means we would have nowhere to park in the vicinity of our house. We can see issues with visitors and tradesmen. • Moving the parking back to the side of the road with the footpath adjacent to the green will be a safety hazard for pedestrians as it was before. • Parked vehicles were moved to the other side of the road to improve safety on the bend. SCC stated this is at the time. It is true. Don't be stupid and move it back again! • Insufficient parking space has been provided. • P&D for commuters is favoured over the needs of residents. • The service road should be residents parking only, not the 08:30- 20:00 restrictions, which are unworkable for residents. • How will you police and enforce in the evenings and weekends. • Where are residents other vehicle supposed to go during the restriction hours? • Have to pay, but no guarantee of parking space 	<p>Residents without off street parking would be eligible for residents and visitor permits.</p> <p>Marking a formal bay will regulate parking. Parking outside the bay (on the footway) will be an offence and can be enforced.</p> <p>The proposed location is away from the bend and considered to be safe.</p> <p>It is now proposed to provide residents parking in the service road on the inside of the bend.</p> <p>The proposed operational hours for the residents parking scheme have been adjusted to between 08:30 – 17:30 Mon- Fri (there are one or two exceptions, detailed elsewhere).</p> <p>There are XXX properties in Kings Road. This is a relatively small number of objections in comparison. The introduction of residents parking should provide more space for residents to park closer to</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient detail supplied in the information distributed. • Forced to pay to park in street where I live, no choice about it, not fair. • Parking Bays are too close to drive, visibility and access issues. • Residents with no off street parking should be guaranteed a parking space, or what else can we do? • Criteria for eligibility is unfair • The scheme is poorly thought out and no attempt has been made to get the residents 'on-side' with the proposals. We conclude or view and support is not valued and you will go ahead anyway. • Pensioners on limited income cannot afford to pay out for annual residents permits and visitor permits. • You have not considered those attending church. Where are those attending church, even for a few minutes supposed to park? 	<p>their homes, particularly given the close proximity to the station.</p>
		<p>It is recommended to make the service road 'permit holders only' using a 'permit holders only beyond this point' type restriction sign. In addition investigate additional long-term parking further west of the proposed scheme and report outcome of these two changes in June. Otherwise proceed as advertised.</p>

Drawing No. 24056. Lion Mead, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	Gradually over time more and more vehicles park on the grass 'circle' at the end of Lion Mead. I think if you install pay and display in this road, more people will park on the grass circle and it will get even more churned up and Lion Mead potentially obstructed.	It is proposed to reduce the extent of the proposals in Lion Mead and this will minimise the likelihood of displacement.
2	I find it unbelievable that in this current climate you are proposing such a scheme. I would imagine the workers along Junction Place are minimum wage employees and charging them to park in Lion Mead demonstrates a distinct lack of	

	awareness and disregard for the circumstances of the ordinary working people of Haslemere. Now to add insult to injury you will make then pay for the pleasure of parking and collecting medicine. Other drivers will just park further down Lion Mead and on the grass circle at the end of the street. SCC must see this proposal is seriously flawed.	
		It is recommended not to proceed with parking charges in Lion Mead, however the local shops would benefit from limited waiting bays in this location. It is proposed to introduce a 1 hour free parking bay in the same location and reduce the extent of the double yellow lines to around the junctions of Meadway and Junction Place.

Drawing No. 24051, 24056. Lion Lane, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
	<p>27 individual objections received, the main objection points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents of children from Shottermill Infant School will nowhere to park to drop off/ collect children. • Insufficient space within school grounds for all staff to park. Have to use street parking, cannot afford to pay every term time day. • Many support staff workers park on street. They will no longer be able to do so and we will lose vital assistance from these people. • Restrictions that run beyond the school day will affect after school clubs, and meetings. • Discourage use of the green and playground, having a negative effect on children's lives. • No commuters park here, these restrictions are not needed. • Lack of provision for short term parking, I'd be concerned that care workers, nurses and doctors would not be able to park. • Displacement further down Lion Lane, which is already heavily parked up. Causing more congestion 	<p>Meetings have been held with the head teachers of Shottermill Infants and Junior Schools and the Waverley Community Travel advisor about parking issues near the schools.</p> <p>Shottermill Junior would be largely unaffected by the proposals that stop lower down Lion Lane near the access to the Infant School.</p> <p>The Infant School has about 6 staff that cannot park in the school and need to park in the road or nearby.</p> <p>Various options were discussed including changing the proposed parking bays in Lion Lane to allow 4 hours free parking. The operational hours could be adjusted to between 10.00 and 16.00pm so that visitors could park either all morning or all afternoon.</p> <p>There are currently no plans to introduce restrictions in Weysprings, an area currently used for parking by school staff.</p> <p>The infant school and governors have however called for the proposals in Lion Lane to be withdrawn and this is proposed, except for double yellow lines where originally proposed to allow passing</p>

	<p>and obstruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having restrictions running until 8.00pm is overkill. • Your proposals to introduce charges are totally unnecessary and clearly fuelled by a desire to raise revenue. • Damage trade to shops on Wey Hill • The assertion that commuters use Lion Lane to park is an exaggeration; the people parking along there are teachers and school helpers. • Lack of consultation and unfairness with the proposals. 	places and keep the school entrance clear.
		Other than double yellow lines, it is recommended not to proceed with this proposal.

Drawing No. 24058. Longdene Road, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
	<p>13 individual objections received, the main objection points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents parking bays are across driveways rendering our off road parking space useless. • Parking bays in front of garages and off-road parking spaces is unworkable and ludicrous. It will cause much anger and frustration and potential damage to vehicles. • We strongly oppose parking bays in front of existing parking areas/ garages. • The scheme is Mon-Sun 08:30- 20:00, way beyond what is needed to manage commuter parking. • The proposed changes appear to be cynical way for the county to raise revenues by removing the rights of residents to park near or in front of their properties. • Double yellow lines should be installed across garages and off-street parking places, not parking bays. • There is a pavement in front of my property, recently resurfaced. Permitting parking here is in contravention 	<p>Residents are generally supportive of a residents parking scheme but have objected to the detail and would like amendments. It is therefore proposed to make the following changes to the proposals.</p> <p>Reduce operational hours to 0830 - 1730 Monday to Friday</p> <p>Propose to provide advisory access protection markings or double yellow lines in front of driveways and garages.</p> <p>Footway parking can be formalised by the Traffic Order where necessary, although it is debatable whether this is footway or 'hardened verge'. In either case it has been used for parking for many years.</p>

	of Rule 244 of the Highway Code.	
	Letter of support received on behalf of all residents, but proposing changes to prevent obstruction of driveways and to maintain provision of parking in nearby roads for permit holders.	
		It is recommended to defer the introduction of these parking controls until June, to take into account the amendments requested by residents, as listed above.

Drawing No. 24059. Petworth Road, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	<p>We own a shop in Petworth Road. It seems to us the Surrey County Council wish to apply one all encompassing solution to three quite separate issues.</p> <p>Haslemere is blessed with a good train service to London and as result attracts commuters in growing numbers. Finally getting a plan in place to control this issue, after a lamentable amount of time and providing the right amount of reasonably priced needs to be done.</p> <p>However the issue of displacement has not properly been addressed, and this issue needs to be solved, not merely moved.</p> <p>The third issue is that in reality there is no parking issue in the retail centre of Haslemere and the current arrangements work perfectly well and do not need changing. There has been no meaningful consultation with businesses in the town.</p>	See other recommendations about the town centre and displacement.
2	<p>I am writing about the lay-by in Petworth Road becoming 24-hour disabled parking. The lay-by is not appropriate for disabled parking due to the high speed of vehicles along here.</p> <p>If you parking in the bay (facing west) and open the drivers door, you are getting out into the road and also there is the blind corner coming round from High Street. It is difficult enough for able-bodied drivers to get out of their vehicle; I'd be very concerned for the safety of the disabled.</p> <p>In addition the surface is cobbled and uneven, slippery in the wet and there is a large tree next to the lay-by, which obstructs people moving their vehicle easily.</p>	It is not now proposed to turn this lay-by into blue badge parking.

	The bay does not need to be in operation 24 hours. It could be used for residents parking overnight, so residents would be able to park in close proximity to their homes like they do know.	
3	Petworth Road has no on-street parking other than the lay-by close to the junction with the High Street. Given the road surface this lay-by is the most unsuitable location in the town centre for a disabled parking bay. It is the only location on Petworth Road where residents can park overnight and Sundays, as most do not have off-street parking. Residents of Petworth Road are not being offered and sort of resident permit and yet all of their current parking is being removed or made to pay.	
		It is recommended not to proceed with the proposed disabled parking bay and for the existing restriction to remain in place.

Drawing No 24054. Popes Mead

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	Objection to having parking bay in front of drive.	Parking bays cannot be moved to the side opposite the garages, as the limited road width would prevent access to the garages. It is therefore proposed to keep the parking bays on the same side as the garages but prevent parking in front of them.
		It is recommended to defer the introduction of these parking controls until June for reasons described above.

Drawing No. 24053. Sandrock, Haslemere

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	This proposal will worsen the parking position for residents and their visitors. Only a small parking bay for residents will be laid out in the road providing us with less space than is taken up now by residents parked cars. The cost of permits is	It would be possible to change the proposals in Sandrock to allow 'resident permit holders only beyond this point'. This would mean there would be no reduction in the parking space available and overcome the concerns of many about the loss of parking space.

	excessive and a lot to find for those of us on a low income. Parking in Sandrock should not be accessible to others at any time not just between 08:00 – 20:00. It will be intrusive to have drivers from other streets looking to park and turn around in Sandrock. Extra signs and road markings will spoil this attractive area.	
2	There is no need to make any changes to the existing restrictions, which, if enforced, meet all the stated aims of Surrey County Council. The vast majority of properties are let on a short term leases and no proper consultation with the actual owners has taken place.	
3	Surely the houses in the lane that have private parking should not be eligible to apply for parking permits, thereby leaving the space free for those houses without private parking.	
4	We own a house in Sandrock and have no off-street parking. Currently we park on Sandrock and this is not a problem. Your proposal will result in the number of parking spaces being reduced. The emergency parking space beyond the turning area will be unusable due to double yellow lines. Non-residents will be able to park in Sandrock after the zone times have finished. All adjoining roads will be subject to double yellow lines. The atmosphere of Sandrock will be spoilt.	
5	We object to the permit-parking scheme as proposed due to the cost of purchasing permits, the inadequate parking bay length and the disfigurement of this attractive lane. Sandrock already has parking controls that limit parking. We object to Sandrock being opened up to non-residents on the street for evening parking. There is not enough room.	
6	We object to the revocation of the 1981 Order that bars all motor vehicles from Sandrock except for those needing access and emergencies. We object to the cost of both resident and visitor permits and the inadequate space you are going to provide which will worsen the current situation and disfigure the road. We object to Sandrock being opened up to non-residents on the street for evening parking. There is not enough room.	
7	At present Sandrock is controlled by the SCC Prohibition of Driving Order 1981. Is this order to be revoked? If so why? And what consultation has taken place? There is insufficient space for residents cars under your proposal. To start charging residents for the same service as they have now, or a worse one is obtuse and detrimental to residents and the	The 'prohibition of driving' order would not be required if 'residents only parking beyond this point' were introduced. The prohibition of driving order is only enforceable by Surrey Police and it is not likely to be a high priority for them given there are few obvious safety issues.

	value of properties.	
8	We do not agree with your proposal. We would support the alternative idea of simply erecting at the end of Sandrock saying the road is for residents parking only.	
		It is recommended to defer the introduction of these parking controls until June and consider proceeding with a 'permit holders only beyond this point' restriction that will not require marked out parking bays or double yellow lines.

Drawing No's, 24050, 24052, 24116, 24117. Derby Road, Haslemere

Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
	<p>36 individual objections received, the main objection points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You cannot just classify the school and church as residents of Derby Road. Both need to be treated and consulted separately from households. Their requirements are different and need to be given due consideration. Concern over school drop off/ pick-ups. Where will parents park? Concern over school volunteers, assistants those attending meetings will have to pay to park, assuming there is space in Derby Road. Concern over church volunteers, assistants those attending meetings will have to pay to park, assuming there is space in Derby Road. Lack of consultation Proposals will damage this small town and its community around St Bartholomew's school and church. St Bartholomew's School has 53 members of staff and on-site parking for half of them. We have no other option but to park on Derby Road. Visitors also have to park on Derby Road. St Bartholomew's School has a rural catchments area, and a lot of parents have no choice, but to drive their 	<p>During the consultation period meetings were held with residents, St Bartholomew's School and Church. It was agreed to make the following changes in order to best meet the needs of visitors, parents and workers in the area:</p> <p>A 'no waiting' 16.30 to 17.30 restriction was considered the most appropriate in Derby Rd along the frontage of the Church. This should deter commuters and let school and church visitors park for most of the day.</p> <p>Double yellow lines were considered appropriate opposite the school access (nearest Church Rd)</p> <p>A 'no waiting' 16.30 to 17.30 restriction was also thought to be more suitable in place of the 10.30 to 14.30 restriction on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the south side of Derby Rd (going towards Weydown Rd) (with double yellow lines in some places to act as passing places and cover driveways) the north side of Derby Rd just to the west of the Church Road junction. at the northern end of Church Rd instead of a P&D bay. (we will also investigate a bus bay in this location)

	<p>children to school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These restrictions have not been clearly thought through, but I expect you will be making adjustments over the coming months. • The council should change the restriction hours so you can't park between the 12:00 and 1.00pm only, this would stop commuter parking in the road, but allow for parents to drop off/ collect and assistants to park up and work in the school. • By implementing these changes you will just be moving commuters around to different parts of town. • The restrictions are extreme and in most cases unnecessary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the north side of Tanners Lane where appropriate (instead of DYL's). <p>Resident parking at the eastern end of Derby Road is also proposed, as is High Lane.</p> <p>The extent of these restrictions to be checked to maximize available parking for school visitors whilst maintaining access and safety etc.</p> <p>It would not be appropriate to swap the side of the P&D bays in Derby Rd because the footway on the south side is wider and has a verge whilst the northern footway is narrower and has a hedge at the back. The southern footway would be more suitable for parents/push chairs and school children.</p> <p>A pedestrian crossing point was requested in Derby Road near Church Road.</p>
		<p>It is recommended to defer the introduction of these parking controls until June and then proceed with the amendments listed above.</p>

Drawing No. 24057. St Christopher's Road, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	<p>I wish to object. For some reason you have not classified St Christopher's Road residential. There are 36 homes on this road and most families have more than 1 car. If you are going to put parking restrictions in this road, surely they should make parking better for residents? Shoppers can park on Weyhill, not on our over subscribed residential street. You have set precedence for residents parking elsewhere in Haslemere, why not here? Nobody other than its residents, need to park on St Christopher's Road. You have not had the courtesy to consider resident's opinions before setting out your plans. Your plans reduce the number of parking spaces in the street.</p>	<p>It is now proposed to make the P&D spaces in St Christopher's Road 'permit holders only'.</p>

	<p>This does not help anybody. It is clear the only consideration that has been made is financial.</p>	
2	<p>There has been no consultation with residents of St Christopher's Road, and no effort was made to ascertain whether there was a problem (<i>with parking</i>) at this end of town. Who has asked for this scheme? I'd be interested to know. Previously I have enquired about residents parking schemes for the road and been refused, not suddenly this scheme appears and it not in the residents interests. How to you determine how many residents there are who may wish to buy permits as well as visitor permits and compared this to the space available. Good for revenue, not so good for residents. Residents who have paid a lot of money to drop curbs will no longer be able to park across them.</p>	
3	<p>My family live on St Christopher's Road and I have never experienced any parking problems since I have lived here (1988). It is already restrictive enough. I have an elderly relative who cannot walk far, we had an annex built for her at our house and other family members visit to care for her, where would they park in future? Or pay for the privilege of visiting their mother? My neighbour faces a similar dilemma. I feel we are being bullied off the road and out of our houses.</p>	
4	<p>I wish to object. For some reason you have not classified St Christopher's Road residential. There are 36 homes on this road and most families have more than 1 car. If you are going to put parking restrictions in this road, surely they should make parking better for residents? Shoppers can park on Weyhill, not on our over subscribed residential street. You have set precedence for residents parking elsewhere in Haslemere, why not here? Nobody other than its residents, need to park on St Christopher's Road. You have not had the courtesy to consider resident's opinions before setting out your plans. Your plans reduce the number of parking spaces in the street. This does not help anybody. It is clear the only consideration that has been made is financial.</p>	
5	<p>After reviewing the brief detail provided by Surrey County Council, my understanding of the new plan is that there will be around 5 spaces at the lower end of St Christopher's Road that will become P&D spaces from Mon-Sat 08:30- 20:00 with a free 30 mins. I see this as a new revenue stream for the</p>	

	<p>council rather than a way of improving the parking situation for residents. The only residents parking appear to be at the other end of St Christopher's Green, an unreasonable distance from where we live. We will have to walk along a poorly lit road with no footway to get there. I am very keen to understand how you think this new plan will benefit residents, local shop keepers and people who use the services on Weyhill.</p>	
		<p>It is recommended to defer the introduction of these parking controls until June and make the proposed P&D bays in St Christopher's Road 'permit holders only' and extend the proposed residents parking bay outside numbers 7 and 9 westwards.</p>

Drawing No's. 24053, 24054, 24050. Tanners Lane, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
<p>1</p>	<p>I object to the proposed bays at the junction of Tanners Lane and High Lane. This is an extremely dangerous junction because traffic turning right from High Lane into Tanners Lane is forced to exit on the wrong side of the road on the brow of a hill. Authorised spaces here would be irresponsible. The bays should be further down Tanners Lane or not here at all. I would hope that the planned proposals would not go ahead and that a plan can be conceived that will meet the actual requirements of Haslemere with more public consultation contributing to achieve it.</p>	<p>The safety of the junction in relation to the parking bays has been considered. Due to the extremely wide splay of this junction and the open profile of the green, visibility is very good for vehicles exiting the junction from High Lane, even with vehicles parked in the proposed spaces. Visibility is also very good for vehicles travelling along Tanners Lane to see vehicles waiting to exit the junction. Vehicles currently park in this same part of Tanners Lane and there have been no reported collisions to date.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>I object on behalf of St Bartholomew's Church Putting double yellow lines on Tanners Lane will prevent the majority of church goes from attending Sunday services. These restrictions would make holding wedding and funeral virtually impossible. Surely Mon-Fri restrictions would be sufficient to deter commuter parking. We would be happy with double yellow lines on the green side of the road and a lesser restriction outside the church.</p>	<p>It is proposed to change part of the double yellow line adjacent to the church to no waiting 16.30-17.30, Mon-Fri. See also comments about Derby Road.</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>I object on behalf of St Bartholomew's Church Putting double yellow lines on Tanners Road will prevent the majority of church goes from attending Sunday services. These</p>	

	restrictions would make holding wedding and funeral virtually impossible. Surely Mon-Fri restrictions would be sufficient to deter commuter parking. We would be happy with double yellow lines on the green side of the road and a lesser restriction outside the church.	
4	I would like to object to the location of the 2 parking spaces along Tanners Lane opposite No.1 Railway Cottages. The new development which will have a drive way is not shown on your plans. Access to and from this drive will be directly opposite your proposed bay making it very difficult for a vehicle to get in and out. Please reconsider the position of this bay.	
		It is recommended to downgrade the proposed double yellow lines adjacent the church (located off Church Hill) to single yellow (Mon-Fri 4.30pm to 5.30pm) and the make the 'pay and display' parking bays Lower Street and Bridge Road, 'permit holders only' for Lower Street and Shepherd Hill area residents. Otherwise proceed as advertised.

Drawing No's. 24052, 24116, 24117, 24128. Weydown Road, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
	<p>I wish to very strongly object. I am a resident of the middle section of Weydown Road and your meter proposals will not alleviate the station parking in the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we have meters I suspect the revenue being generated will delay or remove the impetus for a station car park • The bad parking could be controlled by strategically placed yellow lines, paid for by a tiny raise in Rates. • Intrusive regulation of parking is alien to the environment out here and most undesirable. • It will be a massive inconvenience to evening visitors and social events will have to be relocated elsewhere. • Meters will be potential vandalism targets. • You will displace cars into positions in front of residents further away. 	<p>It is proposed to provide additional parking spaces at the upper and lower ends of Weydown Road to reduce parking displacement.</p> <p>The proposed hours of restriction can be reduced to from 20.00 to 17.30 in the evening in lin with resident wishes.</p> <p>There are other lengths of single yellow line along the road that prevent all day parking, but allow free short term parking for visitors.</p>

		It is recommended to investigate additional parking spaces at the lower end of Weydown Road and reduce the operational hours from 20.00 to 17.30. It is also recommended to provide an additional pay and display parking bay at the far northern end of Weydown Road with a reduced tariff of £2.50 a day. The outcome of consultation about this proposal will be reported to the meeting in June.
--	--	--

Drawing No. 24057. Weyhill, Haslemere		
Objection No.	Points raised in objection letter or E-mail (extracts from more lengthy responses)	Officer Response
1	I strongly disagree with the new parking charges being proposed. I work at the pharmacy in Shottermill, but if I have to pay to park everyday I will have to leave my job as I could not afford the £8 per day.	
2	On the street where there is currently a 1-hour limit for parking, there is a steady turnover of cars and a parking space usually available. If longer parking were permitted (albeit for a charge) some people would be put off all together while others would stay longer and therefore turn over of space would be less. This would have a particular impact on Weyhill. I would probably take my business elsewhere or shop on line	
3	I wish to register my objection to the proposed introduction of on-street parking charges to the Weyhill area where I live. Surrey County Council do not appear to be giving any consideration to the problems that a lack of capacity for commuters will pose.	
4	We are writing to object to the plans by SCC to implement on street charging. This business has been in Weyhill for 60 years and we see no reason to change the existing arrangements. If customers have to pay £1 or more every time they visit us, it will seriously affect our business and have a detrimental effect on the whole Weyhill area.	
5	I am writing to object most strongly to the proposed parking plans. As an independent retailer in Wey Hill I fear I would lose an enormous amount of trade if parking meters were installed, no matter how long the 'free parking' period was.	

	The current system of allowing parking for 1 hour is perfectly adequate. I have vision of 2 parking spaces outside my shop and the turnover is constant. From a shoppers point of view I myself would be less likely to 'pop in' to local shops in the High Street.	
6	We are residents of Weyhill who wish to object to the proposal of pay and display parking bays. I work as a postman and my shift time varies. I return home at different hours of the day and under your proposals would be able to purchase a resident permit for Weyhill and be forced to pay to park near my home. What provision are you making for Weyhill residents? Other streets of mixed use residential and retail have been given equal consideration.	
		It is recommended not to proceed with any on street 'pay and display' in shopping areas including Wey Hill.

This following table provides a summary of the comments and objections in Haslemere and highlights the main issues, providing a recommendation about these.

Summary of the comments and objections received about the advertised proposals in Haslemere (Parking Review and On street charges)

There were a total of 724 comments and objections about Haslemere. Of these:

- 227 were street specific and are detailed above in the comments for each road.
- 122 were specifically in relation to the proposed charges in the town centre and Wey Hill. Of these 28 were from businesses in the town.
- 134 were in mainly to charges in the town centre and also commented about proposals elsewhere.
- 196 were in response to the proposals as a whole. Many raised concerns about the effect of town centre charges near shops and the station and also suggested that an enlarged station car park was needed for rail users. Displacement was a concern.
- 28 objections were specifically to the charges around the station by rail travellers.

There were 17 comments specifically about the consultation process and that there wasn't enough time to respond or the process was not appropriate. (some of the more general wide ranging comments mentioned this as well)

The highest number of objections was to the town centre charges, followed by concern about commuter parking in the station area. In total there were 56 individual letters of support, including 1 with 36 names (Longdene Rd) and 1 with 34 names (Beech Road) and 668 letters stating an objection of some form or another to the advertised proposals in Haslemere. It should be noted that many responses in relation to residents parking stated an objection to a point of detail (e.g. the location of a parking bay or the operational hours) but were supportive of resident parking in principal.

Points raised in objection letter or E-mail	Officer Response
<p>Proposed parking charges in Shopping areas (The Town Centre and Wey Hill)</p> <p>There were objections to the principle of introducing parking charges in these areas and 28 objections from Haslemere businesses about on street charges. The Chamber of Trade summed up many of the points against including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with the current 1-hour time restriction is currently good and the benefits of pay and display will not be achieved. Surveys have been submitted to demonstrate this. • In the current economic climate, on street charges would deter visitors to the town and harm local businesses and the town centre. • Town Centre workers would not be able to park. <p>The Haslemere Society called for the charges in shopping areas to be abandoned on the basis that visitors would be discouraged from travelling to town by car and there were few alternative travel choices.</p> <p>Other comments against the proposals were based on the appearance of ticket machines in conservation areas.</p>	<p>Although only representing about 10% of the available parking for shoppers in the town centre and 5% in Wey Hill, there was considerable strength of feeling against parking charges in the retail areas of the High Street and Wey Hill. There was some confusion between the differing responsibilities of SCC and WBC and a number of objections were linked to the recent increase in charges introduced in the off street car parks by Waverley Borough Council.</p> <p>Local businesses and the Chamber of Trade made a strong argument against the need for parking charges in these areas, which could create the perception of Haslemere being an expensive 'destination' and potentially deter visitors. Comments from the Haslemere society and the Town Council supported this view.</p> <p>Whilst there are significant benefits in having 'pay and display' to simplify enforcement, (which in turn reduces cost and improves compliance) and to increase 'churn' there is a perceived risk about the affect it will have on the businesses community and economic activity in the town, that would outweigh these benefits.</p> <p>The economic climate in the UK (and worldwide) is difficult at the moment with little sign of improvement in the short term. Whilst Haslemere is a vibrant country town with very few vacant retail premises, in the present economic climate many businesses report difficult conditions. In light of the strength of feeling against them, parking charges in the retail areas should not be introduced.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that on street parking charges in the town centre and Wey Hill areas are not introduced.</p> <p>It is recommended that chevron parking be replaced with 'parallel' parking in all locations (such as the bottom of Shepherds Hill) for safety reasons.</p> <p>It is recommended that further consultation be carried out about extending the loading restrictions, further along West Street as far as the fire station.</p>

Commuters, rail station parking and displacement

There were 28 objections to the proposed parking charges on roads around the Station from respondents who identified themselves as commuters or station users. (although there were more general objections to this parking charges around the station) Some respondents objected to the introduction of charges on the grounds of the additional cost, particularly in light of the recent increase in rail fares. Several requested an improved bus service to the station from surrounding villages such as Hindhead.

There were 171 general objections from other respondents identified as living within the town area. By far the most common themes were that an enlarged station car park was needed and that displacement would be an issue. Improved bus services to the station were also suggested.

The Haslemere Rail Users Group summarised the views of many but were sympathetic to the introduction of residents parking schemes in some roads with little off road parking for residents, however they felt proposed operational hours of the restrictions were too long.

They also felt there was an overall lack of parking in Haslemere and the proposal did little to assist this and that a larger station car park was needed.

They considered a Commuter code could be adopted by station user/commuters to improve the standard of parking around the station.

They also felt the cost of charges would be a burden on station users on top of the existing, already high rail fares and called for the charges to be withdrawn.

Officer Response

At the moment parking is unrestricted in many road around the station. Cars ‘squeeze in’ to many locations where, if controls were established it would not be appropriate to allow parking for safety or access reasons. Formalising or regulating parking inevitably reduces the number of spaces that would be available in an ‘uncontrolled’ environment in any given area.

Cars park close to driveways and junctions in many roads. It is proposed to introduce waiting restrictions to protect these locations and improve safety for residents and other highway users.

Long-term parking space has also been reduced in some locations to in order to improve facilities for residents and access to local attractions and amenities. For example the at the eastern end of Derby Road, visitors to St Bartholomew’s School and Church (parents, teaching staff and church goers) often need to park in the road because the off road facilities are not adequate. The revised, post consultation proposals in this report would make this easier for them, but in so doing reduce available space for station users. (see revised proposals for Derby Road

In general the roads proposed for residents parking do not suffer the highest level of commuter parking when compared with Weydown, or Derby Rd because the residents vehicles take up a higher proportion of the road space as they have no, or little off street capability themselves. Inevitably though there would be a reduction in long term parking for station users in these roads and they would then need to be accommodated elsewhere.

Consequently it is not possible to maintain the same ‘density’ of long term parking availability when controls, intended to improve facilities for local residents and visitors are in place.

Parking Charges

The introduction of parking charges helps manage demand and can reduce car usage and congestion. Where there is free, unrestrained on street parking, drivers often fill up these spaces first, rather than going straight to a car park.

The introduction of parking charges on roads around the station would inevitably

They stated that SCC does not know where people are travelling from and surveys were needed.

The **Haslemere Society** considers there is a lack of long term parking around the station and the problem could increase if additional development in the area continues.

They also felt that the proposals would jeopardise the chances of an enlarged station car park, which would need a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) around the station to be effective. They considered that the proposed on street charges were a money making exercise and should be scrapped until a solution to the towns parking problem is found.

The society strongly supports an enlarged station car park, however if this is not possible then Waverley BC should enlarge the Wey Hill Car Park.

The HS called for a more comprehensive transport study including public transport links.

Concerns about displaced vehicles have been raised by a number of respondents including Haslemere **Society, Rail Users Group and Town Council**. There is also concern about the possible displacement from the Fairground Car Park when charges are introduced there by WBC later in 2012.

The Town Council considers that there will be fewer spaces available around the station than proposed as realistically parked vehicles will take up about 5.5m rather than 5m.

They also consider that on street spaces further from the station would be less likely to be used, as there would be no incentive to use them. Commuters would be prepared to just to walk a bit further and park for free. The Town Council also considered that spaces close to the station were in a premium location and

change the travel behaviour of some motorists.

- Some, that live within a mile or two of the station may decide to walk or cycle, or be dropped off by their spouses, although there are many other factors that could influence this such. These include the weather, availability of a suitable route, street lighting, school run, health, economic and security.
- Some may try to find free parking on roads around the periphery of the restrictions to avoid the charges and have a longer walk.
- Some may drive to other stations where free parking is more readily available, although there are no others that offer the 'fast' service to London.
- Some may car share or use public transport to get to the station or work from home more often.

Station users may change their travel patterns, perhaps finding it easier to park later in the morning.

Based on season tickets issued by SW Trains for their car park it is estimated that approximately 40% of car park season ticket holders travel from within the GU27 postcode area, although it is accepted that this extends well into West Sussex and Hampshire. If this figure were applied to the rail commuter vehicles that park on street then 120 out of 300 could be from the GU27 postcode area. If only 20 of these changed their travel behaviour (and a small proportion from further a field) then parking demand could reduce by perhaps 30 vehicles per day. Although this figure is very subjective the incentive to stop driving would be greater for commuters living within a mile or so of the station.

Displacement

Parking counts have been undertaken by the SCC parking team to estimate the numbers of vehicles that park around the station each day. Discussions with residents groups, councillors, residents and experience of dealing with on street parking issues over many years in Haslemere has given the parking team a good understanding of the parking situation in the town (and who parks where)

Based on parking surveys and considering the residential roads in the town where new restrictions are proposed:

would be more likely to be used.

The Town Council estimates there could be between 140 to 190 vehicles displaced as a result of the on street proposals, and another 50 to 60 if Waverley introduces charges in the Fairground car park.

HTC summarises as follows:

While HTC strongly supports the principle of re-organising all-day parking, **it believes that nothing should be implemented until additional parking capacity for at least 250 cars can be provided near Haslemere Station**, preferably by a three deck multi-storey car park but otherwise by re-activating the car park area to the north of the station (for which use planning permission once existed) and erecting a single extra deck on the main station car park. Once the additional capacity is available, all-day parking can be prohibited in all the narrow roads near the station, which can then be used solely for residents' parking. **However, attempts like the All-day Parking Proposals in advance of such additional capacity will do little or nothing to reduce the problem but merely move it to different parts of the town.** HTC appreciates that SCC would review the situation after six or 12 months but does not favour the prospect of steadily increasing the urbanisation of Haslemere by pursuing all-day parkers and bordering almost every residential road with yellow lines

- There are currently between 250 and 300 station user's vehicles parked on a typical weekday. (Average say 275)
- Following the amendments proposed in response to the consultation the revised proposals could cater for about 260 vehicles. (based on a 5.0m long space) The town council have stated that parked vehicles typically take more space, however, parking discipline often improves when bays are marked over an unregulated situation. The parking bays proposed as part of this scheme are often only 3 to 10 cars long so even assuming parked cars take up a bit more space the possible total reduction would be minimal.
- Parking charges could mean there would be a reduction in demand. 10% is suggested as a reasonable estimate. The total post implementation demand could therefore be around 250 vehicles per day.

The potential primary reason for displacement is likely to be when commuters seek to avoid paying to park. (This problem applies whether on street charging is introduced, or whether a multi storey car park at the station was built and parking restrictions introduced in the surrounding roads). In fact the provision of a multi storey car park may well exacerbate the problem, given that the current charge is £7 per day for a surface level car park and any revised charge is unlikely to be lower.

In developing the proposals for this parking management scheme, restrictions have been taken to what was considered a reasonable distance from the station to avoid significant displacement problems. Again the number of vehicles that could displace to the periphery is subjective. 'How far will someone walk to avoid paying £5 each day, and what if it's raining etc?'

To allay the concerns about parking displacement a number of options could be considered:

- Waiting restrictions could be extended to roads even further from the station. The potential concern with this is that it may not be necessary, and does not solve the possible shortage of long-term parking space. To mitigate against displacement problems, however further extension in all roads are unlikely to be supported at the current time and would be better addressed when or if a problem arises

- Increasing the amount of long-term spaces available by providing additional parking bays at the top end of Weydown Road and in other locations.
- The tariff for parking furthest from the station could be reduced, the bays would be more likely to be used and would minimise the chance of displacement beyond the range of restrictions. This would mitigate the economic impact to some extent as well and allow commuters to pay less, but have a less convenient walk. The parking bays in roads furthest from the station could have a reduced tariff to reflect the longer walk, of say £2.50 maximum for parking for 5 hours and over.
- The actual level of displacement is very difficult to predict, however if the scheme were implemented parking patterns would be monitored and displacement problems tackled in a planned review 6 – 12 months after implementation.

The revised proposals have consequently included greater provision of long term parking in several roads and a reduced tariff in some spaces furthest from the station (in additional bays at the top end of Weydown Road) to help minimise displacement. As a result 260 spaces can be provided taking into account those that have been converted to residents parking or are no longer included in the proposals. Consequently there should be enough spaces for all the station users vehicles that currently park on roads around the station at the moment.

The introduction of parking charges makes it more likely that spaces will be available after 9.30 in the morning. This will help improve access to the station during the day.

The locations where additional spaces could be provided are listed in the street specific responses.

The introduction of parking spaces with a lower tariff further from the station helps reduce the economic impact on station users, one of the concerns in the consultation response.

There will still be free unrestricted parking in some roads near the station that do not wish to be part of the scheme and as such there is a possibility that Weysprings and Lion Lane that will be more heavily parked by station users.

	<p>Some respondents have commented that surveys have not been carried out to find out where commuters live, however as mentioned previously there are so many factors that influence travel mode and behaviour that it is unlikely this would provide any more meaningful information about travel behaviour. The consultation responses gave an insight into the types of improvements that could be made to station accessibility.</p> <p>The introduction of parking charges into the Fairground car park is a matter for Waverley Borough Council however, the on street parking management proposals mean that any displacement from the car park would be better managed and less likely to cause disruption on the surrounding highway network.</p> <p>The Station Car Park</p> <p>A large number of respondents (about 35% of the total) stated that Haslemere needed a larger car park or multi storey car park (MSCP)</p> <p>In 2009, planning permission was granted 'in principle', to allow South West Trains to double the size of the eastern station car park to around 450 spaces, although this would not account totally for the number of vehicles currently parked on the roads. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that permission to construct an even larger car park would be granted.</p> <p>However, the current permission has never been formalised, and SWT have not exercised their permission, allegedly on the grounds of the scheme being financially non viable. Furthermore, these additional spaces are unlikely to be used with so much free on street parking in the immediate area, making this, or any similar project financially uncertain.</p> <p>An enlarged MSCP is widely accepted, including by SCC, as the preferred long-term solution for parking around the station. Many respondents suggested this, but it is not within the powers of SCC to do other than support any such proposal, which in any case is a minimum of 2 years away from operation. However, the availability of so much free parking in the area makes the business case for a developer uncertain. Why would rail commuters choose to pay to park in the station when there was readily available free parking on roads within a short walking distance?</p> <p>A developer or SWT would need to secure an area wide parking management scheme around the station (as is currently proposed) as part of any planning submission and, like any proposal of this nature it would be subject to lengthy consultation and other statutory processes, the end result being by no means certain. In order to satisfy the business case for an enlarged MSCP the developer would also need to ensure the parking scheme was in place and adequately enforced when the car park opened, or</p>
--	---

	<p>face several years of uncertain income. This could mean starting preparations for a parking management scheme about 2 years before the car park opened. An enlarged car park would involve the same type of proposals as are currently undergoing consultation and the 'simple' suggestion of a single yellow line with restrictions to prevent commuter parking, would also result in similar of increased issues of displacement, due to the higher charges.</p> <p>In these circumstances it would be a significant risk for a developer to put up £150K or so, for parking management scheme before planning permission and other approvals were in place. If they didn't however, the car park income would be uncertain. It is recognised that the existing car parks around the station are close to capacity and there is a 7 or so year wait for a season ticket. This is unlikely to change if parking charges are introduced.</p> <p>Demand for parking around the station, if unrestrained will continue to increase as new developments are approved in the surrounding area, including those in West Sussex and Hampshire. Free parking exacerbates this problem. The introduction of a parking management scheme around the station sooner makes the possibility of an enlarged car park more viable as it eliminates a lot of risk for the developer. There is no reason why SCC would not reduce the extent of the on street scheme proposed by making more spaces available to residents and local businesses, rather than commuters when an MSCP were in place.</p> <p>The suggestion that the proposals should not go ahead because the risk of displacement is too great does not take account the problems that have been experienced over many years by residents and highway users closer to the station. A perceived concern about displacement shouldn't outweigh the actual problems of existing unmanaged parking in many roads at the moment. Residents on roads close to the station may feel their concerns are being addressed if the proposals are postponed.</p> <p>A number of respondents to the consultation have also mentioned the need for improving transport links to the station from surrounding villages such as Hindhead and Grayshott.</p> <p>There is no reason why, if a parking management scheme were agreed, that ways of improving public transport links and routes on foot/cycle to the station, as well as car clubs couldn't be investigated.</p>
--	---

	<p>If any surplus income is generated, it must by law, be spent on the highway network and station transport links would be a good use of the income.</p> <p>Summary of recommendations for the rail station area</p> <p>Proceed with the parking management scheme (but with amendments described elsewhere in the street specific comments). Retain the proposed tariff of £1 per hour up to 5 hours and £5 for 5 hours or more.</p> <p>However,</p> <p><u>To reduce the likelihood of displacement:</u> Increase the number of long-term parking spaces where practical and safe to do so. By making small adjustments to the proposals it is possible to provide more spaces in Weydown Road, Bunch Lane, Kings Road. Also to consult about residents parking in High lane and additional waiting restrictions in Weycombe Road.</p> <p><u>To reduce displacement and economic impact:</u> Reduce the tariff for long term parking bays at the upper end of Weydown Road (furthest from the station) to £2.50 maximum for 5 hours and over. Introduce a discount for season ticket holders.</p> <p><u>To reduce economic impact and improve access to the station:</u> If the proposals around the station are agreed, investigate improvements that could be made to station accessibility by non-car means. Investigate whether bus services and timetables could be adjusted to provide more convenient access to the station.</p> <p><u>To minimise environmental concerns:</u> Ensure that no ticket machines are located in conservation areas. Minimise the use of signage by greater utilisation of signs saying 'permit holders only beyond this point'.</p> <p>That the number of on street 'pay and display' ticket machines is kept to a minimum and that 5 are initially installed alongside a 'pay by phone' system.</p> <p>Additional consultation will be required on these proposals.</p>
--	---

**Comments- Residents Parking
(see also detailed comments for each road)**

Generally there was wide spread support for the principal of resident parking, although there were many comments about the details. Typically these concerned where parking bays were located or the proposed operational hours, or 'zoning'.

Residents in the **Lower Street and Shepherds Hill** area were concerned about the introduction of resident parking schemes in nearby roads and felt that they would be left without any parking nearby, other than the car parks.

HTC supports the principle of the Residents Parking Proposals and the provision of residents'-only parking spaces ("ROPS") where these are (a) still wanted by a majority of the residents of the relevant roads having understood the details of the published proposals, (b) any outstanding practical issues have been resolved (dropped kerbs etc) and (c) the impact on adjacent roads has been taken into account in some cases. **HTC** has recently received many communications from residents and it has become clear that, although many residents were confused by **HTC's** attempts at clarification, in some cases, there is a difference between what residents thought they were being offered and what the **SCC** proposals actually offer in terms of time of operation and of zoning. A further round of consultation by **SCC** will be needed in these cases.

Officer Response – residents parking

Overall there was support from the majority of respondents to resident parking schemes in nearly all roads where it was proposed. Objections tended to be about relatively minor detail. The exceptions were Beech Road, Bridge Road and Sandrock, which would require more extensive amendments. The proposals for each road are listed in the street specific recommendations.

The proposed hours of the residents parking schemes (and many other restrictions) were advertised to be operational between 08.00 and 20.00. This was intended to stop displacement from the Waverley car where charging has recently been extended to 19.00hrs. .

Following the consultation response it is proposed to reduce the operational hours to between 08.30hrs and 17.30hrs, Monday to Friday in all the residents parking schemes, unless specifically identified in the street specific comments, in the vicinity of a WBC car park.

It is proposed that residents permits are allocated as advertised in Haslemere as follows:

- Properties with no off street parking are eligible for 2 permits, if space permits.
- Properties with 1 off street parking space are eligible for 1 permit.
- Properties with 2 or more off street parking spaces are not eligible for a permit.

Any variations to this are identified on the street specific recommendations.

Many also commented (although some disagreed) that they wanted permits to be street specific and not valid for use in nearby residents parking streets. **This is recommended in the revised proposals and some additional consultation will be required.**

The majority of residents of the Shepherds Hill and Lower Street area currently have no off street parking and currently park where space permits in surrounding roads. In order to accommodate these residents it is proposed to introduce parking spaces

	<p>specifically for residents in these areas: The proposed locations for Lower Street/Shepherds Hill residents parking bays are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The lay-by in Shepherds Hill• The western end of Hill Road• The southern end of Tanners Lane (between Lower Street and Bridge Road) this was proposed as a 'commuter' bay but can be changed to residents only.• The northern side of Hollyridge (off Shepherds Hill). <p>It is recommended that additional consultation be carried out about these proposals and reported to the committee in June.</p> <p>In order to mitigate against parking displacement it is proposed to consult about residents parking in High Lane between Derby Road and Weydown Road and also about whether to introduce waiting restrictions at the southern end of Weycombe Road.</p>
--	---

<i>Schools</i>	See comments and recommendations about Derby Road and Lion Lane.
<p>Comments – Enforcement</p> <p>HTC commented on enforcement as follows:</p> <p>HTC does not agree that there is a need for increased on-street parking enforcement in relation to the All-day Parking Proposals and the Residents Parking Proposals. Those who park their cars for 12 hours invariably respect parking prohibitions indicated by yellow lines and residents' parking bays as witnessed by the effect of the single yellow line in Derby Road, Haslemere. They fear the risk of being reported and are unable to dash out and move the car when a traffic warden appears.</p> <p>And also</p> <p>HTC suggests that, in the true spirit of localism and subsidiarity, SCC should consider seeking to place the onus for proposing parking changes in Haslemere on the lowest and most relevant tier, namely HTC, and give the Waverley Local Committee the role of adjudicating if proposals coming from HTC can be supported and implemented by SCC. This would immediately improve the atmosphere and place the responsibility for engaging with the Haslemere public with the body closest to them.</p>	<p>Officer recommendations</p> <p>The financial considerations involved with enforcing the proposals are dealt with in the main committee report under 'Financial Implications'</p> <p>Parking and waiting restrictions are introduced for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to stop dangerous parking and improve safety • to reduce obstructive parking and keep traffic moving • to allow better access to shops and amenities • to help residents park nearer their home • to achieve other transport plan objections <p>Without enforcement, parking restrictions are not effective and compliance reduces.</p> <p>Surrey County Council and it's enforcement partners (currently most of the District and Borough Council's) operate Civil Parking Enforcement in accordance with Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2006. The County Council is the Traffic Authority in Surrey with ultimate responsibility on street parking enforcement. The district and borough councils however carry out the day-to-day enforcement of parking restrictions, under agreement.</p> <p>Surrey County Council is the Traffic Authority in Waverley and the Local Committee is authorised by the Council to make changes about traffic regulation orders including parking restrictions.</p>