

ITEM XX : ANNEXE 3 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER (ONslow VILLAGE)

Summary

Onslow Village – 122 representations from 109 properties

ITEM XX : ANNEXE 3 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Onslow Village		(122 representations from 109 properties)
<p>Page 70</p> <p>10201 & 10251 two different reps</p>	<p>Having lived in this house for over thirty years I am so delighted that Wilderness Road will hopefully have controlled parking.</p> <p>In the last few years our road has become dirty and noisy. We often have large vans parked outside our house (and half on the pavements). When my husband and I take our car out of the drive, our vision is greatly restricted as cars are parked so close to our entrance. I am amazed that we have not had an accident getting out of our drive!</p> <p>I am retired now from teaching full-time for 35 years. My husband is still working part-time as a professor at the University.</p> <p>Friends now catch the bus to see us as they have nowhere to park when they arrive.</p> <p>Twice we have had old cars left permanently outside our house for a year. The second car was only taken away this October. My side of the road has never been swept as cars are permanently left on it.</p> <p>We are on a bus route so it makes sense to have controlled parking in Wilderness Road. I would prefer to not have an unrestricted parking bay alongside the wall outside my house. I feel the bay will be abused by people wanting to park work vans rather than leave them on their own drives.</p> <p>I hope that for my last 20 years or more I can enjoy living in Wilderness Road and that the road can be the pleasant, clean place that it used to be.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

	<p>-----</p> <p>Firstly, let me say that I fully support the introduction of controlled parking in Wilderness Road, where I live. I'm happy for there to be a few unrestricted bays providing their use is strictly time limited and that they are located well away from drive entrances.</p> <p>This must be the third or fourth time that I've written in support of this and I am really very disappointed that a positive decision hasn't been taken much earlier. As for Wilderness Road, well it is on a bus route and is probably the busiest road in Onslow village as it serves two schools and links Farnham Road to the A3. It is also used inappropriately and inconsiderately for short and long term parking by non-residents. We have even had cars left unused near our house for months on end.</p> <p>So please introduce parking controls and do so quickly.</p>	
10202	<p>We are please to confirm that the proposals to Ellis Avenue are acceptable to us and we look forward to them being implemented as soon as possible.</p> <p>You will appreciate that we have had major parking problems in the road since the CPZ was implemented to half the village some 10 years ago and you now recognise that this did cause parking to displace.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10203	<p>In response to the notices you have recently posted we just wanted to write to say we fully support the extension of the control zone to take in the Crossways leading into Manor Way. We are fed up of not being able to park outside of our own home and having our drive obstructed so we cannot turn onto our drive in one manouver or see clearly up and down the road when exiting.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

	<p>It has our full support and the sooner the better.</p> <p>Many thanks for this initiative and lets hope it is successfully introduced this time.</p>	
10204	<p>We live at 5 Ellis Avenue.</p> <p>We fully agree with the proposals. The plan will greatly assist us, as it will enable us to use our driveway, which under the current unrestricted parking situation is often difficult and sometimes impossible. We note that the plan has a single yellow line opposite our house and we would kindly request that this be retained and implemented as soon as possible. At the moment, students and commuters are parking opposite our drive daily, making it very difficult to turn in and out of the driveway. The road is narrow outside our house, so it is not appropriate to have parking there at any time. It will be useful to have some unrestricted parking on the road for visitors where proposed.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10205	<p>I attach my views as a resident of 8 Litchfield Way.</p> <p>As a relatively quiet area I do not find that the parking of vehicles generally causes any inconvenience to me. Despite having off-street parking, I find access for myself and guests to plentiful unrestricted parking on the surrounding roads is very useful and would find restrictions to this access an inconvenience.</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted and limited waiting shared-use space, which broadly match present demand, will provide residents and their visitors with opportunities to park and flexibility.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control</p>

		and increase the availability of parking.
10206	<p>I completely agree with and approve of the proposed CPZ.</p> <p>I do hope it will reduce the amount of signage around the village as you enter and exit the existing zone.</p> <p>Can you confirm the controlled zone signs will indicate 8:30 to 6pm Monday to Saturday and that this would mean we would not need the individual waiting restrictions signs at regular intervals around Litchfield Way.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10207	<p>I live at 31 Manor Way. I do not believe that the changes currently proposed are needed around the Abbots Way junction, and that double yellow lines here would look out of place and ugly in contrast to the majority of the road. I have never experienced issues with cars parked there.</p> <p>However, I do believe that proposed changes are needed at the A3 junction.</p>	<p>Many have commented about the issues experienced in the section of Manor Way between The Crossways and Abbots Close. If controls are introduced elsewhere to resolve the issues there, it is likely that parking may begin to take place inappropriately close to junctions, bend and on the brow of hills, if militating steps are not taken.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 74</p> <p>10208</p>	<p>As residents of 13 Manor Way, we are deeply concerned that the part of Manor Way extending from The Crossways to Abbots close has been excluded from the CPZ proposals. By all surrounding roads being included in the scheme, this will cause major issues, especially to the residents that live adjacent to the embankments (especially no.'s 5 - 15) that have no other access to parking facilities. You are going to cause commuter, University and shopping parkers that can no longer park in the areas that will become CPZ to roam up and down Manor Way seeking spaces. There are already a number of CPZ residents that cannot get sufficient permits for their own needs that regularly park in Manor Way, especially when they go on holiday for days/weeks on end, and the introduction of CPZ areas closer to us is bound to exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>We would ask you to reconsider the exclusion of Manor Way from the CPZ.</p> <p>We are also slightly concerned that the notification dated 29th November came in a plain white envelope, and looked like a flyer from an estate agent or double glazing company, from whom we get many such flyers. This would likely have caused it to have been binned as such, without opening. Surely you should have had some form of indication that this was an important and official letter from G.B.C. so that people would open them, after all if people do not know you are sending them important information they cannot respond to you.</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways to Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in</p>

		<p>Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10209	<p>On the whole the proposed parking restrictions seem very helpful. However, if a 4-hour parking bay is put outside 13, The Crossways, please could it be far enough away from our entrance gate to enable us to see clearly when leaving our driveway.</p> <p>This would make it safer for us to exit.</p>	<p>General support for the proposal noted.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions. A standard set back distance of two kerbs (one transition and one full) from the lowered kerb is being used throughout the proposed extension area.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

10210	<p>We are very much in favour of controlled parking, in particular along Wilderness Road as we regularly suffer problems accessing our own drive due to inconsiderate parking.</p> <p>Please accept our Support for the proposals under the above references.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10211	<p>I do not object to the introduction of controlled parking in Onslow Village per se. That said having reviewed the plans there are two proposed bays that I need to bring to your attention as being dangerous because Orchard Road is a very narrow road. They are circled in the attached</p> <p>Dangerous Parking Bay 1 (o/s No.6)</p> <p>This is dangerous because to drive around a car parked here you will have to drive on the wrong side of the road just before a blind bend when going down the road. You will not see another car coming up the road until it is too late. Single yellow lines are more appropriate here.</p> <p>Dangerous Parking Bay 2 (o/s No.13)</p> <p>This is the bay directly outside our drive. Driving out of our drive onto the road when cars are parked in that spot is really difficult and dangerous. We have had three crashes in as many years due to cars being parked there. It is simply very difficult to get out of the drive when someone parks there. You should try it yourself. In addition cars have to drive on the wong side of the road to avoid parked cars there and when we are trying to pull out into the road this leads to accidents. Single yellow lines are more appropriate here.</p>	<p>General support for the proposal noted.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.</p> <p>The width of Orchard Road, and the vast majority of other roads within the area are such that the positioning of parking opposite driveways is feasible without unduly affecting access.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

10212

I support the extension of the CPZ within Onslow Village.

Will the Council ensure that any bays are not directly opposite driveways? One of the current problems in Wilderness Rd is that it is very hard to get out of the driveways when people are parked directly opposite!!

I can see the sense of unrestricted bays in Manor Way and High View Road.

I have concerns about unrestricted bays in Powell Close and Windsor Close. I wonder whether it would be sensible for these to be unrestricted only after a certain time (Eg 8am). Otherwise I can foresee difficulties where commuters who currently park in Wilderness Rd move to Powell Close/Windsor Close. In addition to the fact that many of the teachers need to be able to find parking spaces, this would cause problems both for residents of those roads and for parents taking their children to school.

As Onslow Infant School is due to expand, parking is likely to become more of an issue because children who live some distance from the school are now being allocated places there. This necessarily means that there are far more cars than there used to be!!

Will the CPZ extension allow for the fact that more parking will be required at the beginning and end of the school day?

Similarly, what provision is to be made for The Square (where there is a small parade of shops and where parents of schoolchildren frequently park)?

General support for the proposal noted.

The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.

The width of Wilderness Road, and the vast majority of other roads within the area are such that the positioning of parking opposite driveways is feasible without unduly affecting access.

During the previous stages of informal consultation, those that responded from Powell Close and Windsor Close have consistently clearly opposed their inclusion within the CPZ.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking, for residents and those involved in the school run.

I work for the National Health Service, and currently commute from Ewshot (near Farnham) by car, then park near Onslow village, to walk a mile or so to work in the centre of Guildford.

I park my car considerably the in the areas that you are proposing changes for – and on one occasion moved my car when a resident put a notice on my windscreen, explaining that he had no driveway, so that was the only place left for him/her to park. I moved my car and took notice the next time around.

I walk down from near Onslow village, to my work place every day. There are many, many parking spaces I can park in – and so I believe that the complaints about inconsiderate parking are basically from residents who are upset about people who work in Guildford parking in the Onslow Village area. Why yet more restrictions on parking? Do we not risk turning the whole of suburban England into one parking site, just because some people are too selfish to ‘share’ their parking spaces with people that have to work in town centres, and have no other way of getting into work? What good does this proposal do for Guildford – a city already restricted to the extreme with parking spaces.

I cannot afford the considerable parking fees for Park and Ride, Park and Ride is not a healthy option that I believe the National Health Service would endorse, and Park and Ride will take ages to get down Farnham Road into Guildford (indeed if that scheme is proposed).

Some of my other colleagues also park in Litchfield Avenue/Orchard Road etc. and walk over a mile into work. The reason: we cannot get the train from where we live – and either have to cycle (I do occasionally) and walking is healthier than taking an expensive/slow/environmentally unfriendly bus into Guildford.

This proposed extension is Draconian; puts further pressure on people that already cannot either afford to park around Guildford

Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by inconsiderately parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.

A combination of unrestricted and limited waiting shared-use spaces are proposed to provide some facility for all-day parking without the need for a permit. In part, this is to minimise the potential for commuters to displace en masse to just beyond proposed boundary.

Prior to the formal advertisement stage, a series of informal consultations have been undertaken. Street notices were used to highlight the previous public exhibitions stage, held in June 2013. During both the current stage and the previous one, feedback has been received from those not resident within the area, and these views have been considered by the Local Committee.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

	<p>and who work within Guildford. It will mean that my already stretched finances are further stretched either because I have to find somewhere to park in Guildford, or I have to pay for the ineffective, unhealthy, and environmentally option of using Park and Ride.</p> <p>I would urge you to re-consider this proposal on the basis of the points that I have raised above – or alternatively, offer free permits for people that work for the good of others, and particularly free permits for those that work for the NHS and have to work in the centre of Guildford.</p> <p>One final point I would like to make: I first became aware of this consultation today (3 December) and notice that it is running for an unreasonably short period 29 November – 20 December. I also notice that you put the address and contact details on the back of the notice. This is something that I would consider raising with the press here in Guildford, as I believe you are trying to sneak this proposal through the back door, if at all possible,</p>	
10214	<p>I am strongly opposed to the proposed controlled parking zone as well as the limited controls being considered for the road which I live on, Manor Way.</p> <p>Currently the residents of Onslow Village have to live with the occasional minor inconvenience of road users parking freely around our homes. This is kept to only a <i>minor</i> inconvenience because unrestricted parking means the dispersal of vehicles is fairly well spread throughout the village and so you never have to go too far to find a space for yourself.</p> <p>Equally reducing the availability of free parking means the likely displacement of cars into a more confined area which would take parking from being occasionally tricky to often impossible on our street. To date I have never had to park more than six doors away</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not be particularly inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area regularly do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways to Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it</p>

from my home, I cannot see this being the case if you impose a CPZ in our area unless you eventually impose one on the whole area which I am even more opposed to not least because if controls were brought in I assume permits would be required and you would therefore be further raiding the purses of people already suffering in these straitened economic times and adding to personal and council administrative time. There is simply not a great enough problem with alien parking to require this measure.

I cannot stress strongly enough how against these restrictions I am and speaking to my neighbours, who may not be inclined to write in, I know that the general consensus is the same.

within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.

The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

10215	I approve of the changes proposed for High View Road, where I live.	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10216	We would like to register our support for making Ellis Avenue, Onslow Village a restricted parking zone. We would be grateful if you could also record that we would like to object to having any parking bays opposite our drive as this is the problem we are having now making it very difficult to get in and out of our drive.	<p>General support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.</p> <p>The width of Ellis Avenue, and the vast majority of other roads within the area are such that the positioning of parking opposite driveways is feasible without unduly affecting access.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10217	I am a care worker and often go to Bannisters Road, there are no driveways and I therefore strongly protest to proposed restricted parking plans in my road.	<p>Many, but not all, of the properties in Bannisters Road have off-street parking.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and</p>

		<p>the proximity of junctions.</p> <p>Being one of the narrower roads within the area, we have been particularly careful when positioning parking bays opposite driveways, so as not to unduly affect access.</p> <p>Those residents with the need for carers can acquire a carer permit at a heavily discounted rate, which allow the user to use the limited waiting shared-use spaces without restriction.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10218	<p>We are writing to express our complete agreement with the current CPZ proposals contained in KM/13/0005. We strongly support the idea that it would be wrong to leave out roads leading to them being surrounded by others contained in the CPZ. We live in Vicarage Gate and have already observed commuter and University parking creep into the street over the last few years.</p> <p>We also know the dangers uncontrolled parking at street corners has caused. This must be prevented.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10219, 10320 & 10369 three different reps	<p>I sincerely object to any parking restrictions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . most of us in this (Bannisters) road have little or no driveway. . Rarely is the road full of cars. . Last Saturday there was one car parked in my stretch . Children play football in this road, it's not a busy road. . Nobody will gain from this. 	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p>

. This money would be far better spent repairing the uneven pavements, so the mothers and children can walk safely to school, and not have to wheel buggies in the road to avoid tree roots.
 . My father would be unable to park as regularly as he does as he looks after his grand children which means the parents could not work such hours.
 . There are many two car families in our roads, as stated previously, drives or no drives many have only one car space or none.

I would like to object to the proposed parking restrictions in Onslow Village.

- As a resident I object to having to tarmac over my garden to park the car.
- The shops would be finished off as parking is restricted there.
- The residents in the flats of 34 flats, some with two cars have 6 unreserved parking places.

My neighbour would be unable to walk to her own village shop. She is 86 and can not walk that far.

I object

The proposed parking would block my drive at no. 20 bannisters road. Currently I can get in my drive if there is a gap between cars parked opposite. If parking restrictions were in place three cars would try to park. We all in Onslow village are not allowed to remove our Beech hedges, this is in our deeds. So we are unable to Tarmac our front gardens even if we had to.

Many, but not all, of the properties in Bannisters Road have off-street parking.

The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.

Being one of the narrower roads within the area, we have been particularly careful when positioning parking bays opposite driveways, so as not to unduly affect access.

The parking immediately outside the shopping parade is proposed as limited waiting shared-use, which will actually encourage turnover of these spaces. The spaces opposite are proposed as unrestricted, in part, to facilitate the needs of the shop workers.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

I am writing following the letter dated November 29th to object to the controlled parking zone planned outside my property, 8 Wilderness Rd, Guildford. My objections are based on the following counts:

- Based on the current situation there is no need to introduce controlled parking. I have lived in Wilderness Rd for 3 years and have always been able to park close to my house throughout the week. We do not have a large number of non-residence or commuters currently parking in the road such that the introduction of controlled parking would be needed.
- Household finances are already stretched, I strongly object to the prospect of having to purchase parking permits to introduce controlled parking which I do not consent to.
- If controlled parking is introduced I would strongly request that it is limited to weekdays and not weekends. The number of commuters parking in the area on a weekend must be very much smaller than a week day, therefore the proposal to extend the restrictions to Saturdays is uncalled for. Furthermore the knock on impacts in terms of inconvenience and costs to residents who are likely to have visitors at weekends is disproportionate.

I would therefore requests that you reconsider the proposal on these grounds. I would appreciate a further conversation with you before any further decisions are made.

Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.

It would be more appropriate to consider the issue of operational hours during a future parking review, and across a wider area, rather than introducing a Monday to Friday extension to the existing Monday to Saturday Area J. Such a change would result in the boundary between the two being relatively indistinct and arbitrary. If the proposed new area for controls were to have different operational hours, it would also result in the need for considerably more large zone boundary signs. The visual intrusion of the controls is an issue touched upon by some that have made representations. We therefore recommend that the time limited controls operate Monday to Saturday, as advertised.

The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. This also overcomes some of the concerns expressed by representees about the zone operating on Saturdays. We therefore recommend that that a combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are implemented, as advertised.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of

		<p>Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
<p>10221</p>	<p>We request that the double yellow line parking restriction, currently shown as being outside Nos. 27 and 28 High View Road, be extended to No. 31 HVR, with a similar extension on the north side of the road.</p> <p>This stretch is already hazardous, being a blind bend. Currently there is parking on both sides of the road, forcing traffic coming from the Farnham Road (A31) in order to access the cul-de-sac end of HVR (and traffic leaving the cul-de-sac end) into the middle of the road with a strong chance of a head-on collision.</p>	<p>The proposal was developed after the Police contacted Parking Services. They had been called to the location on at least one occasion after buses had become grounded whilst turning. They suggested that, because of the rapidly altering gradient around the junction, buses and other large vehicles had a tendency to ground when vehicles parked in the vicinity and opposite the junction. The proposals developed are the minimum required to overcome these issues, by allowing larger vehicles to use the full width of the carriageway. We therefore recommend that the proposals for High View Road are implemented as advertised.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
<p>10222 &10223 Same rep sent twice</p>	<p>Bannisters road. Onslow village.</p> <p>I Object to plans to make my area parking controlled !</p> <p>This is a residential area and see this plans as nothing more than a cash generating system.</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted and limited waiting shared-use space, which broadly match present demand, will provide residents and their visitors with</p>

		<p>opportunities to park and flexibility, and reduce the reliance on permits.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10228 (Farm Walk)	<p>This is to confirm that my wife and I fully support the proposals to extend the Controlled Parking Zone further into Onslow Village, particularly the inclusion of Wilderness Road and Litchfield Way which should greatly improve sight lines and road safety at the junction of these two roads.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10229	<p>As I said at the meeting in the village hall earlier this year and as I wrote in my comments after the meeting, I am very concerned about the parking in Abbots Close.</p> <p>I live in number 3, the first driveway on the left as you enter the road. When the parking restrictions are introduced, this little road will be full of cars, making it impossible for my family and me to access our driveway. If people park very close to the gate opposite (number 2) we find it is impossible to enter our drive as the road is so narrow. At the moment we sometimes are unable to park off road because of inconsiderate parking. In future this will be a permanent state of affairs. We will NEVER be able to park on our own driveway. It will result in two or three cars parking somewhere on the road in Onslow Village. It would also have repercussions for car insurance.</p> <p>All I am asking for is two or three metres of double yellow or white lines either side of the gateway of number 2. This would enable us to reverse into the driveway and to drive out safely (for safety</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented from Abbots Close have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the controls in Abbots Close, at the junction with Manor Way, were extended as part of the formal proposals, private points of access onto the public highway are not protected with yellow lines, unless a road to form part of a CPZ.</p> <p>The possible use of a white, advisory protection</p>

10230,
10391 &
10405
three
different
reps

reasons we have to reverse into the driveway).

I have put this comment in the two letters I have written to you but no one has addressed my worries and written to me in reply. I would be grateful if I could receive an answer to my question. Can I have road markings with side of number 2 Abbots Close?

marking to highlight the presence of the crossover has been passed onto the County Council, as it is they that consider the need for such measures.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

We write in full support of the proposed extension of the CPZ to include our road, Wilderness Road, in response to your latest review of on-street parking in the Onslow Village area.

The restricted parking places planned for outside nos. 32 and 33 Wilderness Road should be on the opposite side of the street. This is a one way Bus Route and it makes no sense from a road safety perspective to have these bays on the side of the road used by the buses.

The other matter I would like to mention is that if Wilderness Road is scheduled for much-needed resurfacing (as apparently Queen Eleanors Road is) it would make sense for it to be done before all the road markings for the parking scheme.

As far as we are concerned the sooner the CPZ is extended the better as the pavements on our side of the road are in a terrible state due to vehicles parking on the pavement.

The only other thought we have had is that now the revised CPZ will have different timed periods for parking in allotted bays, can we assume that this idea will be extended to roads nearer to Guildford,

Support for the proposals is noted.

Although primarily being done to increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.

The CPZ is regularly kept under review, and there may be further opportunities to consider specific controls in specific roads, the operational hours of the scheme and permit eligibility etc...

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

	<p>notably Poltimore Road which must be the widest cul-de-sac in the south of England which is manifestly under utilised for parking.</p>	
<p>Page 88 10232</p>	<p>I write with regard to the above. I am resident at 149 Farnham Road GU2 7RL and am affected by the proposals - the location of our property means any on street parking for us is in Abbots Close.</p> <p>The problem with this whole proposal to extend the controls is exactly as you highlight in your recent communication - that is that the displacement of commuter parking will just continue further out and all you are doing with these proposals is to shift the problem to others.</p> <p>Before any of these restrictions were introduced, the Onslow Village area was a pleasant place with easy parking, few traffic problems etc. The ONLY people affected by commuter parking would have been those residing closest to the Station - but they knew this when they bought their property!! Those of us who bought further out did so with this in mind. All you did by introducing the restrictions was to push the problem further out and here we are with the same problem over again but affecting a different set of residents!</p> <p>If you carry out any further extension at all under these proposals, you have no choice but to restrict the WHOLE of THE VILLAGE up to and including High View Road. All that will happen under these proposals is that the commuters will park in Manor Way and, as some already do, in Abbots Close.</p> <p>However, why are the controls in place Monday to Saturday? Surely the problem only exists Monday to Friday because of the Station primarily? These are not shoppers. Moreover, why not just introduce a ban for non residents that applies Monday to Friday</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented from Manor Way and Abbots Close, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their roads' inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that these roads were on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include them within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way and Abbots Close now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that these roads remain outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p>

BEFORE 9.30 or 10.00AM as they do in parts of London? That way visitors to our homes can spend the day with us without further problems and the lazy parents collecting their children can park freely where permitted with no excuses.

And this leads me to another issue which I am not sure is being properly addressed. The parking on yellow lines and, more importantly ON THE PAVEMENT, by parents who are too bone idle or ignorant to seek out a proper parking place before dropping their children to school. The local council has massively increased the intake of pupils to our two small local schools with apparently NO CONSIDERATION WHATSOEVER for the increased traffic management issues. What are the Council doing regarding this? Or are you waiting for a child to be seriously injured by a vehicle before something is done? YOU MUST take immediate action to prevent parking on the pavements in Queen Eleanor's Road. There could be bollards, barriers, proper road markings or signs - but doing nothing is surely not an option.

And I speak as a parent with children attending these local schools.

Sadly I suspect that whatever happens now will be an unsatisfactory solution and some of us will end up further inconvenienced, all because of the selfishness of those who chose to purchase a property close to the Town Centre.

Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.

It would be more appropriate to consider the issue of operational hours during a future parking review, and across a wider area, rather than introducing a Monday to Friday extension to the existing Monday to Saturday Area J. Such a change would result in the boundary between the two being relatively indistinct and arbitrary. If the proposed new area for controls were to have different operational hours, it would also result in the need for considerably more large zone boundary signs. The visual intrusion of the controls is an issue touched upon by some that have made representations. We therefore recommend that the time limited controls operate Monday to Saturday, as advertised.

The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. This also overcomes some of the concerns expressed by representees about the zone operating on Saturdays. We therefore recommend that a combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are implemented, as advertised.

Although not the primary purpose for introducing formalised parking controls, where such measures are present, it does allow our enforcement officers to take action against footway parking. However, the issues associated with the school run are replicated

		<p>around many of the 70-or-so schools within the borough, and the nature of the parking activity is such, that there has to be an almost constant enforcement presence for it to be effective.</p> <p>The parking controls throughout the CPZ have been designed with safety, access and traffic flow in mind, and not just to prioritise parking for specific user-groups.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 90</p> <p>10233</p>	<p>I work for the National Health Service in the centre of Guildford, and currently commute from Farnborough by car, I then park near Onslow village, to walk a mile or so to work in the centre of Guildford.</p> <p>I was invited by one of my colleagues who is a resident of Onslow village to I park my car outside her house in one of the areas that you are proposing changes for so that we can walk to work together – she is also against the controlled parking zone as it will have an effect on visitors to her home.</p> <p>I walk down from near Onslow village, to my work place every day. There are many parking spaces I can park in and I have not seen inconsiderate parking – and so I believe that the complaints about inconsiderate parking are from residents who are upset about people who work in Guildford parking in the Onslow Village area.</p> <p>Why are you considering more restrictions on parking? Already 4 hour zones have been reduced to 2 hours. The centre of Guildford</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by inconsiderately parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>A combination of unrestricted and limited waiting shared-use spaces are proposed to provide some facility for all-day parking without the need for a permit. In part, this is to minimise the potential for commuters to displace en masse to just beyond proposed boundary.</p> <p>Of course, if town centre commuters choose to park beyond the proposed boundary there may be health benefits associated with walking that little bit further to and from work. The various park and ride facilities prevent several hundred cars from adding to the town centre traffic flows. In addition to reflecting supply and demand, the pricing strategy of</p>

	<p>is already congested and preventing people from parking on the outskirts is going to increase the congestion in the town centre.</p> <p>There is the Park and Ride but I believe that this is not a healthy option that the National Health Service would endorse, as the levels of obesity and diabetes are continuing to rise we should be encouraging more people to walk every day.</p> <p>On the days that I have taken the Park and Ride, I often find that it takes longer than walking. I have to drive (or sit in Guildford traffic) for longer to drive two miles further each way, which is not good for my health or the environment, and does nothing for the town centre congestion.</p> <p>This proposed restriction puts further pressure on myself and other people that either cannot either afford to park in Guildford town centre and who work within Guildford.</p> <p>For me it will mean that my already stretched finances are further stretched either because I have to find somewhere to park in Guildford, or I have to pay for the ineffective, unhealthy, and environmentally option of using Park and Ride.</p> <p>I would urge you to re-consider this proposal on the basis of the points that I have raised above – or alternatively, offer free permits for people that work for the good of others, and particularly free permits for those that work for the NHS and have to work in the centre of Guildford.</p>	<p>the car parks in and around the town centre also has similar goals in trying to reduce town centre congestion.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10234 (The Crossways)	We are strongly in favour of the proposals you have put forward.	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

10235	<p>I am writing regarding my bungalow. My bungalow is the only building at the above address (Bannisters Road) without a drive. Please can you advise what will happen if we are “yellow lined” regarding parking arrangements? Will this be a parking charge to my property.</p>	<p>The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, and an ability to park all-day, without the need to acquire a permit.</p> <p>Of course, if there was a desire to benefit by being able to use the limited waiting shared-use spaces without restriction, then it would be necessary to acquire a residents’ permit. These currently cost £50 for the first permit and £80 for the second. Daily visitor scratch-card permits are also available, and these cost £2 each. Normally, up to 30 can be acquired per annum.</p>
10236	<p>I fully support all of Wilderness Road’s inclusion in the proposed scheme and sincerely hope Wilderness Road will be free from inconsiderate parking as soon as possible.</p> <p>We are already aware of cars left for whole days along our stretch of Wilderness Road (nos 1 to 12) and the congestion caused trying to get up to Crossways and then onto the Farnham Road as a result of the blockage caused by one entire side of the road clogged with cars.</p> <p>The lower part of Wilderness Road leading up to Powell Close is extremely bad due to cars parked all along the road and having lived here for 32 years it is a great sadness to see the character of the village so changed by the lack of consideration of motorists who</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

	<p>clearly don't live here. Hopefully restricted parking will allow safer access and support the normal activity of the village ie using the shops and the school etc to proceed the way it should.</p>	
	<p>As a long term resident of High View Road, I would serious object to parking restrictions in most of the road.</p> <p>The majority of people in our section – Farnham Road to the triangle – park in the road as the drives are so steep. Most also have 2 cars so use all the space outside their property. It would be very inconvenient to have just designated spaces as in other roads. I appreciate that strangers might move up to park in our road – it happens a little now – but feel that this would be minor compared to parking restrictions.</p>	<p>Proposed controls in High View Road around its junction with Manor Way have been developed to resolve the issues there. Indeed, this location has an accident history.</p> <p>Additionally, the measures around the 'switchback' junction with the road were developed after the Police contacted Parking Services. They had been called to the location on at least one occasion after buses had become grounded whilst turning. They suggested that, because of the rapidly altering gradient around the junction, buses and other large vehicles had a tendency to ground when vehicles parked in the vicinity and opposite the junction. The proposals developed are the minimum required to overcome these issues, by allowing larger vehicles to use the full width of the carriageway. There are no proposals elsewhere within the road. We therefore recommend that the proposals for High View Road are implemented as advertised.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

10238	<p>I should like to confirm that my views have not changed and in fact my desire to see controlled parking in Bannisters Road has strengthened.</p> <p>Of particular concern is the parking on the corner of Bannisters Road with Litchfield Way to such an extent in both directions that it creates a single lane around what becomes a completely blind corner. It can be only a matter of time before there is an accident. While I would like to blame commuters from outside the area I very much fear that most of the offending vehicle belong to residents – no doubt some of those who bitterly object to the possibility of not being able to park within a few steps of their property.</p> <p>Also a controlled area would, I hope, put an end to the practice of parking on the pavement, forcing pedestrians onto the road, as well as cars parked for anything up to a fortnight while their owners go away on holiday.</p> <p>I should point out that we do own a car, lest it should be thought we are merely embittered pedestrians whose right to free access to the pavement is often denied.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10239s	<p>I am in support of the plans to have controls in our road, Vicarage Gate.</p> <p>We are having problems with commuters at our end of the road (Number 2) and this would only get worse if we were to be excluded from the CPZ,</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

We do not consider that Controlled Parking Zones would be appropriate at our part of Manor Way (Abbots Close – High View Road).

Many of the vehicles that park in our area are for short term, whilst they visit the American Golf shop or are associated with temporary building works going on locally, **and do not cause us any problems** - any reduction in parking spaces due to the introduction of CPZ could make it difficult for the few occasions we need to park in the road.

Also, we usually park our cars in our driveway but, being **very steep**, this is not possible when there is ice or snow and having to purchase parking permits (we would require three) for the few days/weeks each year when this occurs would be expensive (unless residents with these sort of problems are granted free permits).

We therefore hope that you do not feel it is necessary to extend the CPZ to our area of Manor Way.

Proposed controls in Manor Way at its junction with High View Road have been developed to resolve the issues there. Indeed, this location has an accident history.

During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from both The Crossways to Abbots Close and the Abbots Close to High View Road sections of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from the section of Manor Way from The Crossways to Abbots Close now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

		<p>Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
Page 96 10244	<p>We recently moved to Orchard Road from Bray Road, and so have experienced life in central Guildford both with and without restricted parking. I would like to voice my opinion strongly in favour of the proposals. We frequently find that visibility on the junctions in Onslow village is poor to the point of dangerous, especially on the T junction between Orchard Road and Bannister's Road. We never experienced difficulty getting parked under the residents' scheme in Bray Road.</p> <p>We have two cars and faithfully park them on our own drive, but I sometimes find it difficult to reverse out because of vehicles parked directly opposite. Many residents have ample off street parking but appear to choose to park on-street instead, possibly for fear of the same problem. It seems to me that they are creating a bit of a snowball effect here, which the new proposals would solve. I don't have a problem with short term non resident parking (eg to access the shops, schools etc) but don't see why Onslow Village should be used as free parking for commuters leaving their cars outside all day and then walking to the station. If they were encouraged to use the car parks or park and rides provided ,this would at least</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

	provide a bit more revenue for the borough, which presumably would either pay for the policing of the measures or for some other beneficial purpose.	
10245	We live at 9 The Crossways, which is in the part not already included within the CPZ, and we definitely do NOT want the zone extended to this part.	<p>The previous informal consultations have confirmed that the vast majority of residents from The Crossways are supportive of their road's total inclusion within the CPZ.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10246	<p>We are not totally opposed to the parking restrictions being extended to include our road - Orchard Road - but as I said at the previous consultation, there is absolutely no need for these restrictions to cover Saturday. The parking issues are caused by people who work/study at the University site during the week ie Monday to Friday. I have lived here for over 10 years and there have never been any parking issues in this area on Saturdays. Additionally, this part of Onslow Village is too far away from the town centre for people to park here at the weekend and then walk into town.</p> <p>I was told at the previous consultation that because we would be joining up with the parking restrictions in place in the rest of Onslow Village that it would have to include Saturdays. I just do not see why this has to be the case. I can see that such a decision will result in more and more people digging out their front gardens and putting in a bigger drive way because for those who have more than one car, their cars are more likely to be parked at home at the</p>	<p>It would be more appropriate to consider the issue of operational hours during a future parking review, and across a wider area, rather than introducing a Monday to Friday extension to the existing Monday to Saturday Area J. Such a change would result in the boundary between the two being relatively indistinct and arbitrary. If the proposed new area for controls were to have different operational hours, it would also result in the need for considerably more large zone boundary signs. The visual intrusion of the controls is an issue touched upon by some that have made representations. We therefore recommend that the time limited controls operate Monday to Saturday, as advertised.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their</p>

	<p>weekend.</p> <p>Please can you reconsider this decision.</p>	<p>visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. This also overcomes some of the concerns expressed by representees about the zone operating on Saturdays. We therefore recommend that that a combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are implemented, as advertised.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 98</p> <p>10247</p>	<p>This is just a short letter to notify you of my objection to the proposed controlled parking zone on Wilderness Road, reference KM/13/0005.</p> <p>Since I wrote a letter to you during the previous consultation period then I wont go into too much detail. My main objection concerns the flats at the top of Wilderness Road (Wilderness Court) within which I am a resident. Most of the houses in Onslow Village have a large amount of parking on their own driveways. In the flats where I live we only have parking for 6 cars for the entire block. Most of the time we have to park our own cars on the street and so this new arrangement would not be helpful to the vast majority of Wilderness Court residents.</p> <p>We don't ever have a problem with parking on the road outside the flats - however by creating these controlled parking zones then you will create a problem for us. On this basis I object to the new proposals and request that you do not proceed with restricting the parking outside of Wilderness Court.</p>	<p>At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerned about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on</p>

		<p>the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.</p> <p>To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.</p>
10248	<p>We should like to give our wholehearted support to the proposed extension of the CPZ in Onslow Village. We have endured the current arrangements for far too long with our visitors and people doing some work for us continually having parking problems and often being unable to park near the house (in Ellis Avenue).</p> <p>So for us, implementation of the proposals cannot come too soon.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10249 same rep sent twice	<p>I have taken the opportunity to review the proposed changes to the parking restrictions in Onslow Village and am generally in agreement. My one major concern is the omission of any restrictions on the approaches to the turning circle / junction in Abbots Close, approximately 100m up from the junction with Manor Way.</p> <p>Given that we are likely to see even more commuter cars displaced</p>	<p>General support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented from Abbots Close have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the</p>

into Abbots Close and along Manor Way, it seems inevitable that there will be cars parked right on the corners of this turning circle / junction – as there are on a regular basis at the moment. Using this stretch of Abbots Close on a daily basis (be that in a car, by bicycle or on foot), I am concerned that the heavily restricted sight lines imposed by vehicles parking adjacent to (and occasionally on) this turning circle / junction will sooner or later lead to a head-on collision between two road users who should happen to approach at the same time. It will only take a delivery van driver in a bit of hurry or someone who isn't familiar with the road layout rounding the corner a little too fast...

You are probably aware that traffic approaches / departs from this turning circle / junction in three directions – towards Manor Way, towards the residential cul-de-sac of Abbots Close, and towards the single track access road that serves a group of houses on Farnham Road and Manor Way. This third access regularly catches visitors to Abbots Close unaware – as they round the corner heading or down up Abbots Close evidently oblivious to traffic entering or exiting the single track access road.

I would strongly advocate the introduction of single yellow lines with Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm restriction on the approaches to this turning circle / junction - similar to what is being proposed for the similar turning circle / junction in Litchfield Way and for the turning circle at the end of Vicarage Gate (which also serves the All Saints Church car-park). This would allow vehicles approaching from opposite directions to see each other from a safe distance and have somewhere for one of them to wait (in clear line of site) until the other has passed. Please, I implore you; amend the plan to include this restriction.

fact that these roads were on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include them within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the controls in Abbots Close, at the junction with Manor Way, were extended as part of the formal proposals, more extensive measures away from the Manor Way junction were not considered appropriate given the feeling amongst residents.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

10250	<p>We live at 9 Abbots Close, Onslow Village, and are writing to you in connection with the proposed Controlled Parking Zones for Onslow Village.</p> <p>We are concerned that virtually all the roads around us are being considered for CPZ inclusion, except ours, and therefore strongly feel that Abbots Close should be included in the CPZ - otherwise we will have a serious parking issue on our road. We will also have commuters parking on the road, that aren't necessarily aware that, because we are a cul-de-sac, many kids play on the road safely.</p> <p>Also, the stretch of road on Abbots Close leading up to Manor Way, is currently dangerous because cars park on it right up to the junction, and therefore when exiting Abbots Close, you need to be on the right hand side of the road This is an accident waiting to happen and strongly suggest the council puts in double-yellow lines on this junction.</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented from Abbots Close have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the controls in Abbots Close, at the junction with Manor Way, were extended as part of the formal proposals, more extensive measures away from the Manor Way junction were not considered appropriate given the feeling amongst residents.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10252 & 10253 two different reps – both sent twice	<p>I am writing to you because I wish to object the parking restrictions being proposed for the junction in High View Road opposite Nos 27 and 28. I have lived at No. 27 since 1986 and in all those 27 years I have not noticed, or been made aware of, any problems related to cars being parked in front of our house. All this time the road has been used by buses, refuse carts and other large vehicles. It seems very unfair that you are proposing to deprive me of the benefit of using this parking space with very little, or no, real justification.</p> <p>I agree that the junction would benefit from some control as some people park on the north side not knowing it forces buses to reverse</p>	<p>The proposal around the 'switchback' junction within the road was developed after the Police contacted Parking Services. They had been called to the location on at least one occasion after buses had become grounded whilst turning. They suggested that, because of the rapidly altering gradient around the junction, buses and other large vehicles had a tendency to ground when vehicles parked in the vicinity and opposite the junction. The proposals developed are the minimum required to overcome these issues, by allowing larger vehicles to use the</p>

when turning. Apart from this, the junction works well without controlled parking. Because of the steep drives, most residents in High View Road, including me, park on the road. The introduction of these parking restrictions will mean that alternative places will have to be found for all four cars normally parked outside the affected houses and this may have a knock-on effect on our neighbours.

Therefore, I am requesting that this proposal be shelved, or modified to leave the road outside Nos 27 and 28 unrestricted. If you feel you are unable to accommodate this request please let me know so that I can start looking into the options for appealing against the decision.

I am writing to express my views on the proposed parking controls in Onslow Village. I am particularly concerned about the double yellow lines in front of the two houses (27 and 28) by the junction in High View Road, where the traffic island is located. There are often two cars parked in front of each of these houses and they cause no obstruction to traffic at all. The No 18 bus comes from the Farnham Road and turns right at this junction towards Manor Way, and cars parked outside numbers 27 and 28 High View Road do not cause it any problems. The only time it has any difficulty is when there is a car parked on the North side of the junction (between the bus stop and the traffic island) so I can see that yellow lines on this side of the junction make sense. If cars were no longer allowed to park outside these two houses, they would need to park further along the road, preventing other residents from being able to park outside their own homes.

I believe that adding yellow lines outside the houses is completely unnecessary as it would not benefit any road users. It would just make parking for the residents of High View Road more difficult.

full width of the carriageway. We therefore recommend that the proposals for High View Road are implemented as advertised.

More generally, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

10254 &
10295
two
different
reps

I live at 28 High View Road with my wife (Roz Hall) and 2 small children and am very concerned about the proposed parking controls proposed in front of the two houses (27 and 28) by the High View Road junction. I can only imagine the Council's objection relates to the Number 18 bus which turns in front of our house towards Manor Way. In all the time we have lived at No 28 we have never had any issue with parking. We have two cars and park both in front of our house. Our neighbours at No 27 do exactly the same. I feel that these proposals are discriminatory towards us.

While I have no objections to double yellow lines going down on the other side of the junction, there makes no sense in placing double yellow lines directly outside No 27 and 28. If the lines were added then it would simply make other users of the road inconvenienced as I would still need to park my cars (in particular No 29 and then a knock on effect would follow). This could cause disturbances and irritations with all of the neighbours in our vicinity which I do not want.

As an aside, my wife also has a recently bereaved and mildly disabled father who visits us. The proposed double yellow lines will also cause severe disruption to him and us and I fear could be viewed as discriminatory action against the disabled.

Therefore I would like to strongly express my view that I am NOT in favour and would not support any action to place double yellow lines directly outside No's 28 and 27 High View Road (i.e. running directly adjacent to our property). However I reiterate I am not opposed to double yellow lines on the opposite section of road to our house running adjacent to the A3 down towards Manor Way.

I strongly object to the Councils proposals to put double yellow lines outside 27 and 28 High View Road.

The proposal around the 'switchback' junction within the road was developed after the Police contacted Parking Services. They had been called to the location on at least one occasion after buses had become grounded whilst turning. They suggested that, because of the rapidly altering gradient around the junction, buses and other large vehicles had a tendency to ground when vehicles parked in the vicinity and opposite the junction. The proposals developed are the minimum required to overcome these issues, by allowing larger vehicles to use the full width of the carriageway. We therefore recommend that the proposals for High View Road are implemented as advertised.

More generally, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

	<p>I live at number 28 High View Rd with 2 young children and my dad who is disabled and quite recently bereaved often stays with us.</p> <p>I also think the proposal will cause a knock on effect with parking and generally seems unnecessarily heavy handed.</p> <p>-----</p>	
<p>Page 104</p> <p>10255 & 10272 two different reps</p>	<p>I am writing to offer my full support for the planned extension of the controlled parking zone to include Bannisters Road.</p> <p>I live at 5 Bannisters Road, which is on a blind bend and over the years inconsiderate parking has made life a misery for our family in terms of getting our cars on and off of our drive, while also making the road dangerously narrow on this bend.</p> <p>I believe that double yellow lines are planned for opposite our house, again if this is the case, I fully support it.</p> <p>Finally, enforcement will be key, to not only ensure people use the new parking bays correctly, but also to clamp down on the numerous examples of individuals parking on the pavements in Bannisters Road.</p> <p>The pavements are already narrow, so when these individuals park on the pavement, it forces children and parents with prams and buggies, on their way to both Onslow Infants and Queen Eleanors School, to walk in the road, which is unfair to them and dangerous. This is also a problem for our numerous elderly residents.</p> <p>I assume the parking wardens will be able to issue tickets for all types of parking violations, so hopefully both these parking related issues will become a thing of the past in both Bannisters Road and the other streets which are to be included in the CPZ.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

I look forward to the yellow lines and parking bays arriving.

I am writing to express my full support for the CPZ in Bannisters Road.

I work part time, so I am at home quite a lot during the week and see the parking situation in our road at all times of day. By far the worst time of day is after school, 3.30pm onwards.

Driving up or down our road at any time of day can be likened to a slalom and naturally I drive with caution, but unfortunately there are many who do not. There have been many near misses I have witnessed, along with a head-on collision at the Bannisters Road/Litchfield Way junction in the last few months in the middle of the day.

Most of the time, there are so many cars parked on the road, drivers are forced to drive on the wrong side of the road, sometimes round blind bends. There are three particularly dangerous spots in Bannisters Road:

1. The junction of Bannisters Road, East Meads, Hedgeway and Orchard Road, where parked cars force you onto the wrong side of the road driving up Bannisters Road. If a driver turns left into Bannisters Road from Hedgeway, they cannot see what is either coming down Bannisters Road or even what cars may be turning left from Orchard Road into Bannisters Road, as the view is obscured by cars parked on the left hand side. If you are coming down Orchard Road, because of the way the junction is positioned, you cannot see traffic in Bannisters Road until the very last second. The danger is compounded by vehicles having to drive on the wrong side of Bannisters Road at this point.

2. The bend between 5 & 7/ 8 & 10 Bannisters Road, which is blind. Parked cars in this area force drivers in both directions to drive on

the wrong side of the road, not knowing quite what might be coming round the bend, whether another vehicle, cyclist, child, etc.. This is often the part of the road where drivers are speeding up either down the hill or to accelerate up it.

3. The junction of Bannisters Road and Litchfield Way, also blind. As you look up Bannisters Road and turn right into Litchfield Way, cars park on the right hand side of the sharp bend into Litchfield Way then all the way along that side of Litchfield Way. This forces drivers in Litchfield Way onto the wrong side of the road potentially facing a head-on with drivers turning the bend from Bannisters Road, whose view is completely obscured by the parked cars. The head-on I am aware of was on a Sunday lunchtime in broad daylight at this junction. I happened to be walking back from church and came upon it about a minute after it had happened. There were children in one of the cars and they were upset and shaken, but thankfully unharmed. Both cars sustained damage, one significantly so.

The problem really with Onslow Village is inconsiderate parking, making things dangerous for everyone else. The majority of cars in Bannisters Road are residents' vehicles. They all have drives, but often choose not to use them effectively, probably partly because of the difficulty of getting their cars out when someone parks opposite their drive, and so the problem gets worse and worse. The danger is then compounded by beech hedges which are lovely but reduce visibility when pulling out of a drive into a road with cars parked all over the place. Some of the parked cars at the top section of Bannisters Road are residents from Litchfield Way who do not have a drive; perhaps they should be allocated specific spaces.

So, in conclusion, I fully support the proposal for the CPZ in Bannisters Road, to enforce considerate parking and make the road safer for all road users and pedestrians.

<p>10256</p>	<p>I am anxious as to how the school drop off and pick up of children in onslow village will be addressed.</p> <p>I believe that there is a problem now.....tempers getting out of control.....where will the parents park and will there be adequate policing of all the restrictions?</p>	<p>Although proposed parking controls will be introduced within Powell Close, it will be outside the CPZ and much of the kerb space will remain uncontrolled.</p> <p>A combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted bays will be available in the vicinity. The former, in particular, are likely to be available for those involved in the school run.</p> <p>As a result of concerns raised about the availability of parking in the vicinity of Wilderness Court and Onslow Infants School, it is now recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking, for residents and those involved in the school run.</p>
<p>10257</p>	<p>I write to express my surprise that the whole of Manor Way appears to be being treated as one road, when it has two distinctly different parts. From numbers 1 to 23 inclusive the road has similar characteristics to The Crossways, with road being narrow, but additionally not all houses have driveways. Beyond the Abbots Close junction the road widens, sightlines improve and most houses have drives which can accommodate three cars or more.</p> <p>In our narrow part of the road 12 houses do not have front</p>	<p>The proposals for Manor Way in the section from The Crossways to Abbots Close reflect the different nature of this part of the road. Similar controls, primarily to facilitate passing, are not considered necessary in the section of Manor Way between Abbots Close and High View Road.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered</p>

driveways due to the steeply banked grass verges with the homes at a higher level. Five of those houses do not have rear vehicular access either, so are dependant on the opportunity to park on the road close to their own front doors.

From the parking behaviours of non-residents in our part of Manor Way I would favour bays with some sort of time or permit restriction. Unrestricted bays anywhere in Onslow Village will not solve the current problem with commuters and long term parking (currently by some residents of roads closer to the town centre). I see residents and their visitors unlikely to benefit from unrestricted bays, as some cars appear to be left for days at a time.

On a more personal note I am interested to understand the rationale for the introduction of double yellow lines outside our house. If it is as a passing place then it seems rather larger than we currently have, and which works for majority of the time. Could there be a midway point between current gap (created by our drive and no.4 drive entrances) and that proposed? Also the other proposed double yellow lines seem to extend an excessively long distance east from the junction with Abbots Close, thereby reducing the space for parking for numbers 1-23.

and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.

During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways to Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.

10259

Please be aware that not all residents welcome an extension of the CPZ in Onslow Village as proposed.

At No 9 Ellis Avenue we have never need inconvenienced by cars parking in the road during the day and at weekends the road is exceptionally quiet.

We don't mind some cars parked in our road as it slows the traffic down, preventing potential accidents with small children (the school is very close by) and animals, but also reduces noise. Parking bays will be a nuisance at best, and the presence of parking wardens wandering the street at taxpayers expense especially unwelcome.

We therefore formally and strongly object to the proposals for the extension of the CPZ.

The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.

The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions. The regulation of parking will also help resolve issues associated with inconsiderately parked vehicles.

The provision of unrestricted and limited waiting shared-use space, which broadly match present demand, also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. This also overcomes some of the concerns expressed by representees about the zone operating on Saturdays. We therefore recommend that that a combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are implemented, as

		<p>advertised.</p> <p>More generally, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10260	<p>We continue to support residents only parking throughout Onslow Village. The implementation of reduced and restricted parking would help to solve the ever increasing problem of commuters parking in the area for which there is no excuse or need now that The Onslow park and ride is open.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10264 & 10315 two different reps	<p>I have lived in Bannisters Road (No12) for 48 years. What was a quiet village road is now like a main road. I am retired and I need to go out in my car most days. However if a car parks opposite my narrow driveway I am unable to get out. Most of the people who park in this road go to the station so they are not back till the evening. I know there are people in this road who do not want yellow lines. One I know goes to work at 8am and is not back to the evening. He has no idea what happens in this road during the day. I also think that some unrestricted bays are a good idea. Yes I would like single yellow lines in this road.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>On viewing the maps, Map No2 shows an unrestricted parking bay opposite my driveway. If this goes ahead I will be unable to get my car out. I have a very narrow drive with brick pillars both sides, I have to go out straight till the car has cleared the gate posts before turning. If a car is parked opposite my drive I am unable to get out.</p>	<p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.</p> <p>Being one of the narrower roads within the area, we have been particularly careful when positioning parking bays opposite driveways, so as not to unduly affect access.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

	<p>This has caused all sorts of problems over the years. I am retired and I need to go out most days for various reasons.</p> <p>I would like someone to come and look at this problem and have it sorted out.</p>	
	<p>Thank you for your recent letter regarding the proposals for on street parking restrictions in Onslow Village. I live at 20 Wilderness Road which is at the end of the current restrictions at the convergence of Wilderness Road and Queen Eleanors Road, opposite the slip road onto the A3.</p> <p>Since the original restrictions were brought in, parking inevitably has moved from closer to the town up to our road and beyond. I am delighted that you are considering bringing in restrictions as I now consider the parking in Wilderness Road and up towards the shops and school dangerous. I am amazed that there hasn't been a serious accident with so many children around the area. Although I do not live in the areas which will remain unrestricted, Manor Way for instance, I would hope that these areas would be included in the new scheme as I know from experience that commuters, health workers and University users will simply park there once they can no longer park in the newly restricted roads.</p> <p>The bus regularly cannot get through in our road because of inconsiderate parking and because of the curve of the road, it is impossible now to see oncoming traffic. This combined with the shocking state of the road surface is an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>My only observation is that although you have added restricted bays, there is still a long line of seemingly unrestricted parking between our house and Ellis Avenue. Is this correct? I cannot see a reason why this should not be restricted to 4 hour limits as well. If this is left unrestricted, the problem will remain. In my opinion, the spaces, as in the older restricted area, should all be four hour limits. Apart from the few shops which don't require all day parking due to</p>	<p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions. On the bus route, parking bays are generally positioned around 20 metres away from the junctions, which is appropriate for the circumstances. Whether the bay is occupied by a commuter or a permit-holder is of little influence.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great.</p> <p>Although primarily being done to increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor</p>

	<p>their nature, it is a purely residential area with schools, both of which have onsite parking. I don't understand the reasoning behind leaving some bays unrestricted in this area.</p>	<p>amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10273	<p>I write to inform you we are completely supportive of the introduction of Controlled Parking Zones in Bannisters Road. Currently we experience inconsiderate parking directly outside and within the proximity of our home. In some instances people leave their car for days blocking easy access to our driveway and the driveways of our neighbours. In worst cases the parking makes the street dangerous as non-residence are parking on the corners of Bannisters road blocking visibility up and down the road, leaving other users at risk of accident or worse hitting a pedestrian.</p> <p>In our view it is really important to bring controlled parking zones into Bannisters Road.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10274	<p>We own/live in property 9 Bannisters Road, GU27RA.</p> <p>We originally welcomed the idea of restricted parking on Bannisters Road but having looked at the new plans we are disappointed to see that there are now unrestricted parking bays proposed for the road.</p> <p>This not only makes it very complicated for anyone parking on the road but also opens up the opportunity for people to continue to park on the road all day who don't live in the vicinity.</p> <p>We very much want to see the introduction of restricted parking all day but only on the basis that this is 4 hour waiting.</p>	<p>The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

10275 &
10373
two
different
reps

We're responding to the Council's letter of 29th November 2013; specifically proposals referenced KM/13/0005 which would effect Wilderness Road between its junctions with Litchfield Way and Manor Way.

Very often when exiting our driveway by car our view of the road uphill - and, in the daytime, traffic approaching downhill from The Crossways - is obscured by parked vehicles outside our house and No. 3. Consequently, parking measures that reduce the number of parked vehicles and improve our sight-line would be welcomed.

We can support all the suggestions (delineated in Maps 2 and 3 of the Council's advertisement) apart from the measure "unrestricted parking place" adjacent to No. 3 and No.4. In our view this measure will not discourage in the daytime the lengthy vehicle parking stays invariably experienced or facilitate safer exit by car from our driveway.

We continue to support instead the previously proposed 4 - hour limited waiting/Permit J' shared-use parking measure. This has greater potential to reduce the number of daytime long parking stays. We note the measure has been retained on Maps 2 and 3 for other houses towards The Crossways . We believe a similar delineation (introducing shared - use parking space to just one vehicle outside No.4 and also No.3) would be a better way of controlling parking, and also safety, in this stretch of Wilderness Road.

It would be greatly appreciated if the above views could be taken into account in, hopefully, finalising the CPZ extension proposals.

I note that the tabled papers at the Committee meeting on 18th September 2013 did not comment on Godfrey Blights' observations regarding parked cars blocking visibility when reversing out of his

The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions. A standard set back distance of two kerbs (one transition and one full) from the lowered kerb is being used throughout the proposed extension area.

The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. Whether the bay is occupied by a commuter or a permit-holder is of little influence.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

	<p>driveway at the Crossways. He considered this dangerous - see item 4 paper, Q.7 and the answer thereto. This aspect would be our concern where the unrestricted parking bays (proposed outside No. 3 and 4 Wilderness Road) all occupied compromising the inter visibility between traffic exiting our driveway and that coming down this section of Wilderness Road from the Crossways direction.</p> <p>We note that PPG 13: Transport (Update 2011) states that “Local authorities...should promote...layouts which are safe...in terms of road safety...”. The Companion Guide (Bulletin 32) addresses on-street parking and the need to ensure it does not dominate or inconvenience or interfere with visibility splays.</p> <p>It is appreciated that the above mentioned guidance is for use in considering the design of new road layouts. However, we are sure that (like the Government) Guildford Borough Council places great emphasise on people being able to travel safely. Having regard to the characteristics of Onslow Village - particularly in this downhill section with its narrow road and dominant breech hedges - the inadequacies of sightlines should also be taken into account in finalising these proposals.</p>	
10276 Onslow Village Hall	<p>We are basically in favour of the proposed CPZ extensions, even though it will entail us having to barrier off our car park entrances, to prevent large scale non hirers using the car park once the proposed CPZ is established.</p> <p>The only comment for our committee is the exclusion of Manor Way from the CPZ, as a large number of our hirers use this road as access to the village square and hall.</p> <p>We feel it would be better if the Crossways end of Manor Way was included as a residents/4hour parking area, to create (possibly) a less solid parked road for around 12 hours a day, which is what will certainly happen if it remains an unrestricted area.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>In respect to Manor Way, during the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from the section between The Crossways and Abbots Close, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road’s inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made</p>

representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.

The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

10279	<p>We reside at 2 Orchard Road, Onslow Village and are broadly supportive of introducing parking controls in and around Onslow Village, as car parking appears to be an increasing problem on the side streets- in particular outside of the existing controlled areas, which we assume is as a result of displacement parking.</p> <p>We do like the idea of having some areas of more limited controls and indeed are highly supportive of having some unrestricted parking bays for visitors- as this can be a big problem in controlled areas. The alternative is to allow an extension of the voucher purchase scheme for residents irrespective of whether they have parking space within the curtilage of their properties as this would prevent permanent parking of residents vehicles in the unrestricted parking bays.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10280	<p>Please take this as confirmation that we of 1 Wilderness Road, Onslow Village, Guildford GU2 7QN, are in favour of the proposed plans for inclusion of Wilderness Road within the Controlled Parking Zone KM/13/0005.</p> <p>We support this because of the amount of cars that currently park in a very narrow stretch of the road make it very difficult on occasions for us to be able to access our driveway. Inconsiderate parking also makes it difficult for the bus to sometimes manoeuvre around the junction of The Crossways into Wilderness Road. We have also seen an increase in the number of people parking all day in our stretch of the road as a result of controlled parking introduced in other areas of the village. If our road is not included in full in the next round then this problem will only become greater and the current problems will increase.</p> <p>With the number of cars that park along one side of the road it also makes the area a 'rat run' as cars dash to get past parked cars before another vehicle comes in the opposite direction. This makes it dangerous for all concerned.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

10284

I was disappointed to see that part of Manor Way was not included in your CPZ area.

This will make it very difficult for the five houses in Manor Way, whom have no alternative but to park on the road, to find a space. As the commuters, and householders with more than one car in the CPZ area will just come further up the village to the nearest free parking place hence Manor Way.

Abbots Close and Manor Way are already used by the commuters etc and this is usually full most of the day. I would like you to re-consider the proposal as it will be some considerable time before you look at the parking situation again.

During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways to Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in

		<p>Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
Page 118 10285	We are in favour of parking zone. It will make the area around us (Ellis Avenue) a safer place.	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10286	<p>My view remains the same and I am opposed to CPZ.</p> <p>When I moved from London I was determined not to live anywhere where there was CPZ, so I moved to Onslow Village. In London I experienced many different rules for CPZ when visiting friends. They all caused problems for the householders, their visitors and workmen in different ways. However, I agree if the proposed plan is accepted in all other roads it would not be sensible for Bannisters Road to remain outside the CPZ zone.</p> <p>I would like to make another comment. I was involved in survey research for most of my working lifer and I feel you are unlikely to</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not feel that the present parking situation warrants the need for the proposals, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents, their visitors and tradespeople greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great.</p>

	<p>get a good response to a postal request for opinions on any subject if it is sent out just before Christmas. The same is true for summer holiday times. At the moment people are too busy with preparations for Christmas and after Christmas would be too late to reply.</p>	<p>The previous informal questionnaire surveys resulted in around a 50% response rate. Even when those wishing to comment about the proposals formally have had write representations, rather than simply fill in a tick box questionnaire, there has been a 20% response rate, which is still very healthy, and comparable with other similar, recent formal consultations where residents have been written to directly.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10287	<p>You will recall that in June the Council arranged a public exhibition of the proposals shown to extend the CPZ, in Onslow Village Hall. These were broadly welcomed by residents to counter the street parking pressure caused by being the nearest unrestricted parking area to the university, hospital and the railway station.</p> <p>However an amendment to the detail by the Council since then will leave the residents of the eastern part of Ellis Avenue near West Meads worse off than having no scheme at all. That is the change made to the proposed parking next to 6,7 and 8 Ellis Avenue from '4 hour or permit J' to 'Unrestricted' parking.</p> <p>The current proposal means this bay will be the nearest unrestricted area to the existing CPZ, and as such will be keenly prized by commuters and workers displaced by the rest of the new scheme. We already know this will mean parking all day, and sometimes longer.</p> <p>As residents do use this area when they can find a space, may we</p>	<p>The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

	<p>please revert to the original scheme of making this bay available for '4 hr or Permit J holder' parking, or alternatively split it to leave just 1-2 spaces at the West Meads end of this bay as unrestricted.</p>	
<p>Page 120 10288 (Abbots Close)</p>	<p>I wish to register my formal opposition to the proposals that have been made to increase the Controlled Parking Zone as set out in the plans under KM/13/0005 and KM/13/0006.</p> <p>My reasons for opposing the proposals are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no evidence that the proposals are required for road safety purposes – in fact the density of parking on several roads around Onslow Village is in itself a road safety measure reducing speeds due to negotiating around parked vehicles. 2. The proposals will not deal with the issue of displacement which is admitted in the body of your own correspondence. 3. The nuisance value of 'strangers' and perhaps commuters parking cars within Onslow Village is very limited causing no disruption or adverse traffic conditions within the roads of the Village. 4. The proposals will cause immense difficulty in The Square and to parents delivering and collecting children from both the Onslow and Queen Eleanors Schools. Both schools are planned to have their attendances increased by a third over the next 2/3 years. Parking at 0845 and 1500 is already a massive problem which will only be exacerbated by further restrictions. 5. The expense of installing the traffic signs and lines are disproportionate to any beneficial effect which may be gained at a time when both Authorities claim to be under austerity regimes. The cost of enforcement cannot be justified. 6. That there is no clear majority in favour of the proposals is in 	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.</p> <p>Even so, the number of spaces proposed broadly matches demand during the majority of the day, although its regulation means that it takes place in appropriate locations, rather than inconsiderate ones.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great.</p> <p>A combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are proposed around The Square and Onslow Infants School. The time limited space, in particular, are likely to be available for customers of the shops and those involved in the</p>

	<p>itself a reason that they should not go ahead. There is no clear mandate or public clamour for the extra restrictions.</p> <p>7. The installation of the additional signage and yellow lines is a significant blight on the amenity of this otherwise pleasant village area of Guildford.</p>	<p>school run. The yellow lines around junctions and protecting points of access will attempt to resolve some of the issues associated with the school run.</p> <p>Implementation is not envisaged to cost more than £17,500. Being a relatively small extension of the existing CPZ, the additional cost of enforcement will be negligible.</p> <p>The local borough and county councillors have considered the various previous informal stages of consultation, and the present formal stage, in great detail, and are keen for the CPZ to be extended.</p> <p>The position of the proposed zone boundary will actually result in a reduction in the number large zone boundary signs necessary. The signs associated with the parking bays will be kept to a minimum and located sensitively. Furthermore, 50mm primrose markings will be used throughout, rather than the more standard, wider yellow road markings. This will also help to minimise implementation costs.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10289	<p>I am writing again to express my opposition to the extension of parking controls in the area of Onslow village. (refs. KM/13/0005, KM/13/0006, and your message 9540).</p> <p>The main reason for the proposal apparently is to prevent antisocial parking. However, this reason appears to me to be overstated, and</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not feel that the present parking situation warrants the need for the proposals, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p>

thus it is not necessary to extend the parking controls. I often park in the Onslow village area outside the present controlled zone, and rarely see any antisocial parking. There is always plenty of space at any time. Indeed, I see that many people make some effort to park "prettily".

Moreover, the introduction of controls will do nothing to stop antisocial parking, based on my observation that it seems to occur more often in the parts of the Onslow area where there are already parking controls. The worst offenders are the delivery lorries that park on the yellow zigzag markings outside Queen Eleanor's school. Many people also park on the pavement in this area that is within the existing zone, yet rarely do so outside the zone. Tradesmen and van drivers are the worst offenders. This implies that antisocial parking will likely be made worse by the extension of parking controls.

The rare instances of antisocial parking that I have witnessed in the area outside the present zone are all cases of parking on the pavement. Since this is an offence anyway, it can be dealt with accordingly.

In summary, the proposals can be likened to using a sledgehammer to crack a nut. The nut will not be worth eating afterwards. I hope you will take this into consideration.

The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.

None of the School Keep Clear zigzag markings within Guildford Borough are enforceable in their own right, and they were instead introduced by Surrey County Council on an advisory basis. Even so, those within the CPZ, and others elsewhere, are supported by yellow line waiting restrictions. However, these do not prevent boarding and alighting or loading and unloading, but do prevent parking of longer durations.

There is not a blanket ban on footway and verge parking, either within our borough, or elsewhere across the county. As such, parking on the footway is not an offence, which our enforcement officers can deal with. However, they can take action if the location is subject formalised parking controls, such as yellow lines and signed parking bays, or anywhere, if the vehicle involved is a HGV (not involved in loading or unloading). Therefore, it is surprising that it is suggested that footway parking takes place more often in locations where enforcement action is actually possible.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

I was delighted to see that Bannisters Road has been included in the new proposal to extend the Controlled Parking Zone in Onslow Village for the following reasons:

- 1) If the residents do not agree to this proposal, Bannisters Road will become an open invitation to all car owners to take advantage of free parking here whilst other adjoining roads have agreed to be zoned making the road more intolerable than ever and dangerous. I already am putting up with folk living in Hedgeway using the open as yet freedom to park usually for a week, and lately a car was parked outside my property for 2 weeks and none of my neighbours knew where it had come from, so we presumed someone had gone on holiday?
- 2) The junction of Orchard Road to Bannisters is just below my house and during term times there is a constant flow of traffic between 8.30 & 9.15 and again 3pm onwards up & down, again a dangerous hazard already as Bannisters & Orchard Road are not very wide & congested with parked cars.
- 3) The junction at the top of Bannisters Rd & Litchfield Way going into Wilderness Rd on the right is again really dangerous as cars are parked at present right on the bend. Bannisters is quite a narrow road & with cars parked at present 'Willy Nilly' very often cars have to mount the pavement to pass each other, and getting a car from my house into the road is very difficult as cars parked either side makes it very difficult to see if the road is clear.
- 4) As a close community living in Bannisters Road we happen to know that one home occupier who is opposed to the zoning be extended to Bannisters Road leaves his house each morning before 8am & returns after 6pm so has no idea of congestion caused during that time.

Finally if this extended parking zoning does not happen in Bannisters Road I dread to think of the dire consequences & we have to wait another 3 or 4 years before the next consultation, and I

Support for the proposals is noted.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

	<p>trust common sense of the majority of residents which I know, are united in saying 'Zoning' cannot come quick enough for us.</p>	
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 124</p> <p>10293</p>	<p>I believe the omission of the section of Manor Way between Crossways and Abbots Close, in the most recent version of the CPZ review, is a mistake. This part of Manor Way includes a blind brow and is significantly narrower than the rest of Manor Way beyond Abbots Close. There is already a significant problem for the local bus and for larger commercial vehicles as there is rarely room left by parked cars for opposing streams of traffic to pull in to avoid each other, a situation exacerbated by the blind brow, which means that vehicles are often already committed to the single lane left by the parked cars.</p> <p>The other alterations to the CPZ will undoubtedly cause more vehicles to use this section of road as the nearest uncontrolled parking area, so I would recommend including Manor Way between Crossways and Abbots Close in the CPZ, with a limited number of resident only parking bays on the south side of the road, positioned so that there are spaces for westbound vehicles to pull over to allow the eastbound traffic priority.</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways to Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in</p>

		<p>Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10296	<p>Further to the concerns I expressed in June regarding your proposed changes, although I approved of some of the proposals, there were others that I felt that in principle I should oppose. I have now seen the latest proposals in respect of Manor Way/Crossways/Abbots Close and I see that you have reduced the area of the CPZ. In particular the proposals show that the space opposite numbers 9 to 15 (ie those without any garages at all) is totally unrestricted. This will result in these owners having to compete for space with all those people banned from elsewhere, or those having more than one car in a CPZ area, or those unwilling to buy a permit, or those commuting. These owners will rarely thus get a space outside their own home to keep their car, drop off shopping etc. etc. With many owners being elderly, this is very important.</p> <p>Do <u>please</u> extend the CPZ to cover this whiles area up to and including the first part of Abbots Close, and put in the dull permit parking spaces, with the vary occasional single yellow line for passing places. This will give these owners some chance of a space.</p> <p>I do suggest taking it up into Abbots Close as this will obviously be</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways to Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of</p>

	<p>the “overflow” area, and the residents here will find it almost impossible to exit their own driveways, and then to exit into Manor Way.</p> <p>I also would like to see double yellow lines extended further into Manor Way from Crossways, as sometimes two cars have to wait in this area if traffic is coming down Manor Way.</p> <p><u>Please</u> do rethink the proposals as I know we will have to live with the final decision for some considerable time.</p>	<p>the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10300	<p>My wife and I have some concerns regarding your new plan of introducing Unrestricted parking into the lower part of Ellis Avenue. It seems that changes have been made since the exhibition in our Village Hall. We are unhappy about this proposal to extend the unrestricted area in Ellis Avenue. Unrestricted all night and all day, it means we look out on to a permanent long term car park. Must not miss an opportunity to improve Onslow Village parking. This latest scheme makes things worse than they are at present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The present unrestricted parking has allowed some vehicles to remain parked in the same place indefinitely for days on end, and this may increase. This could be exacerbated by the proximity of the university. In the past they have 	<p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions. A standard set back distance of two kerbs (one transition and one full) from the lowered kerb is being used throughout the proposed extension area.</p> <p>The width of Ellis Avenue, and the vast majority of other roads within the area are such that the positioning of parking opposite driveways is feasible</p>

	<p>encouraged students to park here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ellis Avenue is narrower than both East Meads and West Meads so even single parking can sometimes make entry and exit difficult for those living opposite, however small their car. 	<p>without unduly affecting access.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. Whether the bay is occupied by a commuter or a permit-holder is of little influence.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10301	<p>I would like to object to the roads in Onslow Village proposed for inclusion within the controlled parking zone (KM/13/0005), especially on the Wilderness Road near the Orchard Road junction.</p> <p>There is a large section of the Wilderness Road that is included in the proposal as "No Waiting At Any Time". As there are several blocks of flats (Wildness Court) on Wilderness Road near the Orchard Road junction and the resident parking space is very limited, this proposal will cause significant problems for the residents living in those flats.</p> <p>The lack of allocated parking space on the plan around Wilderness Court area could also affect the property value in Wilderness Court.</p>	<p>At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerns about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow</p>

		<p>lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.</p> <p>To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.</p>
<p>10303</p>	<p>We are both very pleased that our road, Ellis Avenue, is going to have controlled parking zone and agree with the lay-out etc.</p> <p>Parents taking and collecting their children from the infant school nearby are a nuisance in as much they seem to think they can park anywhere. Some cars park on the pavement in Wilderness which means pedestrians have to walk in the road. We even had a car last week which parked across our drive which is not acceptable and we put a note on his windscreen to that effect! This particular problem may not be your department.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Although the proposals have not been specifically designed to resolve the issues caused by the school run, it is hoped that they will assist in this regard.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

We are surprised and disappointed in Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council Parking department's apparent disregard for our previous response to the 1 or 2 consultations that have already taken place on this topic.

It seems to us that a slight amendment has been made to the previous proposal that now enables you to start a whole new consultation process at what is a very busy time of year for most people. If I was a cynical person this would make me suspicious of your intent to go ahead with this parking action regardless of the wishes of the residents of Litchfield way.

Before the latest small change to the plan, your department consulted with us at a public session in Onslow Village Hall and we, with quite a few of our neighbours responded that we did not want any new parking restrictions in Litchfield way. You maintain this consultation is no longer valid. Frankly that is an incredible position for the council to take. You seem very determined to go ahead with this change despite the views of the residents. This doesn't seem very democratic.

Since you are again consulting, I am wondering that if we reject it again, how many more times you will make a small adjustment to the plan and we'll have to respond again.

How much money are you spending on this? I am curious to see your business model. Please let us know your forecasts for incomes from parking permits and penalties versus the cost of implementation.

Litchfield Way is in conservation zone, this was established by Guildford Borough Council in c2004. There are a set of quite stringent conditions of what can't be done to properties in this area. For example, when we wanted to replace our old leaky windows with energy efficient double glazing, we had to get planning permission from Guildford Borough Council with all the associated

Prior to the formal proposals being finalised, one of the major points of discussion was whether to include a number of other roads that had expressed opposition (some repeatedly) to their roads' inclusion within the CPZ during the previous stages of informal consultation. These included Bannisters Road, Litchfield Way, Manor Way and Vicarage Gate. Unlike Manor Way, which is situated at the edge of the proposed zone, if the other roads were to be omitted from the CPZ, their position would mean that they would be completely surrounded by roads within the CPZ. Previous experience elsewhere within the CPZ has shown that this can cause significant issues. This led the Committee to decide to include them within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

The local borough and county councillors have considered the various previous informal stages of consultation, and the present formal stage, in great detail, and are keen for the CPZ to be extended.

Implementation is not envisaged to cost more than £17,500. Being a relatively small extension of the existing CPZ, the additional cost of enforcement will be negligible. The aim of most on-street parking operations is to be self-financing, and therefore, be no burden to the general council tax payer. Guildford's on-street parking operation achieves this aim, and the surplus it makes, primarily from pay and display income and penalty notices, is used to subsidise transportation initiatives, such as Guildford Park and Ride services. The charge made for the permits is designed to cover the cost of administering the permit scheme and issuing the permits.

	<p>costs and delays. We couldn't use plastic windows but had to use much more expensive hard wood. Yet when Surrey County Council / Guildford Borough Council want to make changes in the conservation zone, such as replacing the old elegant street lamps with brighter and very modern ones, then you give yourselves permission and go ahead. So much for the conservation zone.</p> <p>So now you are proposing another change to the conservation zone. Has the Borough planning department relaxed its definition of conservation? Will a whole load of painted lines and new road signs grace the area with a feeling of preserved 1920-30's charm? We don't think it will and for this reason we state here that <u>we object and don't want the parking restrictions proposed in KM/13/0005 to be implemented.</u></p> <p>If you are successful with your plan to implement this change, please be informed that we will apply for planning permission to remove 20 metres of our beech hedge at the front of our property to improve our off road parking. We believe this would greatly modernise the look of Litchfield way in keeping with the new street lamps and proposed road markings. Further more we would expect the planning department to waive the fee for this change as a courtesy to our inconvenience in having to keep responding to you. We confidently expect the planning department to approve such a proposal to improve our parking situation and the conservation zone.</p>	<p>The position of the proposed zone boundary will actually result in a reduction in the number large zone boundary signs necessary. The signs associated with the parking bays will be kept to a minimum and located sensitively. Furthermore, 50mm primrose markings will be used throughout, rather than the more standard, wider yellow road markings. This will also help to minimise implementation costs.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10305	<p>As the owners of No 31 Wilderness Court, we have been sent by Clarke Gammon Wellers a copy of your letter APH/8304/5 dated 29 November 2013 so that we may comment if we wish.</p> <p>Firstly, we would like to know a bit more about how this parking is inconvenient and to whom. Is it people parking there for protracted periods during the day? If so, is this so as to get to work, and if not, why are they parking there? Or is it people parking there at night, and if so why?</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The various previous stages of informal consultation have confirmed that residents feel that there are various issues, but views have been mixed on how</p>

We have heard that some people think that this review is a 'knee-jerk' reaction to a small number of concerns. With this in mind can you tell us how many complaints and communications you have had about these problems and whether they emanate from one particular area or from complainants spread broadly across the whole Onslow Village area?

Finally, if there are to be controls, may we suggest that rather than introducing expensive and difficult to enforce residential parking permit schemes, you consider introducing a scheme that has been most successful in Sevenoaks, Kent. There, people were parking inconsiderately in many of the roads surrounding Sevenoaks Station for the whole day while they were working on London. This was denying local residents and their visitors parking during the day. The scheme is simple and involves allowing parking on one side of the road during the morning and on the other side of the road during the afternoon. The problems soon evaporated once a few people had been heavily fined for ignoring the new parking rules.

to resolve these.

At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerns about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.

In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted..

To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.

		<p>We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 132</p> <p>10310</p>	<p>I would like to object to the roads in Onslow Village proposed for inclusion within the controlled parking zone (KM/13/0005), especially on the Wilderness Road near the Orchard Road junction. There is a large section of the Wilderness Road that is included in the proposal as "No Waiting At Any Time". As there are several blocks of flats (Wildness Court) on Wilderness Road near the Orchard Road junction and the resident parking space is very limited, this proposal will cause significant problems for the residents living in those flats. The lack of allocated parking space on the plan around Wilderness Court area could also affect the property value in Wilderness Court.</p>	<p>At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerns about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.</p> <p>To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east</p>

10311

I would like to make my views known about parking in my road and any proposed changes.

I am very much opposed to any parking restrictions being imposed in High View Road. Although I realize that non resident parking may well be pushed into our road as restrictions are put in place lower down ,this is better than having restrictions . Parking bays would make things even worse . It is difficult for people to use drives in this road . and parking on the pavement one side of the road is essential to allow the bus through safely. At present there is no parking problem , to introduce bays would create a lot of difficulties even though it would earn a lot of nice revenue for the council.

I believe ther are a number of residents who have similar views . I hope you take them into consideration.

side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.

We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.

Proposed controls in High View Road around its junction with Manor Way have been developed to resolve the issues there. Indeed, this location has an accident history.

Additionally, the measures around the 'switchback' junction with the road were developed after the Police contacted Parking Services. They had been called to the location on at least one occasion after buses had become grounded whilst turning. They suggested that, because of the rapidly altering gradient around the junction, buses and other large vehicles had a tendency to ground when vehicles parked in the vicinity and opposite the junction. The proposals developed are the minimum required to overcome these issues, by allowing larger vehicles to use the full width of the carriageway. There are no proposals elsewhere within the road. We therefore recommend that the proposals for High View Road are implemented as advertised.

The proposals within High View Road are limited, and do not include the introduction of parking bays.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor

		amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.
10312	<p>With regard to the CPZ proposals. We have considered the effects of Vicarage Gate being included in the yellow banding and have decided that it would be beneficial, so we agree to these proposals.</p> <p>The condition of the road in Vicarage Gate is extremely poor and work would need to be done to be able to paint lines.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted, as is your concerns about the condition of the road surface.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10313 (Manor Way)	<p>I am very alarmed and disappointed at the proposal to limit the controlled parking zone and not extend it from the Crossways down Manor Way to Abbott's Close. The effect of stopping at the Crossways, having a double yellow line up to my house, and no restrictions beyond this to Abbott's Close will inevitably lead to the current parking problems being concentrated on this "no restrictions" section. I believe my neighbours who are not in agreement with this section being controlled are unaware of the disastrous impact this proposal will have on their current free parking. This section is already a dangerous, single lane rat run that will be made worse by the new proposal. With CPZ down the complete section, the parking would be less continuous and result in cars slowing.</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those in that have commented, from The Crossways and Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would</p>

		<p>invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10319	<p>In response to the latest proposal to introduce CPZ changes to Onslow village and in particular to the area of Manor Way, between Crossways and Abbots Close we would like to make the following representation, objecting to the current proposals KM/13/0006 and KM/13/0005.</p> <p>We live in the section of Manor Way between Crossways and Abbots Close at 9 Manor Way.</p> <p>The section of Manor Way and Crossways up to Abbots Close mainly includes houses which due to high banks have no drives</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not feel that the present parking situation warrants the need for the proposals, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.</p>

and require on street parking for most residents. Currently there is **just** about adequate parking spaces at most times of the day for residents use.

We **strongly object** to the proposal to introduce new and in our view **unnecessary additional double yellow lines** to half of this section of road. This will significantly reduce essential parking availability for residents to below the required capacity. Additionally, by not including this section within the controlled zone this will be the first area that external motorists will attempt to park outside the CPZ. This will be a disaster for residents of this section of the road who have no off street parking. We and they will find it extremely difficult to park in the new reduced parking area.

In addition the proposed new areas of double yellow lines will widen the road for traffic and encourage two-way traffic along this section to travel at higher speeds than is safe for such a residential area with very narrow pavements. Traffic speed along Manor Way is already a problem, but is slightly reduced by the existing area of parking which serves to briefly stop two-way full speed traffic. It would be far better to introduce traffic calming measures and a 20mph restriction rather making the situation worse by increasing the traffic flow with new double yellow lines.

As a resident of this area of Onslow village we see absolutely no evidence to suggest that there is currently a parking problem in the wider area of the **KM/13/0005** proposal, and therefore we object to extending the CPZ to this area.

We believe that the proposed changes will be greatly detrimental to residents of this area and greatly increase parking congestion and traffic in the area of Manor Way up to Abbots Close.

However, only if the **KM/13/0005** proposal is accepted we strongly recommend that the CPZ is extended to include the area of Manor Way up to Abbots Close. Unlike many area of Onslow village this is one area where due to high banks many residents do not have off

Even so, the number of spaces proposed broadly matches demand during the majority of the day, although its regulation means that it takes place in appropriate locations, rather than inconsiderate ones.

The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great.

During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways to Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore

	<p>street parking and it is essential that the proposed changes properly protect the existing essential parking for residents who have no choice but to park on the road.</p> <p>We believe the council should prioritize parking amenity for residents of areas of Onslow village where no off street parking is available such as Crossways/Manor Way to Abbots Close . These proposals do the opposite, and will significantly reduce essential parking for residents.</p>	<p>recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10321	<p>My views have <u>NOT</u> & will <u>NOT</u> change (from those I have previously expressed, in that I am still very much against parking restrictions in Wilderness Road / Wilderness Court).</p> <p>Has anyone from your Department ever visited Wilderness Road when parents are bringing to and collecting children from the Infants School. It would be a very good idea if someone did. I also wrote to our Local Councillors stating the same to them.</p> <p>Next time you put information on lamp posts could you please put them at a reasonable height – one needs to be nearly 6’ tall to see what’s printed.</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not feel that the present parking situation warrants the need for the proposals, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.</p> <p>Even so, the number of spaces proposed broadly matches demand, although its regulation means that</p>

it takes place in appropriate locations, rather than inconsiderate ones.

At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerns about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.

In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.

To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.

		<p>We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.</p>
10322	<p>I was highly relieved to read that double yellow lines are on the plan for High View Road. Hopefully this will prevent the dangerous parking at the bottom of the road from staff at the sports park/university and the businesses on the A3. (I have observed this myself).</p> <p>As a resident of High View Road it worries me greatly that, when turning from Manor Way into High View Road I have to drive on the right while fearing that traffic may be coming down the road.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10323	<p>We, the owners, residents and carers of elderly residents of Wilderness Court in Wilderness Road already experience difficulty in parking and regularly have to park on-street. Non-residents persist in using our private parking areas to deliver children to the local school. We have insufficient parking as it is, but if these new restrictions are introduced it will seriously impact all residents of Wilderness Court and presumably the surrounding area.</p> <p>We therefore strongly object to the proposed restrictions.</p>	<p>At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerns about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and</p>

		<p>points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.</p> <p>To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.</p>
10324	<p>I support the proposals to extend the CPZ further into Onslow Village. However, I would like to make representations regarding the proposal to introduce some unrestricted parking bays, particularly in relation to Litchfield Way. I understand it is proposed to place an unrestricted parking bay outside numbers 4 and 6 Litchfield Way.</p> <p>Litchfield Way is always full of parked cars as a number of residents in this road, and neighbouring Wilderness Road, do not have off street parking. If the current proposals go ahead parking for residents will be extremely difficult as commuters who park all day will seek out unrestricted parking bays. Whilst I acknowledge there should be some unrestricted parking bays, they should not be placed in roads where a number of residents do not have off street parking. I therefore submit that Litchfield Way should be for permit holders only.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>A combination of unrestricted and limited waiting shared-use spaces are proposed throughout the proposed area to provide some facility for all-day parking without the need for a permit. In part, this is to minimise the potential for commuters to displace en masse to just beyond proposed boundary. It also provides residents and their visitors with greater flexibility, particularly at times when there is less pressure on parking. The limited waiting shared-use spaces also offer a degree of flexibility.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor</p>

10325

		<p>amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
	<p>I am pleased to read in the Surrey Advertiser that the next stage of the CPZ will go ahead. As you know I have been delighted with the existing scheme as it applies to my part of The Crossways. We rarely have problems as those of us with parking at our property, use it, and give priority to those without.</p> <p>My only concern as a great fan of Onslow Village, is the fact that the whole length of the narrow part of Manor Way is not in the proposed residents' parking zone. It will be a disaster to leave the part from the end of Crossways to Abbot's Close out. It becomes single lane, is narrow, and is a bus route. Drivers see a gap coming in the traffic from the other direction and belt like hell before another car appears. Often there are not cars but large vans and lorries! This is dangerous to children and animals (and old people like me!).</p> <p>I can only assume that the people living in that area who voted against extension of cpz were hoping that the whole scheme would not go ahead. WE MUST SORT OUT THE PROBLEM THAT EXISTS NOW. They do not realise that if they are excluded there will be no spaces for them to park. They will have to do what one resident who is currently affected does and go shopping at 6am so they can get their cars back in a space near their homes before the commuters that those looking to park spare cards, arrive.</p> <p>The proposal for double yellow lines is also bound to worsen the current congestion situation. Our preference is for full inclusion of the road from Crossways to Abbot's Close to be included in the proposed residents' parking zone. Not to do so will inevitably cause parking here outside our house (No.17 The Crossways) to Abbot's Close.</p>	<p>The Surrey Advertiser (13 December 2013) were mistaken in their reporting of the situation. The decision was taken at the Local Committee meeting held on 12 March 2014.</p> <p>In respect to Manor Way, during the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from the section between The Crossways and Abbots Close, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ</p>

		<p>for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10326	<p>I am pleased to read in the Surrey Advertiser that the next stage of the CPZ will go ahead. As you know I have been delighted with the existing scheme as it applies to my part of The Crossways. We rarely have problems as those of us with parking at our property, use it, and give priority to those without.</p> <p>My only concern as a great fan of Onslow Village, is the fact that the whole length of the narrow part of Manor Way is not in the proposed residents' parking zone. It will be a disaster to leave the part from the end of Crossways to Abbot's Close out. It becomes single lane, is narrow, and is a bus route. Drivers see a gap coming in the traffic from the other direction and belt like hell before another car appears. Often there are not cars but large vans and lorries! This is dangerous to children and animals (and old people like me!).</p>	<p>The Surrey Advertiser (13 December 2013) were mistaken in their reporting of the situation. The decision was taken at the Local Committee meeting held on 12 March 2014.</p> <p>In respect to Manor Way, during the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from the section between The Crossways and Abbots Close, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it</p>

I can only assume that the people living in that area who voted against extension of cpz were hoping that the whole scheme would not go ahead. WE MUST SORT OUT THE PROBLEM THAT EXISTS NOW. They do not realise that if they are excluded there will be no spaces for them to park. They will have to do what one resident who is currently affected does and go shopping at 6am so they can get their cars back in a space near their homes before the commuters that those looking to park spare cards, arrive.

within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.

The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

Our view is that we **strongly oppose** the idea of on-street parking on Wilderness Road and the rest of the Onslow village.

Our grounds for opposition are as follows:

From your letter it appears that this plan has come about due to concerns about inconsiderate parking”, we are unsure what this means and we have most definitely not seen any evidence of such inconsiderate parking that would warrant all of the residents of Onslow Village being asked to pay to park outside of their own property.

We have just bought a property at Wilderness Court (Aug 13) which sits on Wilderness Road. There is not enough off-street parking within Wilderness Court for all of its residents. Therefore it is necessary that residents have to use the current unrestricted on-street parking on Wilderness Road. If parking on Wilderness Road was to be restricted (as per your proposal) then we would have to pay to park outside our own house.

The above point has a further consequence in that the value of the property we have just invested our life savings in will decrease – the property will be less desirable to future buyers if there is restricted on-street parking on Wilderness Road in particular. Furthermore, having unrestricted parking outside the property was one of the key factors in our own choosing of that property over others we considered.

Additional to this, the service charge that we currently pay to the freeholders of Wilderness Court will increase due to the management agency having to engage in parking control for the parking available at Wilderness Court. This will most likely have to happen if the parking on Wilderness Road is restricted as people that do not have the right to park in Wilderness Court may take their chances and park there – further increasing the issue of parking at Wilderness Court.

Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.

The various previous stages of informal consultation have confirmed that residents feel that there are various issues, but views have been mixed on how to resolve these.

At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerned about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.

In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.

	<p>As you state in your letter, emplacing restricted on-street parking on some roads in Onslow Village, but not all (like Manor Way), will cause an issue for those residents on that road. Something that seems entirely unfair and unnecessary with they are currently not experiencing an issue.</p> <p>It is also worth stating that although we have only discussed our own views in this letter, the above points will apply to <u>all</u> the residents in Wilderness Court.</p> <p>In summary we oppose to your proposal on the grounds of the following:</p> <p>We disagree with there being an issue with parking. Having to pay to park outside our own property. Losing value on our property. Having to pay an increased service charge. Risk of creating a parking issue</p>	<p>To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.</p> <p>As is the case for all residents' permit schemes across Surrey, and much of the rest of the country, permits are charged for. Primarily, this is levied to cover the cost of administering the permit scheme and issuing permits.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that permit schemes devalue property values. Indeed, the opposite may be true. Nevertheless, if the garages at the Wilderness Court development were still associated with the residential premises for which they were intended, this too may increase the property values.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.</p>
10328	<p>We live at 22 Abbots Close, Onslow Village, and are writing to you regarding the proposed Controlled Parking Zone for Onslow Village.</p> <p>We firmly believe Abbots Close needs to be fully included in the CPZ. Virtually all of the roads in Onslow Village are planned to have some form of controlled parking, except Abbots Close. We believe</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those in Abbots Close that have commented have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed</p>

this will result in a serious parking issue in Abbots Close, with a shift in commuter parking to this cul-de-sac. The history of CPZ has already proven that parking problems are simply pushed to those roads not included.

As a narrow road, concentrated parking along the road will cause a number of issues:

1. Residents will have serious difficulty manoeuvring off their driveways, if cars are parked either side of the driveway, as there simply is insufficient road depth/driveway width.
2. Assuming cars park the full length of the road, there will be insufficient "pull in" space to allow a two-way, free-flow of traffic. Compounded by the fact Abbots Close is a cul-de-sac, this has potential for serious difficulties for emergency services and council vehicles. It should be noted Abbots Close has at least 3 households with elderly residents living on their own and receiving care of some form.
3. As a cul-de-sac with a number of young families, a sudden influx of commuters will pose a substantial safety risk to the number of children who walk to school and play together.

A sensible solution to meet the requests of those residents wishing to retain some form of "freedom", but also to address the above concerns, would be a single yellow line with a combination of a few carefully placed "unrestricted" and some "restricted" parking spaces along Abbots Close. The yellow line should be such that it eliminates inconsiderate and dangerous parking.

Finally, the stretch of road on Abbots Close leading up to Manor Way is currently dangerous because commuter cars already park on it right up to the junction. When exiting Abbots Close, cars are forced to be on the right hand side of the road, and considerable care is required both on exiting and entering Abbots Close. This is an accident waiting to happen and we strongly suggest the council

extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include them within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Nevertheless, the controls in Abbots Close, at the junction with Manor Way, were extended as part of the formal proposals.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from Abbots Close now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

	<p>puts in double-yellow lines all the way along the first stretch of Abbots Close (junction off Manor Way), up to the right turn.</p>	
<p>10329 (Farm Walk)</p>	<p>I vigorously reject that there is a parking problem in Onslow Village and would like to know what percentage of residents actually think parking is a problem?</p> <p>I have never encountered any problems with parking at any time of the day. You only have to go out in person and this would clearly be evident to yourselves.</p> <p>The cars parked on the roads outside my house belong to residents and I have never seen commuters or students from the university parking there. The only exception to this is the odd building vehicle but that is only short term.</p> <p>If you introduce restricted bays that is when the problems will begin because there will be a reduction in parking spaces from what we presently have. You will not be penalising day trippers but residents, especially those in the village who do not have a driveway. You also need to take into account that we rely on our cars in the village as we have a very limited public transport system.</p> <p>We were told by the MP at the meeting in the village hall earlier this year that this was not a money-making exercise but when we then questioned why there needed to be restrictions on Saturdays he could not give us an answer. He also informed us that the proposal would entail paying for an enforcement officer. If it is not a money-making scheme, and I strenuously do not believe it is something</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The various previous stages of informal consultation have confirmed that residents from across the area feel that there are various issues, but views have been mixed on how to resolve these.</p> <p>It would be more appropriate to consider the issue of operational hours during a future parking review, and across a wider area, rather than introducing a Monday to Friday extension to the existing Monday to Saturday Area J. Such a change would result in the boundary between the two being relatively indistinct and arbitrary. If the proposed new area for controls were to have different operational hours, it would also result in the need for considerably more large zone boundary signs. The visual intrusion of the controls is an issue touched upon by some that have made representations. We therefore recommend that the time limited controls operate Monday to Saturday, as advertised.</p> <p>The number of spaces provided within the proposed area broadly matches present demand during the majority of the day. However, its regulation means that it takes place in appropriate locations, rather</p>

	<p>that is needed in the village, then why would you employ someone to police it?</p> <p>I cannot see how the introduction of a controlled parking zone in Onslow Village will increase the availability of space as stated in your proposal. Just looking at the section of Wilderness Road from the tennis court entrance to Litchfield Way – at present residents are able to park 6 cars without causing any obstruction. Your intention is to limit unrestricted parking to about 3 cars. Again looking at the section of Litchfield Way to Bannisters Road – at present 7 residents cars are parked comfortably and your proposal is to only have space for 2 unrestricted parking spaces and 2 residents’ bays. This small section will cater for 6 less vehicles and when this is multiplied by the whole area in the extension zone you are going to have a very large number of cars with nowhere to park. This lack of availability to what the residents use at present is inevitably going to cause displacement, especially since the sections of roads I have highlighted do not have driveways and are being penalised because of this.</p> <p>I do hope this is the last time I have to voice my objections.</p> <p>I hope common sense will prevail and that the proposal will not go ahead as planned and if it were to go ahead I hope you would reconsider additional unrestricted bays along with abolishing the restrictions on Saturdays.</p>	<p>than inconsiderate ones.</p> <p>The combination of unrestricted and limited waiting shared-use spaces reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. This also overcomes some of the concerns expressed by representees about the zone operating on Saturdays. We therefore recommend that that a combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are implemented, as advertised.</p> <p>More generally, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
<p>10330 & 10341 (Farm Walk) Two different reps</p>	<p>I am writing to express my wholehearted support for the proposal to extend the Controlled Parking Zone in Onslow Village (KM/13/0005), as set out in your letter of 29 November 2013. In my view, the proposal to combine restrictions with a limited number of unrestricted parking bays offers a sound and sensible balance.</p> <p>-----</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

I write in support of the latest proposals to extend the controlled parking in Onslow Village. I have looked at the plans in detail and what is being proposed would seem to be reasonable. I am contacting you in particular regarding the **Roads in Onslow Village proposed for inclusion within the Controlled Parking Zone (KM/13/0005)**: (Bannisters Road, Ellis Avenue, Litchfield Way (part not already included within the CPZ), Orchard Road, The Crossways (part not already included within the CPZ), The Square, Vicarage Gate, West Meads (part not already included within the CPZ), Wilderness Road).

I live in Farm Walk, Wilderness Road, and use these roads on a daily basis. Over recent years, and no doubt linked to the extension of the CPZ else where in the village, these roads have increasingly been used for commuter parking and are always extremely congested. The particular problems I would hope the extension of the CPZ would resolve:

During the day, there are normally no spare spaces between The Square and the Crossways, such that it is impossible for cars to pass in both directions, which means that frequently cars have to back-up to allow cars coming the other way to pass. This is the main route through Onslow Village and through traffic of all sorts, including large vehicles is heavy. This is a particular problem because this road is a bus route and the sight lines are relatively poor.

Often cars are parked so close together, and extremely close or sometimes slightly encroaching on driveways, such that it is quite dangerous for people backing out of their driveways, particularly as traffic often travels quite fast between The Crossways and The Square, and the road is quite narrow. The current situation is an accident waiting to happen.

The parking on the corners (eg Litchfield way etc) means that the traffic has to pass on the wrong side of the road around a blind bend. Again, a collision is a very real possibility.

	<p>Commuter parking means that there is a lack of spaces for residents, delivery van parking, local builders working on houses.</p> <p>Along Manor Way between The Crossways and Abbots Close there are the same problems as between the Crossways and The Square, ie a busy route with no passing places, where the sightlines are poor.</p>	
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 150</p> <p>10331</p>	<p>I welcome the introduction of parking controls in Onslow Village and thank Tony Phillips and David Goodwin for their support in this long-awaited implementation.</p> <p>I have looked at your new proposal maps and note - perhaps some may say 'buried' in the text - your new suggestion of unrestricted parking bays; introduced to reduce the potential for displaced parking? I have to admit to being at a certain degree of loss as to who will use these unrestricted parking bays, in particular the one at the top end of West Meads. Walking around at weekends and outside term times my experience is that this part of the road is nearly always empty and no local resident has a need to park their car there.</p> <p>Therefore I have to conclude that this part of the road will under the new proposals, be a 'free-for-all parking bay ' to be used in term time, week-days, and open to any of the cars that cruise around and around looking for a free place to park all day, all week or for 2 weeks whilst on holiday. I am certain than none of the local residents will get any chance to park their cars there, just as now; if you are not parked in the road before 7am, or you move your car during the morning, it is almost 100% certain that that space is filled quick-as-a- flash by a long-stay parked car. Was not the construction of the Onslow Park & Ride championed as the place where these drivers and vehicles should park?</p> <p>I also envisage any attempt by yourselves to control these ever</p>	<p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.</p> <p>As a result of the feedback from the public exhibition stage, the parking bays in West Meads were revised to further improve the ease of access for those with vehicle crossovers.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

more desperate , and in my experience -" I am not going to pay or walk further than I have to, so I will dump it here" car owners will necessitate enforcement patrols 24/7 to ticket those car drivers confused by mixed signage and who take a chance regardless of time limit, permit or even double yellow lines.

I would also like to add that the upper part of West Meads is physically not as wide as the rest of the road and with cars parked on one side, many lorries and delivery vehicles have no other option but to drive along with one set of wheels on the pavement until they clear the obstruction of parked cars. Hardly a safe environment for pedestrians, in particular the Onslow/QE's school 'walking-bus', which uses this route every day in term time. (It doesn't use the other side of the pavement, I'm guessing because of the parked cars.)

Reluctantly I have come to a conclusion that the revised proposal is not much of an improvement on our existing situation. Pray tell, why is it considered necessary to accommodate unrestricted parking in a residential area when it is not the residents themselves that perhaps need it nor will be able to use it. Once word gets around that parking is free and unlimited, the floodgates will open! Unrestricted parking will only serve the commuters and university parking fraternity - those who highlighted the need for parking controls in Onslow Village in the first place many, many years ago.

And I suggest to try to contain so many cars- worth of problems in a tiny amount of unrestricted parking space dotted around the CPZ will be a totally hopeless case, and seems to make all the years thinking about, arguing and justifying the need for controls in Onslow Village a waste of time and resources.

With the proposed unrestricted parking bay at the top of West Meads we will still have cars parked from early am to late pm, no local resident will be able to use it in daytime, term-time, we will still have traffic coming down the hill on the wrong side of a nearly permanent one-car width road on a collision course with our 3

	<p>driveways, in all probability we will have over-spill from the parking bay, and there will be little space to accommodate any visitor or delivery vehicles.</p> <p>Progress or going around in circles??</p>	
<p>Page 152</p> <p>10332</p>	<p>I am objecting to the proposal to extend the CPZ further into Onslow Village.</p> <p>This proposal seems to have been instigated by a small minority of residents who feel that their roads are subject to inconsiderate parking. I walk to work in the morning through Onslow Village and do not see evidence of this, nor of widespread commuter parking – most of the cars parked belong to local residents. Trying to introduce this proposal based on inconsiderate parking and “uncontrolled commuter parking” seems unjustified, given that more residents are going to be adversely affected by the proposals than those affected by this supposed problem.</p> <p>At the latest consultation I was told that the Council had made the assumption that residents of Wilderness Court had access to garage parking; this is not the case as the garages are held under separate ownership from the flats, therefore residents without garages are going to require permits, whereas the overwhelming majority of residents in the adjacent roads have access to their own off street parking and will not need to purchase permits, this seems to be totally unjust. If residents wish to have parking improvements then surely the burden of financing this should fall equally on all those in the CPZ zone, not just on those who are forced to purchase permits. I doubt that the residents who requested this scheme would support it if they were obliged to pay for its introduction.</p> <p>Powell Close was not included as teachers from Onslow Infant School are expected to park here – why are teachers treated differently from residents? There is little chance of teachers being</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not feel that the present parking situation warrants the need for the proposals, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The various previous stages of informal consultation have confirmed that residents from across the area feel that there are various issues, but views have been mixed on how to resolve these.</p> <p>At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerned about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and</p>

	<p>able to park here, as these spaces will inevitably be used by the residents who don't have access to off street parking, creating a problem that does not exist at the present.</p> <p>The proposals also include a 4 hour parking bay for the current bus stop outside Wilderness Court, where is this to be relocated?</p> <p>How are parents of Onslow Village School going to be able to drop off and collect children given the proposed introduction of the "no waiting at any time" zones?</p>	<p>points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.</p> <p>In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.</p> <p>Clearly, if the garages associated with the Wilderness Court development were associated with the premises for which they were intended, this would improve the residents' lot.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.</p>
<p>10333</p>	<p>I live at 74 Manor Way and am concerned that the proposed parking controls will not alleviate problems at the end of Manor Way where I live.</p> <p>I understand that there is a certain distance where people will park their car and walk into Guildford and this end of Manor Way is probably beyond that. However, I have witnessed many people park and then walk over the A3. Having double yellow lines at the</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from both The Crossways and Abbots Close and Abbots Close to High View Road sections of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on</p>

junction of Manor Way and the A3 is, of course, very wise to improve safety. However, I am worried that the parking will then be pushed further along Manor Way (away from the A3). Many people park on this road and this often causes traffic congestion. I am sure the bus driver would agree!

I am in favour of having more restricted parking to keep more cars parked off the road and in driveways and to stop other people using Manor Way as a car park.

the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from the The Crossways to Abbots Close section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their section of the road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.

The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control

10334

		and increase the availability of parking.
	<p>This response is written on behalf of my wife and myself. <u>It concerns the Eastern end of Manor Way (MW), from The Crossways to Abbot's Close.</u></p> <p>First let me thank you and your colleagues, both Councillors and officers, for the care and attention you have paid to this matter over the months. We are particularly grateful for the response you have made on some points of detail which were of great concern to our neighbours and ourselves and which you have resolved satisfactorily.</p> <p>We have carefully considered the question whether it would be better or worse if this stretch of MW was added to the proposed enlarged Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for Onslow Village (OV). We have worked on the basis (as we have been assured) that the space for parking would be the same whether it was inside or outside the CPZ. In other words, only about half the space which is currently available for parking in MW would still be available for parking, whether or not it was within the CPZ.</p> <p><u>We have come to the conclusion that it would better for it to be within the CPZ.</u> That would prevent anyone parking, during the daytime on Mondays to Saturdays, for more than 4 hours. In particular, it would prevent commuters to the train station or to Guildford, and others such as students. It would therefore assist residents to find parking space. It could also help residents who do not have off-street parking space.</p> <p>We are sorry that the result would be added urbanisation of OV, which is highly regrettable. We also realise that it would be a</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways and Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their section of the road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in</p>

	<p>nuisance, and a cost, to residents, for ourselves and our daytime visitors. It might well also reduce house values. However, we fear that it would be worse without the CPZ extending this far.</p>	<p>Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
<p>Page 156</p> <p>10339 (Manor Way)</p>	<p>As I said in my four previous responses to the Onslow Village surveys relating to the CPZ, we are in general agreement to the proposals. I would like to draw your attention to our comments regarding our views toward extending the CPZ to include the whole of Manor Way, Abbots Clos and High View Road.</p> <p>Unfortunately many people who have objected to your current proposal have apparently not considered the wider implications to roads surrounding the new proposed scheme. This applies particularly to parts of Manor Way, Abbots Close and High View Road. These roads are all within walking distance from the town centre and the station and there is a reasonable change that your current proposal will lead to increased parking in these roads. It does therefore seem very short sighted, after all the effort that has been expended on these proposals and that required to implement the proposed extension, not to include this whole area in the scheme rather than have the expense of going through the process again in a few years time.</p> <p>However, reading the local press on the matter, it would appear that the decision has already been made but I hope that a summary of</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways and Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their section of the road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of</p>

	<p>our comments will be useful in the future.</p>	<p>the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10340	<p>I live at 14 Manor Way, Onslow Village, GU2 7RN and have viewed the on-street parking proposals for this area.</p> <p>I had not wished for any additional CPZs in the Onslow Village area but now that it seems this will go ahead I would want that part of Manor way from Crossways to the Abbots Close turning to be <u>included</u> in the new CPZ.</p> <p>In view of the new parking restrictions elsewhere in the village not to include this part of manor Way will make it even worse for residence. Therefore I would like this part included.</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways and Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made</p>

representations from this section now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their section of the road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.

The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

<p>10342 (Litchfield Way)</p>	<p>With regards to the Onslow Village parking restrictions, we are in favour of the proposals.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
<p>10343 (Bannisters Road)</p>	<p>Although it is a shame to have to have yellow lines in a conservation area it would be worse to become a car park for the rest of Onslow Village. I am therefore in favour of your suggestions as also it will help to prevent careless drivers from blocking my driveway and parking dangerously on corners. However I am concerned that creating a freer road may cause more speeding (a situation that is becoming very dangerous in several roads already throughout the Village). I hope this situation too will be monitored.</p>	<p>General support for proposals noted.</p> <p>The position of the proposed zone boundary will actually result in a reduction in the number large zone boundary signs necessary. The signs associated with the parking bays will be kept to a minimum and located sensitively. Furthermore, 50mm primrose markings will be used throughout, rather than the more standard, wider yellow road markings.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.</p> <p>Even so, the number of spaces proposed broadly matches demand, although its regulation means that it takes place in appropriate locations, rather than inconsiderate ones.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>

10344	<p>Taxman Rate Road Tax VAT Tax of Fuel Congestion charging Parking Meter charging</p> <p>and now your looking at fees to charge resident to park within a non-commuter free zone ?</p> <p>This is Residential there are no station where commuter flood the area with car,MPV's Motor bikes etc, it's yet another cash-cow to source funds to support those that don't work.</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by inconsiderately parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The various previous stages of informal consultation have confirmed that residents feel that there are various issues, including ones caused by non-residents, as well as fellow residents.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10345 Onslow Infant School	<p>I am writing to you to respond on behalf of Onslow Infant School to the proposals for the changes to on-street parking in the area around the school in Onslow Village.</p> <p>Our responses have been made taking into account the safety of our children in getting to school, the need for safe, legal and available parking for parents, visitors and some staff and the need for safe legal and available parking for the residents in the immediately vicinity of the school.</p> <p>In the first instance, we agree that limited parking in Powell Close and Windsor Close will enable enough on-street parking for the</p>	<p>The issues associated with the school run are replicated around the 70-or-so schools within the borough, and because of the nature of the issue, occur regardless of the presence, or otherwise of formalised parking controls.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.</p>

residents in these roads and for temporary parking for visitors to the school and some staff. We currently have discouraged parents from parking in these roads as they are not suitable for a large volume of vehicles and put the children at risk. Recently, many of the Powell Close residents have had dropped kerbs installed and therefore the number of available parking spaces has decreased considerably. We are strongly in favour of these proposals in these two roads.

In relation to the proposals on Wilderness Road, Orchard Road and other roads near to the school, we are generally in favour of the addition of some yellow lines in the area and 4 hour parking bays being installed. However, we are concerned that the large number of proposed yellow lines, particularly on Wilderness Road will lead to 2 issues. Primarily, this road will become a rat-run for traffic diverting through the village at high speeds because, although parked traffic creates congestion in the village, **no** parked traffic could encourage drivers to speed up. The proposed site of our Traffic Patrol Crossing will be on the corner of Wilderness Road and Powell Close. Speeding traffic around the blind bend will make this very dangerous.

Secondly, although discouraging parents from parking near the school, we have to accept that a number of parents will still need to drive to school. The relatively small number of parking bays proposed will reduce considerably the spaces available for both parents and residents to park legally and safely, and will encourage more illegal and unsafe parking around the school.

In general we are in favour of restricting parking in the area but request that there are less yellow lines and far more legal parking bays available in Wilderness Road, Orchard Road and other roads close to the school.

Even so, the number of spaces proposed broadly matches demand during the majority of the day, although its regulation means that it takes place in appropriate locations, rather than inconsiderate ones. As a result, parking in many roads will continue to take place where it does at the present time.

At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerns about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.

In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.

To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be

		<p>swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.</p> <p>There simply are not opportunities to provide significantly more parking, because of the previously mentioned consideration of geometry, carriageway width, points of access and geometry. Indeed, there have been concerns and objections to some of the spaces that have been proposed.</p> <p>A combination of unrestricted and limited waiting shared-use spaces are proposed to provide some facility for all-day parking without the need for a permit, whilst the limited waiting shared-use spaces are more likely to be available for those involved in the school run.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking, for residents and those involved in the school run.</p>
<p>10346 & 10370 (The Crossways) same rep sent twice</p>	<p>In response to your letter I am sorry to see that the CPZ zone will not include up to Abbots Close. The residents are being very short sighted. I still maintain that the whole of the village should be covered by the CPZ zone. It is just going to have a knock on effect throughout the village as we soon realised when the first CPZ zone was put in place.</p> <p>I noted the other day that a car drew up outside our house, dropped two people off who proceeded to get into their cars that were</p>	<p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from The Crossways and Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it</p>

parked outside our house, one of which was a nurse! This is an ongoing saga. I have also witnessed the bus struggling to get past cars that have parked very near The Crossways. If Manor Way does not get parking restrictions cars will be parking both sides of the road after Abbots Close which will cause more difficulties for the bus. There has also been a lot of building work along Manor Way recently, vans being parked all along the road which has caused terrible problems in the morning rush hour and also for the buses.

There has been an increase of cars parking at the bottom end of Manor Way and up the road to High View Road. This is as a result of people now parking and walking across the bridge to the university or hospital!

For a long while I had been getting up at 6 am in the morning to go to Tesco's so that I still had parking when I got back. I often saw commuters parking their cars outside the house at 6.45 am! We have also had cars parked outside the house for weeks on end, whose owners are not residents in the village. We cannot park down our driveway because it is shared, extremely steep and also narrow.

I cannot stress enough the knock on effect this is going to have on the whole of the village, especially with the university expansion and the problems for staff who work at the hospital.

within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their section of the road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.

The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

10347	<p>I am writing in a PERSONAL capacity as a resident of 16 Bannisters Road, Onslow Village, Guildford GU2 7QZ</p> <p>In response to your letter dated 29 November 2013 I support the proposals relating to the extension of the CPZ in the Onslow Village area as tabled on 29 November 2013. I would further comment that you appear to have struck the right balance between residents bays, unrestricted parking bays and no parking at any time / between 0830 and 1800 hours.</p> <p>Although your 29 November 2013 letter states that any representations should be made by 20 December 2013 (ie today) I understand from the Surrey Advertiser dated 13 December 2013 that a recent Guildford Local Committee has already approved the plans..... Please would you comment.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>The Surrey Advertiser (13 December 2013) were mistaken in their reporting of the situation. The decision was taken at the Local Committee meeting held on 12 March 2014.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10348	<p>I live at 3 Bannisters Road, Onslow Village.</p> <p>I am against the plan to change the on street parking at Onslow Village for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We were attracted to the area for its distinctive character (Conservation Area) and unlike other parts of Guildford the absence of parking zones/yellow lines etc. The proposal flies in the face of Conservation area policy. We are prevented from making even the slightest change to the front of our houses without your consent and yet GBC appear to be content to implement the proposed change (lines all over the road, signs, parking zones etc) which will change the character of the area forever. It is very difficult to accommodate 2 cars on the drive in front of our house, but if you implement this change we will have to consider the removal of the beech hedge in front of our house. That would be a big shame but you would force us (and probably others) to do the same. 	<p>The position of the proposed zone boundary will actually result in a reduction in the number large zone boundary signs necessary. The signs associated with the parking bays will be kept to a minimum and located sensitively. Furthermore, 50mm primrose markings will be used throughout, rather than the more standard, wider yellow road markings.</p> <p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The combination of unrestricted and limited waiting shared-use spaces reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors</p>

2. The proposal is unnecessary – there is a never a problem with parking on Bannisters Road. Even the daily commuters who occasionally park on the local roads are gone by the evening when residents return from work. You will argue that there are knock on effects as a result of you creating parking zones on other streets but you have engineered this situation deliberately so that you can turn the whole area into a controlled car parking area and thus generate yet more income for the Council.
3. We would lose the ability to park on the road near to our houses when we choose. It would cause difficulty for those visitors or workmen who wish to stay longer than 4 hours.
4. Placing double yellow lines on Orchard Road is not necessary and in itself would then cause residents to look for spaces on Bannisters Road.
5. Overall the proposal is totally unnecessary. At present there are only occasional issues/problems (although I personally have never heard anyone mention any problem). However if the proposal goes ahead there would then be significant inconvenience/cost/conflict on a permanent basis. A sledgehammer to crack a nut.
6. You would force us to consider buying permits – yet more expense at a time when we are being squeezed financially from all sides.

I have yet to meet a single person on Bannisters Road, Litchfield Way, Hedgeway or Orchard Road who is in favour of these proposals. Please respect the wishes of the local residents and do not 'steamroller' this proposal through.

greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great.

Some that have commented previously have suggested that there should be no parking spaces in Orchard Road, between its junctions with Bannisters Road and West Meads.

As many residents in Bannisters Road have written representation in support of the proposals, as opposed. Slightly more residents in Litchfield Way have made representations in support of the proposals, than opposed. The same is true for Orchard Road.

I am pleased to read in the Surrey Advertiser that the next stage of the CPZ will go ahead. As you know I have been delighted with the existing scheme as it applies to my part of The Crossways. We rarely have problems as those of us with parking at our property, use it, and give priority to those without.

My only concern as a great fan of Onslow Village, is the fact that the whole length of the narrow part of Manor Way is not in the proposed residents' parking zone. It will be a disaster to leave the part from the end of Crossways to Abbot's Close out. It becomes single lane, is narrow, and is a bus route. Drivers see a gap coming in the traffic from the other direction and belt like hell before another car appears. Often there are not cars but large vans and lorries! This is dangerous to children and animals (and old people like me!).

I can only assume that the people living in that area who voted against extension of cpz were hoping that the whole scheme would not go ahead. **WE MUST SORT OUT THE PROBLEM THAT EXISTS NOW.** They do not realise that if they are excluded there will be no spaces for them to park. They will have to do what one resident who is currently affected does and go shopping at 6am so they can get their cars back in a space near their homes before the commuters that those looking to park spare cards, arrive.

I don't think there is any 'perfect' solution to the problem in our area – even having the restriction up to Abbots Close will still cause problems as commuters will just park outside the arboretum instead and down the rest of Manor Way!

General support for the proposals is noted.

The Surrey Advertiser (13 December 2013) were mistaken in their reporting of the situation. The decision was taken at the Local Committee meeting held on 12 March 2014.

In respect to Manor Way, during the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented, from the section between The Crossways and Abbots Close, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

		<p>Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.</p> <p>The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10362	<p>I would like to object again to the proposed extension of the restricted parking zone in Onslow Village, and in particular to Wilderness Road. I have lived in Wilderness Court for 2 years and the only time parking is an issue is during school pick up and drop off and when there is overflow from the car park when the village hall is busy. I walk to work in Guildford and I have not seen any evidence of “commuter” parking which I understand is the main reason for the changes and indeed one area which I believe has been identified is in Windsor Close which is not included in the restricted area so will probably suffer more in the future, as will Powell Close. If the side roads where the residents have their own drives and garages are problematic then yellow line these areas by all means but please do not make all residents suffer as a result of a few vocal owners who have given no thought to the residents of the flats many of whom rent and would not realise they are able to have a say in the consultation.</p> <p>As both a resident and an employee of Clarke Gammon Wellers who are managing agents for Wilderness Court, Windsor Close</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by inconsiderately parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The various previous stages of informal consultation have confirmed that residents feel that there are various issues, including ones caused by non-residents, as well as fellow residents.</p> <p>At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerns about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which</p>

flats and Powell Close I have a greater interest than most in the changes. The 34 flats at Wilderness Court do not have allocated parking and the garages are held under separate title, largely by non residents which means there is a greater demand for on street parking spaces particularly at night and during weekends. It would seem the only option will be to park in the non restricted areas of Windsor Close and Powell Close which will increase the problems already experienced by the residents in these areas and those of the school teachers who will not be able to purchase parking permits.

A further issue which needs to be addressed is the availability of parking for the many carers who visit the Wilderness Court flats frequently during the day, usually on a very tight schedule who currently park on street.

If the parking has to be controlled due to “inconsiderate commuter parking” perhaps this could be resolved by putting single yellow lines instead of double as currently suggested and making the restrictions operational Monday to Friday to allow residents to park in the evenings and at weekends when the school is closed and the rogue commuters are not working. This would also be an advantage for the village hall users who will find it difficult to park in the evenings when the hall is busy if there are double yellow line restrictions.

I would like to reiterate that I do not feel the current problems supposedly identified justify the wholesale changes suggested and it seems unreasonable to force residents without parking to pay for a scheme through permits which I believe will not provide adequate provision for all those who need to park even if they have a permit.

uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal proposals.

In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.

To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service.

Clearly, if the garages associated with the Wilderness Court development were associated with the premises for which they were intended, this would improve the residents’ lot.

Those residents with the need for carers can acquire a carer permit at a heavily discounted rate, which allow the user to use the limited waiting shared-use spaces without restriction.

The number of spaces provided within the proposed area broadly matches present demand. However, its regulation means that it takes place in appropriate locations, rather than inconsiderate ones.

The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions. Double yellow lines are primarily proposed around junctions and points of communal access to prevent parking within an inappropriate distance.

It would be more appropriate to consider the issue of operational hours during a future parking review, and across a wider area, rather than introducing a Monday to Friday extension to the existing Monday to Saturday Area J. Such a change would result in the boundary between the two being relatively indistinct and arbitrary. If the proposed new area for controls were to have different operational hours, it would also result in the need for considerably more large zone boundary signs. The visual intrusion of the controls is an issue touched upon by some that have made representations. We therefore recommend that the time limited controls operate Monday to Saturday, as advertised.

The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. This also overcomes some of the concerns expressed by representees about the zone

		<p>operating on Saturdays. We therefore recommend that that a combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are implemented, as advertised.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 170</p> <p>10371</p>	<p>Hitherto I have been concerned about the imposition of yellow lines in our road as I believe they are unnecessary. I would be grateful if the following points could be considered before a final decision is made.</p> <p>The residents of Vicarage Gate have been consulted twice already about this and both times have rejected it. The authorities seem to think that, because there was such a low number of people who gave their opinions, we should be consulted again. Following that principle through, then, can we assume that, if there is a low turn-out for the next Guildford Borough Council Elections in Onslow Ward, the councillors elected should stand down while another poll is carried out?</p> <p>These are the points I would like considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If residents of Vicarage Gate were taking their cars somewhere daily I am sure park they would rather park for free. I therefore see it as very 'NIMBY' to want parking restrictions in this road. It seems that the only reason for parking restrictions is residents' fear of being blocked in their driveways (See 3 below). 2. There is no <u>absolute</u> certainty that, if we don't have yellow lines, we shall be flooded with non-residents' parking. Yes, it is extremely likely but it is not a private 	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The various previous stages of informal consultation have confirmed that residents from across the area feel that there are various issues, but views have been mixed on how to resolve these.</p> <p>Prior to the formal proposals being finalised, one of the major points of discussion was whether to include a number of other roads that had expressed opposition (some repeatedly) to their roads' inclusion within the CPZ during the previous stages of informal consultation. These included Bannisters Road, Litchfield Way, Manor Way and Vicarage Gate. Unlike Manor Way, which is situated at the edge of the proposed zone, if the other roads were to be omitted from the CPZ, their position would mean that they would be completely surrounded by roads within the CPZ. Previous experience elsewhere within the CPZ has shown that this can cause significant issues. This led the Committee to decide to include them within the CPZ, as part of the</p>

road and therefore everyone who's paid his road tax has a legal right to park in the road without obstructing driveways. Once we have yellow lines we shall never get rid of them and so I contend that we should give it the four years then make another decision if necessary.

- 3. The main reason for people wanting parking restrictions in marked bays would appear to be that residents are afraid of being blocked in. The driveways in Vicarage Gate are different from many other roads in the area in that driveways are directly – or nearly directly - opposite each other. This means that to prevent egress from one drive a car would have to be parked wholly or partially across someone's (opposite) driveway and I do not believe even the most pig-headed motorist would do that. The road is not wide enough to facilitate parking opposite another car.
- 4. Vicarage Gate is different from other roads in that there is a church at the end of it and in that church we sometimes have weddings, usually on a Saturday. Commuters and office workers are unlikely to need parking on a Saturday but yellow lines will restrict those coming to the church on that day. Therefore I would suggest that, if we are compelled to have these unsightly lines, the restrictions should not apply on Saturdays. When I raised this point at the consultation in the Village Hall in June I was told that it would confuse the motorist which you do not like doing. Even more confusing is having one side of Upperton Road for 'residents only' parking and the other side for anyone to park for two hours. Except the last one on the right as you go up; that is 'residents only'! Yet you appear to think that is acceptable and, presumably, not confusing to the motorist.
- 5. The CPZ map shows Vicarage Gate proposed parking slots all down the left side which would mean cars are far

formal proposals.

The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.

It would be more appropriate to consider the issue of operational hours during a future parking review, and across a wider area, rather than introducing a Monday to Friday extension to the existing Monday to Saturday Area J. Such a change would result in the boundary between the two being relatively indistinct and arbitrary. If the proposed new area for controls were to have different operational hours, it would also result in the need for considerably more large zone boundary signs. The visual intrusion of the controls is an issue touched upon by some that have made representations. We therefore recommend that the time limited controls operate Monday to Saturday, as advertised.

The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. This also overcomes some of the concerns expressed by representees about the zone operating on Saturdays. We therefore recommend that that a combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are implemented, as advertised.

The present parking in Vicarage Gate almost always occurs on the north-western side of the road. The

	<p>more likely to speed up and down than if people park on each side as they do now, creating a 'chicane' effect. With a large number of children going to and from the church hall each morning, afternoon and evening, and on Sunday mornings, and weekend afternoons, plus mothers with pushchairs (who sometimes have to go into the road because of people's car wheels on the pavements) this one-sided parking will encourage already accelerating motorists to drive even faster. Parents dropping off children very often seem to be in a hurry to reach their next destination!</p> <p>6. I am fully in favour of the proposed single yellow line in the turning circle because, if cars park there, heavy goods vehicles are inclined to turn round in the church car park where the ground is not stable enough for vehicles of that size. Again, a Monday to Friday restriction would, I think, make more sense as HGVs are a rarity on at the weekends and allowing visitors to the church to park would facilitate entry to the church on more level ground for the handicapped and less mobile.</p>	<p>speed of traffic using the road has not been raised as an issue thus far. The proposed spaces merely formalises the present arrangement.</p> <p>Those with blue badges are able to park on yellow line waiting restrictions for up to 3 hours provided doing so does not cause danger or obstruction.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.</p>
<p>10383, 10384 & 10402 three different reps</p>	<p>I understand from the local paper that the deadline for commenting on CPZ proposals in Onslow Village has been extended to 20 January, which is great as my family and I were unable to comment in time before. I know other residents wanted to support the CPZ proposal but with Christmas travel and commitments they also missed the deadline and were upset they didn't comment in time.</p> <p>We are very supportive of the CPZ proposal in Onslow Village in general and are keen for it to come into force. The number of commuters parking on our street has increased in the 7 years we have lived here and it causes problems all the time with deliveries, tradesmen, and us just getting in and out of our drives etc. Therefore our only concern is the number of bays at the top end of Wilderness Road/ Farm Walk and we would like this to be reduced</p>	<p>General support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions. A standard set back distance of two kerbs (one transition and one full) from the lowered kerb is being used throughout the proposed extension area.</p> <p>The width of Wilderness Road, and the vast majority of other roads within the area are such that the positioning of parking bays in the vicinity of</p>

if possible and bays kept away from residents private drives. This will allow us better sight of cars coming down the hill as parked cars are higher and obscure these approaching cars. It will also mean we can exit our drives in one manoeuvre - currently cars park right up to and sometimes over our drive which makes it hard to get out or we are just trapped in.

I hope my comments have been received in time, and that the CPZ goes ahead.

I am a resident at [3 Wilderness Road](#) (the top near Crossways) and am supportive of the proposed CPZ, and have communicated this in previous consultations.

At the moment I find it really inconvenient when commuters park on the street and sometimes partially blocking my drive, especially when I have deliveries or workmen due. When I moved house my removal company had to park 50 meters away on Curling Vale and carried all my furniture is heavy rain because parking on my street is rarely an option after [07:30am](#). I have occasionally asked commuters not to park in front of my house when I know I am having workmen coming, but I just get rather abusive comments back - a neighbour even got a rude drawing put through her letter box when she left a note on someones van as they had blocked her in.

I also think the number of bays should be considered as when there are too many cars parked at the top of Wilderness Road the bus sometimes has difficulty getting through. Also the residents of Farm Walk struggle to get out of their drives if there are too many cars outside No 2 and No 3 Wilderness Road due to the angle of the narrow road and the steepness of the hill. This is why they initially objected to the CPZ as they thought the bays would block them in.

driveways is feasible without unduly affecting access. Even so, the number of spaces were reduced as a result of the feedback from the public exhibition stage of informal consultation.

We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.

At the moment so many cars tightly parked on Wilderness Road also causes a safety issue. Many children walk to the village play school or Queen Eleanor's primary school further down the street on Queen Eleanor's Road, and when backing my car out of my drive it can be very hard to see pedestrians walking between the cars and the high hedges as it leaves very little room on the pavement for pedestrians and makes it hard to see them especially the height of a small child. After backing out of the drive and once over the pavement, there is then the difficulty to see around the parked cars to see if there are any vehicles coming down the road from the A31 / Farnham Road. Many commuters use Wilderness Road as a rat-run to quickly get to the A3 from the A31, the hospital or the university and drive very fast between these 2 roads which have much higher speed limit controls. Drivers are not aware that residential life is going on because they see Wilderness Road as a connection between highways.

In understand the deadline for commenting on CPZ in Onslow Village has been extended. Thank you for this as I was unable to meet the earlier deadline due to the Christmas and year end rush.

I support the new CPZ plans in the village and am very hopeful they will come into force. However I have a concern regarding the number of proposed bays outside 1-6 Wilderness Road and would like you to consider this. My neighbour has pointed out that with too many bays the view of cars driving down the hill is completely obstructed when we try to exit our drives. This is quite dangerous as cars generally speed down Wilderness Road when they come off the Farnham road which has a higher speed limit and the hill helps them go even faster.

The number of bays too close to or opposite drives also makes it difficult for resident to exit their drives for 1-6 Wilderness Road and 1-4 Farm Walk and so perhaps there should be a reduced number of bays for this reason as well. Because of the steepness of the hill

10385

	<p>and the narrow road with a tall hedge on one side, when we exit our drives we sometimes have to make several attempts at it, which holds up the traffic and can be a bit scary when the traffic is speeding downhill.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these points, but in general I am happy with the proposal and look forward to it coming into force.</p>	
	<p>I am writing to express my objection to the above parking control proposals for Onslow Village, especially because of how it would effect Manor Way, which is the road we have recently moved into, at number 9, where there is no off-road parking facility.</p> <p>We have not had trouble parking here, even with the temporary addition of a second car during December, so do not see any need for any changes to the parking regulations on this road. Nor have I been aware of any obvious problems as I drive around and occasionally park in other parts of Onslow Village.</p> <p>Furthermore, I believe that the new parking proposals KM/13/0005 and KM/13/0006 will have significant detrimental effects on this currently adequate parking provision; for the following reasons:</p> <p>Firstly, as your letter rightly points out, if the extended CPZ is introduced to the rest of Onslow village but not to this section of Manor Way (as per proposals KM/13/0005), then this would displace all the non-resident car parking into Manor Way, and parking would most definitely become a problem for us and our neighbours, who have no alternative but to park on the road outside our properties on this section of Manor Way.</p> <p>Secondly, this would be further worsened by the KM/13/0006 proposals to introduce new No Waiting At Any Time restrictions on Manor Way and Abbots Close, by significantly reducing the amount of space on the road for us all to park in. Even without the displaced parking caused by an extension of the CPZ in the rest of</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not be inconvenienced by the present parking situation, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p> <p>The various previous stages of informal consultation have confirmed that residents from across the area feel that there are various issues, but views have been mixed on how to resolve these. One of the issues that has been raised repeatedly are the difficulties that parking causes in The Crossways to Abbots Close section of Manor Way for other road users, and particularly the bus service.</p> <p>During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those in that have commented, from The Crossways and Abbots Close section of Manor Way, have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.</p> <p>Although the majority of those that have made representations from this section of Manor Way now</p>

Onslow Village, these KM/13/0006 proposals would cause us and our neighbours significant problems as there simply would not be enough space for us all to park.

Thirdly, the KM/13/0006 proposals would increase traffic flow and encourage more two-way traffic to travel at speed along Manor Way. With two children, family pets and narrow pathways, we are unfortunately already very concerned for safety on our section of Manor Way due to the amount and speed of traffic using the road as a cut through. The current level of parking acts to narrow the road to one lane on this section of Manor Way and this is the only thing that sometimes forces cars to slow down if they meet oncoming traffic. However, if the KM/13/0006 proposals for No Waiting At Any Time restrictions on Manor Way go ahead and thereby reduce the amount of parked cars on this section of Manor Way, then I believe our road would become even more unsafe, as there would be the space for more cars to travel at speed over a greater section of the road. Indeed, rather than any of these unnecessary parking restriction proposals, I believe the council should be acting urgently to introduce traffic calming restrictions instead, such as speed bumps and 20mph speed limits, which are far more necessary and therefore would be much more welcome.

Finally, if any parking restrictions are to be considered, then I believe the council should prioritise the parking amenity for residents in areas of Onslow Village where no off street parking is available, such as our section of Manor Way, Crossways and Abbots Close. These current proposals do the opposite, and would significantly reduce essential parking for residents. If however, the KM/13/0005 proposal is accepted, it would then also be essential for the CPZ to be extended to include Residents Only parking in Crossways, Manor Way and Abbots Close in order to properly protect the existing parking provision for us residents who have no choice but to park on the road.

object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation. Even so, if controls were subsequently introduced, it is likely that they would be similar to those in the proposed area, namely a combination of unrestricted and limited waiting shared-use parking bays, rather than permit only spaces.

Nevertheless, the more limited controls proposed in Manor Way, protect the junction with Abbots Close, the brow of the hill and provide a suitable location for passing.

The provision of unrestricted bays within the proposed zone also reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.

Further to the formal advertisement of proposals to extend the controlled parking zone further into Onslow Village, and subsequent extension of the closing date for comments to Friday 10th January 2014, as published in the Surrey Advertiser, I wish to register my objection to the proposals outlined under KM/13/0005.

As a resident of Wilderness Court, the proposals as they stand will adversely affect us over and above most of the other residents within Onslow Village. There are 34 flats and at present unallocated off road parking for circa 12 vehicles. With many people working outside of Guildford and parking is a necessity and therefore there is a reliance on the availability of on street parking at evenings and weekends and during working days when people are either sick or have taken leave.

The proposals introduce a no waiting at any time restriction on Wilderness Road from the end of the current CPZ up to the Square covering the entire length of carriageway outside the property. The complex side of this length of carriageway has always been used for on-street parking by residents.

As requested, the grounds of my objection are outlined as follows:

- a) The proposals will displace Wilderness Court residents vehicles to other areas in Onslow Village, away from the complex and therefore outside other residents properties. This will in itself cause further issues and will no doubt cause concern amongst those affected residents.
- b) The proposals will require all Wilderness Court residents to purchase a permit to park and a permit for visitors. Note that most of the other privately owned properties have off road parking therefore the purchase of a permit is optional. For those living in Wilderness Court it will be mandatory as an off-road space is not guaranteed. This is therefore a financial burden on us. The adjacent complex of flats in Windsor

During the previous stages of informal consultation, the residents of Powell Close and Windsor Close were clearly opposed to their roads' inclusion within the CPZ. The residents of Wilderness Road did not.

The issues associated with the school run are replicated around the 70-or-so schools within the borough, and because of the nature of the issue, occur regardless of the presence, or otherwise of formalised parking controls.

The position and extents of the waiting restrictions and the parking bays has been carefully considered and takes into account the geometry of the roads, their widths, the presence of points of access and the proximity of junctions.

Even so, the number of spaces proposed broadly matches demand during the majority of the day, although its regulation means that it takes place in appropriate locations, rather than inconsiderate ones. As a result, parking in many roads will continue to take place where it does at the present time.

At the public exhibition stage, the proposals presented included some parking bays immediately outside Wilderness Court. Despite this, those from Wilderness Court raised concerns about the lack of parking. However, others who commented were concerned about the impact that any parking in this area has on safety around the junction with Orchard Road, and particularly for the bus service, which uses the road. As a result, the Committee decided to remove the parking bays, and instead, double yellow lines were proposed as part of the formal

Close has been exempted from similar restrictions through a relaxation of the proposals under KM/130006.

- c) There are currently major parking issues associated with Onslow Village Infant School during morning, lunchtime and evening drop off times: note that despite obligations to implement a travel plan as part of the planning approval for additional classrooms, the situation has deteriorated, not improved. As a result parents have been regularly identified and challenged about parking on Wilderness Court land, the police and local community support officers appear powerless to react. At present any residents displaced can park on the street which whilst frustrating is only short term and therefore a practical solution. With the introduction of formal parking restrictions this issue will increase, there will be nowhere for displaced residents to park and will require our management committee to engage the services of a company to control parking. This would have to be funded through an increase in our service charge. This is another financial burden on us.
- d) There are a few elderly residents who require regular visits by Health Visitors numerous times during the day and evening. The removal of the ability to park outside the property, on Wilderness Road, will impact on the effectiveness of these individuals.
- e) The introduction of parking restrictions will affect the attractiveness of purchasing in the complex and is therefore likely to affect the property value as currently the complex is a desirable investment as not bound by parking restrictions as many similar properties are in Guildford.
- f) Guildford Borough Council have not provided any justification for the imposition of parking controls on Saturdays. The Council representatives confirmed during the public consultations that the cause of parking concerns

proposals.

In view of continuing concerns about the availability of parking, the situation in the vicinity of Wilderness Court has been revisited. Therefore, rather than introducing double yellow lines throughout, it is now recommended that certain lengths of these restrictions, further away from the junctions and points of access, be introduced as single yellow lines. The times that parking would be prevented on the single yellow lines would broadly match the times that the bus service operates. At other times, parking would be permitted.

To further increase the availability of parking in the area, it is also recommended that the limited waiting shared-use parking bay in Wilderness Road, between Powell Close and Ellis Avenue, be swapped from the west side of the road to the east side, which enables an additional two spaces to be provided. Doing this also overcomes concerns raised about parking bays being placed on the side of the road used by the bus service. If the management company of the flats wishes to manage its parking areas, so as to resolve the existing issues, and any ones that it anticipates will occur, that would be its prerogative.

There is no evidence to suggest that permit schemes devalue property values. Indeed, the opposite may be true. Nevertheless, if the garages at the Wilderness Court development were still associated with the residential premises for which they were intended, this too may increase the property values.

It would be more appropriate to consider the issue of

related to commuters using the Station and University Staff, i.e. vehicles that had been displaced from the existing CPZ Monday to Friday. Both of these “sources” only have an effect during the working week therefore there is no justification for Saturday restrictions.

- g) The imposition of Saturday restrictions has a negative impact on the independent businesses running out of the shops on the Square as any available parking will have been filled by residents, displaced from elsewhere, leaving no parking available for new customers/visitors.

I would be grateful if you could ensure my representation is submitted to the committee responsible for the proposals and look forward to the Council abandoning these unnecessary proposals.

operational hours during a future parking review, and across a wider area, rather than introducing a Monday to Friday extension to the existing Monday to Saturday Area J. Such a change would result in the boundary between the two being relatively indistinct and arbitrary. If the proposed new area for controls were to have different operational hours, it would also result in the need for considerably more large zone boundary signs. The visual intrusion of the controls is an issue touched upon by some that have made representations. We therefore recommend that the time limited controls operate Monday to Saturday, as advertised.

The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. This also overcomes some of the concerns expressed by representees about the zone operating on Saturdays. We therefore recommend that that a combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are implemented, as advertised.

Those residents with the need for carers can acquire a carer permit at a heavily discounted rate, which allow the user to use the limited waiting shared-use spaces without restriction.

We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.

10387

I would like to express concern regarding extending the CPZ in Onslow. Whilst I understand the need for this, please consider the possibility of having the parking zone on a Monday-Friday. We do not suffer a problem with parking by the university students / staff/ hospital staff or other vehicles at weekends and it seems rather unkind to prevent residents or their visitors parking in Onslow Village on Saturdays without running the risk of incurring fixed penalty fines. By restricting parking on Saturdays I might be considered to take the cynical view that this is an opportunity to raise some revenue?

It would be more appropriate to consider the issue of operational hours during a future parking review, and across a wider area, rather than introducing a Monday to Friday extension to the existing Monday to Saturday Area J. Such a change would result in the boundary between the two being relatively indistinct and arbitrary. If the proposed new area for controls were to have different operational hours, it would also result in the need for considerably more large zone boundary signs. The visual intrusion of the controls is an issue touched upon by some that have made representations. We therefore recommend that the time limited controls operate Monday to Saturday, as advertised.

The provision of unrestricted bays reduces the likelihood of displacement into the roads beyond the zone boundary. It also offers residents and their visitors greater flexibility, particularly at times when the pressure on parking from non-residents is not as great. This also overcomes some of the concerns expressed by representees about the zone operating on Saturdays. We therefore recommend that that a combination of limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted parking bays are implemented, as advertised.

We therefore recommend that the proposals in Wilderness Road in the vicinity of Wilderness Court are amended resulting in lesser controls and a greater ability to park.

I would like to register that we are not in favour of controlled parking in Abbots Close. We feel it would alter the complete character of our close community in Abbots Close. We know that occasional commuters do park along the road, but feel that parking bays would encourage rather than deter. This is a very narrow cul-de-sac & on-street parking is only possible on one side of the road. The majority of cars which have to park on the road are residents & their visitors. We would be in the position of having to pay for parking permits which is not acceptable. Controlled parking with double yellow lines on the corner of Abbots Close as proposed would be a good idea & make leaving & entering our Close much safer.

During the previous informal stages of consultation, and despite the possibility of displacement occurring being highlighted, the vast majority of those that have commented from Abbots Close have consistently expressed clear opposition to their road's inclusion within the CPZ. As a result, and the fact that the road was on the edge of the proposed extension area, the Local Committee decided not to include it within the CPZ, as part of the formal proposals.

Although the controls in Abbots Close, at the junction with Manor Way, were extended as part of the formal proposals, more extensive measures away from the Manor Way junction were not considered appropriate given the feeling amongst residents.

Although the majority of those that have made representations from Abbots Close object to the proposals on the basis that they would now like their road to be included, if the Committee were now to reconsider the issue, this would, at the very least, require the proposals for this road to be re-advertised. Given that the CPZ review is reaching its conclusion, and the next non-CPZ review has recently commenced, this would invariably have an impact on the implementation of the other controls within the CPZ, and progress of the ongoing non-CPZ review. We therefore recommend that this road remains outside the CPZ for the time being, as residents have previously requested, but confirm that the matter will be kept under review, and future parking reviews may provide an opportunity to revisit the situation.

		Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.
10389	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to extending the controlled parking zone to Wilderness Road, which is where I live.</p> <p>I am opposed because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this will involve me having to pay additional money if I wish to park in my own road. In my view the council fees in local authority tax and car parking fees are already excessive and I do not wish to pay yet more money to the council. - it will prevent visitors to my house, such as my elderly parents, from parking outside my house for any time period beyond what is permitted. - I don't think it will reduce the number of people parking outside my house. Many cars park outside my house but these are neighbours, mostly from across the road in Farm Walk, and are not to my knowledge people from outside of the area. I suspect that my neighbours will pay the annual fee for parking and that the road will remain as crowded as it is currently. 	<p>As is the case for all residents' permit schemes across Surrey, and much of the rest of the country, permits are charged for. Primarily, this is levied to cover the cost of administering the permit scheme and issuing permits.</p> <p>Daily visitor scratchcard permits allow residents' visitors to park without restriction within the limited waiting shared-use spaces.</p> <p>The number of spaces proposed broadly matches demand during the majority of the day, although its regulation means that it takes place in appropriate locations, rather than inconsiderate ones. As a result, parking in many roads will continue to take place where it does at the present time.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10392	<p>I would like to express my strong objection to the proposed extension of the controlled parking zone to include Onslow Village.</p> <p>I feel that we are far enough away from the town centre to not be besieged by shoppers or commuters and don't agree that there are any problems with the parking as it stands at present.</p>	<p>Although some within the area may not feel that the present parking situation warrants the need for the proposals, many from across the area do experience issues caused by parked vehicles, and have asked for them to be resolved.</p>

	<p>If you start introducing bays and time restrictions, that is when the problems will escalate and I can only see the residents being the ones penalised, as any visitors would surely choose to park near the town centre if both areas were to be included in the CPZ.</p> <p>The proposed bays will be very detrimental to residents as the proposals have not given much thought to where all the cars parked on the roads at present will relocate to.</p> <p>I do hope that enough residents object to this proposal and that the scheme is scrapped for the sake of the village.</p>	<p>The various previous stages of informal consultation have confirmed that residents from across the area feel that there are various issues, but views have been mixed on how to resolve these.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
10393	<p>I understand the need to parking control to ensure that residents of the area are not impacted by inappropriate parking.</p> <p>My main concern is to enable residents to be able to park. We own two cars – one is garaged and one is parked on the road. Therefore what measures will be put in place to ensure that I will not be impacted by the proposed change and will still be able to park as a resident.</p> <p>In addition, the changes proposed will also have an impact on parking for the local school. I a director at Wilderness Court we already have a problem with the public parking on private ground at the start and end of the school day. The proposed changes will greatly increase this problem which will result in the management company (and therefore residents) of wilderness court to take action to control parking, incurring additional cost.</p> <p>For this change to be correctly implemented I would expect the council to complete comprehensive analysis of the number of legitimate resident cars in the areas effected to ensure that sufficient parking is made available following any restrictions. Questionnaires to residents do not fill the requirement for analysis, as the questionnaire is based on opinion and not facts and</p>	<p>A residents' permit scheme will accompany the proposed extension to the CPZ. Residents will be able to acquire one permit irrespective of their off-street parking for £50 per annum. Those with no off-street space and two vehicles will be able to acquire two residents permits, the second costing £80 per annum.</p> <p>If the management company of the flats wishes to manage its parking areas, so as to resolve the existing issues, and any ones that it anticipates will occur, that would be its prerogative.</p> <p>The number of spaces proposed broadly matches demand during the majority of the day, although its regulation means that it takes place in appropriate locations, rather than inconsiderate ones. As a result, parking in many roads will continue to take place where it does at the present time.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals are implemented broadly as advertised, but with minor amendments in Wilderness Road, in the vicinity of</p>

	<p>evidence.</p> <p>With this information and a process for gaining parking permits such that residents are not unduly effected makes this acceptable. If these conditions are not met then I will not support any changes to current parking restrictions.</p>	<p>Wilderness Court, which lessen the level of control and increase the availability of parking.</p>
--	---	--