

ITEM XX : ANNEXE 8 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER (OTHER PROPOSALS)

Summary of Representations received for Other proposals

Guildford Park Road – 1 representation

Pewley Way – 1 representation

No representations were received about the proposals for Artillery Road, Denzil Road, Guildford Park Avenue, Jenner Road, Poltimore Road, Stocton Road and Upper Edgeborough Road.

ITEM XX : ANNEXE 8 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
	Guildford Park Road (outside Nos. 31 to 55)	(1 representation)
10283	<p>We (Seale, Sands & Runfold Amenity Society) wish to object most strongly to plans to ban waiting in Guildford Park Road between numbers 31 and 55.</p> <p>The Guildford Park Road entrance to Guildford station is known colloquially as the “side entrance” and I will use this term.</p> <p>The side entrance is a very popular means of accessing Guildford station. I am a reasonably frequent user. There are four trains an hour from London throughout the day. My impression is that there is typically one person from each train during the off peak period being met from each train. In the rush hour, there are usually typically four or five cars waiting there to pick up passengers.</p> <p>My understanding is that your proposal will make it illegal for cars to wait here for passengers arriving by train.</p> <p>The alternative is to cross over the railway bridge and wait in front of the station. This is fraught as there are already too many cars there already and finding somewhere to wait is very difficult. On leaving the station, it is necessary to join Walnut Tree Close and then cross Bridge Street. This is a difficult manoeuvre since it involves crossing three lanes which have considerable amounts of traffic. Not only does it add considerably to the journey time but the gyratory system is already very congested.</p> <p>Our requirement is to have a location where cars can wait to pick</p>	<p>Concerns about loss of facility are noted.</p> <p>Parking of longer durations is currently possible outside the present operational hours of the single yellow line, which are Monday to Saturday 8.30am to 6pm. However, it is parking at these times, and in the vicinity of the nearby pedestrian refuge, taxi rank and bus stop that causes traffic flow issues, for those heading to and from the town centre. Drivers are allowed to stop to allow passengers to board or alight on either double or single yellow lines, so the proposal to introduce a double yellow line will not change this. However, the double yellow line restriction will not be available for parking at any time. Indeed, the removal of parking may increase the availability of space for those wishing to board and alight.</p> <p>We therefore recommend implementing the change as proposed.</p>

up passengers arriving by train and using the side entrance.

The plans for the station and the gyratory system have recently been the subject of a public consultation. Our proposal is that this particular part of the plans be put on hold until the results of the above consultation are finalised.

ITEM XX : ANNEXE 8 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Pewley Way (outside No 23)		(1 representation)
10316	<p>The On Street Parking bay is 10.2M long - Is position related to the boundary between No23 my property, and the adjacent semi detached property No25 - is 7.165M across No.23 3.035M across No25.</p> <p>The parking bay could therefore be moved 2m towards No25.</p> <p>It would then sit Is position related to the boundary between No23 my property, and the adjacent semi detached property No25 is 5.165M across No.23 5.035M across No25 equally spaced either side of the boundary.</p> <p>This would also mean that the on street parking bay would start on the same line as the my garden steps wall forming the edge of my off street parking bays, which would be ideal for me.</p> <p>It would mean moving the on street parking bay line 2m towards No 25, so that it did not conflict with the crossover.</p>	<p>Desire to see further revisions to the position of the parking bay is noted.</p> <p>At present. the proposal merely revises the parking bay's north-western extent, albeit retaining the ability of the bay to accommodate two vehicles. If the parking bay's south-eastern extent was revised, as suggested by the representee, it would bring the bay closer to the parking bay on the opposite side of the road outside No.26 and positions the bay closer to No.25's driveway. To make such a change we would need to re-advertise the proposal to give the people effected the chance to comment.</p> <p>We therefore recommend implementing the change as proposed.</p>