

**ANNEXE 6 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
<b>Fairlands Estate</b>	<b>(introduce various double yellow lines, limited waiting and formalise school keep clear) (37 representations)</b>
2	<p>I am sending this e mail in opposition to the proposed parking restrictions on the Fairlands estate, all this has started because a few grumpy people do not like parents parking near their houses for half a hour in the mornings and half a hour in the afternoon to take their children to school .this happens everywhere there is a school. It is nothing new, so by spending tax payers money ,to install yellow lines and then a traffic warden to enforce this ,is a complete waste of money . The problem won't be solved by this in fact you will create more grumpy people, and so in the end the whole of Fairlands will be yellow lines and they will still park wherever they want yellow lines or not.</p>
3	<p>I am a resident of Fairlands Avenue and will therefore be directly affected by the effects of parking restrictions and changes that you are about to impose.</p> <p>I wholly agree with all junction related changes and yellow lines proposed but -</p> <p>The only issues I have are in respect of the areas related to the use of the shops which are either presently misused by the local residents or others for all day parking.</p> <p>I agree with the purple marked area but think it should be limited to two hours max.</p> <p>I also think that the proposed double yellow lined area running parallel to the marked purple area should , Monday to Friday ALSO be purple and two hour restrictive.</p> <p>This will allow genuine shoppers to have access to more than the only three or four parking spaces you propose during regular shop hours, but the 2hr rule will stop the itinerant all day parkers.</p> <p>It is important that we have enough shopping parking to maintain the access to the businesses. These businesses run on fine margins and our Community needs the services they provide.</p> <p>They are mutually dependant on each other for custom. If their customers cannot park they will go elsewhere , income will fall , shops will close , and all caused by parking restrictions.</p> <p>Please bear this in mind. The Fairlands Avenue area parallel to the shops should be purple (limited waiting).</p> <p>Of course all of this needs to be policed - Job for a local retiree perhaps?</p>

21	<p>I object to the yellow lines in St Michael's Avenue. I have NEVER seen a car parked on that junction, so the lines are unnecessary and would be an eyesore. Even with the other new yellow lines, I don't expect there to be a big problem with cars parking on that junction.</p> <p>I also object to the yellow lines at the entrance to the estate (where Fairlands Road meets Fairlands Avenue). I have only seen cars parked here when there is a big event such as the Merrist Wood shown on, so I think unsightly yellow lines are unnecessary. It would not be a nice welcome to Fairlands!</p> <p>I think the times restrictions around the shops are a good idea. Residents must however have adequate parking behind the flats so that they don't park outside the shops.</p> <p>I agree with formalising the restrictions around the school.</p> <p>I agree with all the other yellow lines, as the junctions involved are often a problem at school times and its is difficult for residents and buses etc. to get around the estate.</p>
27	<p>I can understand and support some of the changes suggested for safety reasons, where the proposed yellow lines would be on roundabouts and road junctions. However I do not support and strongly object to the proposed restrictions on Fairlands Avenue.</p> <p>I feel it is necessary to have adequate parking near to the shops. If the parking is restricted to one side of the road only this will not be sufficient for the number of users. The businesses in the shops will suffer, relying on the convenience of being able to park outside for quick visits. I for one (although living within walking distance) suffer from arthritis, I had one full knee replacement 6 weeks ago and need my other knee replaced too, I am not entitled to a disabled badge even though I cannot walk far without pain. I know that the number of users of these shops at all times of the day already often exceeds the spaces available so where do you think they will go to? The houses opposite these shops often suffer from having constant parking outside their houses and they don't all have large driveways so any visitors will not be able to park nearby or if they do park outside will then reduce the suggested parking spaces for the shops.</p> <p>I appeal to you to remove the restriction in Fairlands Road, but support the restricted times in the service road, as some of these spaces are used by shop owners/managers.</p>
29	<p>I would like to confirm that we are OPPOSED to the implementation proposed parking controls within the Fairlands estate. We were of the same mind in the previous consultation, clearly the outcome of this consultation wasn't to your satisfaction, hence the need to do it again.</p> <p>There is absolutely no need to implement this other than to make money.</p>

33	<p>Having viewed the proposals for the parking controls in Fairlands, I believe that they would greatly improve the line of sight of vehicles entering and leaving junctions therefore making it safer for everyone including pedestrians.</p> <p>My only concern would be in the enforcement of these restrictions and feel it would be necessary to actually issue fines/tickets when vehicles are parked illegally to prove the intention of these restrictions. A mere walk by of a parking restriction officer/ police officer I believe would not suffice in the long run.</p>
49	<p>We would like to register our objections to parking controls on Fairlands Estate, We believe this is unnecessary, it will simply move any problem to adjacent roads, which by the time you have finished you will have to whole of Fairlands with parking restrictions, and at what cost to enforce.</p> <p>There are a lot of older people living on Fairlands who will be inconvenienced by any restrictions.</p> <p>In times of austerity this is a total waste of public money.</p> <p>We believe parking restrictions should be for town centres, where they should remain.</p>
50	<p>I have looked at the parking plans for double parking lines for the above road and wish to make the following comment. Whilst agreeing that parking restrictions could be beneficial for the flow of traffic I would prefer the double yellow lines to be on my side of the road i.e. by the houses. I would feel that all of us on this side have ample parking inside our properties but we suffer from large vehicles parking on our side of the road and cars driving onto the grass verges which at times makes exiting somewhat chancy. I am fortunate that I have room to turn round and drive out where reversing out would be somewhat problematic. Others do not have that advantage.</p> <p>I live at number 28 Fairlands Avenue and feel if the double yellow lines were on my side of the road it would be much safer for all concerned.</p> <p>Whatever the final outcome there will always be someone who gets the hump so I wish you well.</p> <p>I have written this in the hope that any accidents may be prevented</p> <p>P.S. as an afterthought if traffic could park on the shops side of Fairlands Avenue they would not need to cross the road to get to the shops. You try doing that at 1513 when the school turns out.</p> <p>Not a good time to collect the pension.</p>
53	<p>As a resident of Gumbrells close I am happy with the proposed parking restriction on the top corner of Gumbrells close.</p> <p>I am concerned that the parking restrictions at the shops will make it harder for me to access the shops and have a detrimental affect on the shops themselves by making parking there harder. Redesign of the shop forecourt area like burpham shops would benefit the area.</p>

67	<p>First of all I am very surprised that you would consider parking restrictions in a quiet cul-de-sac as it is in Quakers Way.</p> <p>I can only assume that no one in your department has made a visit, as there is hardly any street parking apart from various tradesmen.</p> <p>As the council is making every effort to reduce spending, it seems a strange decision to even consider your proposals for parking controls in Quakers Way.</p> <p>As the estate has no lighting, if you have excess funds, then some of the uneven pavements could be repaired that would assist residents with walking difficulties.</p> <p>Please arrange to make a visit for your own benefit so that you would be able see that there is no need to consider parking controls in Quakers Way.</p>
96	<p>As residents of over thirty years standing we have looked at your map showing proposed double yellow lines to be placed at the junction of Dynevor Place with Brooke Forest which effectively would be directly outside our house and immediately in front of our driveway.</p> <p>Both my wife and I feel that this course of action is entirely unnecessary. As an example I am looking out from my office window at this moment, 11.00am in the morning and there is not a car nor a person in sight, this is a very quiet and pleasant residential area which the advent of ugly yellow lines would spoil totally.</p> <p>We are aware that there is an influx of traffic at school times but this for a maximum of half an hour, morning and evening and quite honestly of very little inconvenience to anyone. What is worrying however is that if this plan for yellow lines were to go ahead then there would be a totally adverse effect created as people would begin to park off the road and on our grass verges spoiling the whole look of the estate and damaging the verges themselves causing ruts and mud everywhere.</p> <p>We have not spoken to anyone who is in favour of this unnecessary and potentially very expensive proposal. Altogether yet another waste of our Council Tax.</p>
101	<p>I am in support of the proposed controls to Fairlands Estate, my reasoning is for the safety of the children due to the amount of traffic at school times.</p> <p>It is very difficult to see clearly when crossing the roads as there are so many vehicles blocking the views.</p>
104	<p>I am vehemently opposed to any form of parking restrictions on Fairland's, we do not have any parking problems or problem parking other than parking on the grass verges which yellow lines will not stop.</p> <p>The vast majority of the day the roads are empty even when the parents park to drop children at the school there is not any problems, the way is always clear to pass.</p>

	<p>The only reason the council is even considering this is to raise revenue which is appalling.</p>
<p>106</p>	<p>The concept, in theory looks admirable; in practice I doubt that it will work. It is more than likely that the double yellow lines will be ignored by many, for others merely to park further along the road in question. If current habits are anything to go by, drivers will park over "Keep Clear" signs on the roundabout near the school; on the zigzag lines outside the school entrance or verges along Fairlands Road forcing walkers into the road.</p> <p>The proposed times parents/guardians will be permitted to stop (08.00 - 10.00 / 14.30 - 16.30) is likely to be the most flouted, especially the afternoon time frame. A considerable number of vehicles definitely arrive much earlier so much so that it is often impossible for the no 17 bus drivers to navigate the route - Aldershot Road, Fairlands Avenue, Brocks Drive, Louis Field Brook Forest, Fairlands Avenue, Aldershot Road. I am given to understand that on occasion the drivers for the 15.32 passenger pick up at Brocks Drive are so frustrated that they go no further than the Fairlands Avenue roundabout, thereby missing out the Brocks, Louis Field and Brook Forest bus stops. I have total sympathy for the drivers, and disgusted at the arrogant selfish and inconsiderate attitude of these motorists.</p> <p>How GBC plans to enforce these new measures, I can only speculate, but whatever method it must be for the long not the short term. I am sure the excuses offered by the perpetrators would fill several volumes of motorists' tall tales, and not too different from those who choose to turn Right out of Fairlands - even though there has been a "No Turn Right" sign up for many years. I have watched many do precisely that, then almost collide with a bus pulling into the bus stop! The drivers are a mix of young and old, male and female, resident and visitor.</p> <p>Whatever GBC's decision is regarding these parking proposals, local residents should be penalised in any way.</p>
<p>110</p>	<p>I have lived in Brooke Forest for 30 years and strongly object to the parking restrictions that you wish to place around Fairlands Estate, by installing double yellow lines in the places indicated in Document 9 and document 13 on your website.</p> <p>This is a small housing estate which has only one access road. I do not think that adding double yellow lines is necessary nor would I like to see them spoiling the ambiance of the estate.</p> <p>When we were 'asked' if such parking restrictions around the junctions and roundabouts was desired by residents in a letter , it was worded in such a way that you could not say' No' no restrictions wanted. Only that if restrictions were implemented would we want them in all places with residents parking bays or just on corners etc. at the time I responded that I would be unhappy with the implementation of any double yellow lines and I still feel this way.</p> <p>I think it is unfair to force double yellow lines on us. I like that when you have workmen to the house they can park freely. I like that any guests I have may park freely. I like that I can park outside the shops and pop in for my paper when I'm on my way off the estate or coming home. I don't mind that I have to give way to traffic by the shops, I have been doing it for 30 years without the slightest</p>

	<p>problem. Residents know to be careful of parked cars on the corner of Brooke Forest and are happy to give way.</p> <p>I objected to the expansion of the school as it means even more parents coming onto the estate twice a day, however they are only there for a short time and in my opinion this does not warrant extra parking restrictions being in place permanently at all times. I DO NOT WANT TO LIVE IN THAT SORT OF ENVIRONMENT.</p> <p>Please Leave my estate as it is. NO DOUBLE YELLOW LINES AT ALL.</p>
<p>Page 126</p> <p>136</p>	<p>I live opposite the shops at fairlands avenue (32) I did email the council when talks began about the parking restrictions with in my view very sensible, ideas that could benefit both visitors, residents and shop owners in a word everyone! I had no reply whatsoever which leads me to believe you could not have received my email or you would have had the courtesy to reply! Please think about the ideas I wish to put to you.</p> <p>Between the parade of shops and flats on Fairlands avenue and the residents on the other side of the road is an area of grass and bushes.</p> <p>This area could quite easily and cheaply be transformed into marked parking bays also to include at least one disabled parking bay or create parking bays accessible to all on this wasted ground and make the shop slip road disabled/ delivery parking only.</p> <p>I really think this would work and serve all local people, visitors and retailers alike.</p> <p>At present we get the local travellers parking ON THE GRASS in this island of wasted land. They come in there trucks and vans and churn up all the mud leaving a very unsightly mess and danger to pedestrians as in winter they leave a trail of mud!</p> <p>The MAJORITY of residents on the Fairlands estate are ELDERLY, and if your proposed plans for double yellow lines on the post office side of the road go ahead these elderly people will have to park on the residential side and walk across the now busy road.</p> <p>Also Fairlands Avenue is on the bus route which is an added danger to pedestrians so if the vehicles were off the road it would make life much easier and safer for all concerned.</p> <p>I really feel you could accommodate more parking spaces if these were angled Like // // // etc.</p> <p>Many villages and towns appear to adopt this type of parking in a central area such as this as most of the spaces are needed for short stay shoppers and as you have stated on your plans a time limit could be put in place.</p> <p>I would also support a mini roundabout construction at the entrance to the Fairlands estate for the following reasons</p> <p>1 To SLOW DOWN the traffic on the long stretch of the Aldershot road, particularly at night the traffic along this road makes it sound like a RACETRACK!</p> <p>2 Enable ELDERLY pedestrians / students (going to Merristwood ) to gain safe passage to the bus stop across such a busy road. (A crossing is needed here!)</p>

	<p>3 Allow easy safe passage both in and out of the estate to both residents and visitors</p> <p>4 The extra flow of traffic from school start/finish would flow much easier as the congestion out of the estate would could filter in two directions.</p>
146	<p>The yellow lines in Fairland's avenue opposite the shops are going to be put opposite the houses on the other side of the road in my opinion this is the wrong side of the road as this will mean all the traffic for the shops will park on the houses side of the road which at present makes it very difficult to reverse out on to Fairland's avenue as there are always vehicles parked in this area and on a number of occasions slightly over hanging driveways . If the yellow lines are put opposite there will be even more traffic parked which will make it very dangerous to reverse out .There are a number of elderly residents in Fairland's avenue who will struggle to leave there own driveway if this is implemented . When its home time from Fairland's school you can sit in your car for ten minutes before being able to reverse out . In the past there have been bollards installed outside the houses in Fairland's avenue opposite the shops I think all but one have been knocked down by cars who continue to park half on the road and half on the grass verge again blocking the view of oncoming traffic which is waiting for an accident to happen . Could I ask why these bollards have not been reinstated as there were some additional ones installed over the other shop side of the road recently and these ones were left laying flat . The new bollards that were installed are nice sturdy wood ones the originally ones installed outside the houses are cheap plastic ones which are obviously no deterrent .</p> <p>I hope the matter can be resolved .</p>
170	<p>My reservations concern the lack of any double yellow lines on a section of Fairlands Avenue between Brooke Forest and the corner where Fairlands Avenue meets Brocks Drive. Without any yellow lines vehicles will be permitted to park on both sides of the road.</p> <p>We currently observe this situation opposite the shops which at present gets parked up on both sides so that only a single vehicle can go through. Vehicles coming from the opposite direction have to wait until the space between the lines of parked cars is clear.</p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines should prevent this but I believe that the problem will be transferred down Fairlands Avenue to the section without any yellow lines because people regularly stop along the Avenue to pop into the shops or use the pillar box. At peak times traffic trying to get in and out of the estate will have to queue in either direction causing backlogs.</p> <p>An additional problem at that location is that vehicles approaching the oblique bend from Brock's Drive have no visibility round it. They will round the corner and discover that the way ahead is blocked by cars coming through the gap between parked vehicles. If vehicles queue back along Brocks Drive they will block access to and from the Doctors' surgery, chemist and community centre.</p> <p>I would urge a re-consideration of the plans so as to include double yellow lines all the way down one side of Fairlands Avenue.</p>

I am **opposed** to parking controls within Fairlands.

I have lived for 18 years in Envis Way (overlooking the main roundabout near the school), am a retired police officer and was delighted my two children benefitted from the excellent Worplesdon Primary School albeit some years ago. I've started my e-mail like this to hopefully show I have some experience of this local resident issue, an understanding of law enforcement and an appreciation of the problems faced by Mr. Parsons and his staff at the school when faced with complaints about parking.

I have a number of points and observations as follows:

1. As a Fairlands resident nobody forced us to live here and in particular near a school. Anyone buying or renting here should adequately research the area - it is exactly the same as people who buy a house near a football ground and then complain about the noise, parking etc! In my 18 years the school traffic has varied with some years being worse than others depending on the attitude of a handful of drivers. In reality parking chaos prevails for just 10 - 15 minutes in the morning and the same in the afternoon. Being a primary school there are very few after school activities and the age of the children means they are supervised and leave the area very quickly.

2. The school does try to encourage responsible parking. I feel Mr. Parsons has been extremely let down by one of his teaching staff as an example. She shall remain nameless and does not in any way appear disabled, however every day she drives from her house in Dynevor Place and looks for street parking in Envis Way or Brooke Forest! Such laziness is extraordinary.

3. Fairlands needs to assess the impact of the new school buildings prior to introducing wholesale parking measures. At present it would be easy to vote in controls because a lot of staff cars are using the local streets to park meaning there is constant clogging up of the roads in and around the large roundabout nearest the school.

4. The cars that park on the grass verges around the roundabout are unacceptable. They are damaging the grass, flaunting 'Keep Clear' messages on the road (which emergency vehicles need to gain swift access to somewhere like the school), they frequently obstruct the local bus to the extent it can't manoeuvre and it encourages similar behaviour in other drivers. That said I would love to say that every Fairlands resident is sufficiently proud of their locality by parking properly themselves. Sadly a resident almost opposite the school drives in behind the black and white posts and parks wholly on the grass verge meaning there is now a visible crater (about a foot deep) when the car is not there. Such behaviour again sends drivers visiting Fairlands the wrong message.

Suggestions/Solutions:

1. We have managed all these years without controls, so what's changed? Any control is only as good as the compliance and supervision that follows, so are local authority staff etc going to be regularly deployed to enforce the restrictions?

2. Before wholesale controls are put in place, I suggest putting more black and white posts along the edge of the grass nearest the road and at the end of each grass section to stop cars swerving round them and parking wholly across the grass verge.

3. To assist with point 2 the grass verges could be made slimmer and have a wider path or simple, maintenance free bulbs could be planted in the middle of the grass verge area meaning a few daffodils and/or tulips would emerge each spring and not only look nice



but would deter anyone parking.

4. Consideration should be given to making some roads 'One Way Only' to ease congestion and maintain the bus route.

5. Here is another idea but would require someone to oversee implementation. That said if any controls are introduced then that requires staff anyway to enforce/deter etc. A lot of residents on Fairlands have long drives/parking space available. This could be 'offered' to parents with a small charge payable for the convenience e.g. £5 a week (50p for each morning and afternoon session). Particularly in cold, horrible conditions the children are much closer to the school than they would otherwise have been and the £5 (or some of it) could even be donated to charity. Research could be done on this to find out the views of residents and potential for 'buy-in' from the parents. The school does not need to get overly involved or be liable. I know from my commuting days that residents near Worplesdon Station used to put flyers on cars advertising their drive to park on for a monthly fee that undercut the station car park charges. I believe there's a potential solution here. Straight away I could offer one car park space everyday, the lady opposite has at least two spaces and an elderly man opposite the school has a permanently empty drive which could house 3 or 4 cars.

I apologise for the length of this e-mail but controls are not needed at this time.

In summary - **NO** to parking controls as this is a term time only issue also i.e. 39 weeks of the year and the cynic in me feels this is just an attempt to generate income for the local authority at the expense of the real victims - Fairlands residents.

I fully support the proposals for yellow lines around the junctions and roundabouts, but wanted to add an additional concern in my own road, where I believe the yellow lines should be extended.

I live in Fairlands Avenue, on the short stretch from the Estate entrance to the first large roundabout, just on the bend of the roundabout. Whilst I agree that there should be yellow lines on the bend of the roundabout outside my house, I strongly believe these lines should be extended all along this first short stretch of road, from the entrance to the roundabout. It is the only entrance in and out of Fairlands, so has a constant flow of traffic all day, and a large number of cars queuing at peak times. There is a constant problem of parked cars on the road, particularly near the roundabout end - this causes a danger in that the cars coming into Fairlands have to overtake the parked cars forcing them into the middle of the road at the roundabout, which creates not only a bottle neck, but also a potentially dangerous situation if a car is coming round the roundabout to come out of Fairlands. This parking is forcing all the cars coming in right into the oncoming path of cars coming out, a problem which is compounded when the buses are coming in and out regularly. There isn't room for larger vehicles to safely get past the parked cars and also allow the free flow of traffic at the roundabout. From a personal perspective I also have difficulty coming out of my driveway as my view is obscured to the right to see if cars are entering Fairlands, and it is often hard to see round the parked cars as to whether it is safe to come out onto the road. Cars often stop temporarily all along this stretch of Fairlands Avenue, and it is just too busy a road for this. The proposal of putting yellow lines only on the bend of the roundabout will not alleviate any of the problems in this particular area, as they will stop just before where the cars are already parking. They need to extend further from the roundabout along towards the entrance, or ideally be put along the whole stretch to keep this very busy main thoroughfare free-flowing.

205	<p>I would just like to have noted that the service road I live in (Fairlands Road) is used daily as a park and ride for the bus service into Guildford and Aldershot and also used by people visiting Merrist Wood College. This is manageable at the moment but with new parking restrictions this will only move the traffic further down the road when the yellow lines are introduced on the corner of Fairlands Road and Fairlands Avenue. We will then experience difficulty leaving our properties from our driveways as sight is impeded and also the service road is quite narrow.</p> <p>I originally moved from 23 St Johns Road Guildford where we had a horrendous problem with parking due to the University of Surrey and really don't want to go back to all that entails.</p>
207	<p>I am writing to you in response to parking proposals in Louis Fields Fairlands and totally support your parking proposals for the surrounding School area but The school run parking and traffic has increased considerably over the last 10 years and now the school has increased in size I wouldn't expect the traffic and parking to do so.</p> <p>I live close to the roundabout and very close to the school any late comers that cannot find a space to park will automatically drive on the grass verges or park across driveway entrances to properties especially mine as it is so close to the school Having had several confrontations with mums or dads about parking across my driveway is unpleasant and stressful as you can imagine when all we want to do or my wife wants to do is to drive in or out of our property.</p> <p>Having no curbs or post to deter drivers from mounting grass verges or even yellow lines across driveway entrances makes it easy for late comers just abandon their cars where they feel fit to do so with no consequences to them only the residents, having lived here for over 10 years I can see that the problem is worse the closer you are to the school and therefore needs further action on your behalf. There are plastic posts on the opposite side of my road to me which the council and fitted years ago and therefore parking seems to be more uniformed and sensible but not on my side of the road.</p> <p>So I'm not asking you to fit curbs to the side of the road just to consider extending the yellow lines passed my property across my driveway or even adding some post to the grass verge four post will only be needed to correct this problem</p>
236 Worplesdon Primary School	<p>In response to the proposed parking controls on Fairlands Estate I would like to offer the following comments on behalf of Worplesdon Primary School.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The general move to put yellow lines to protect corners and roundabout we think is sensible and will help to ensure that traffic can circulate and will help safer crossing for adults and children.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The proposal to formalise the existing advisory "School Keep Clear" markings outside the school is hugely welcomed by the school. <b>Please note that the existing map onto which the proposals are drawn will soon be incorrect due to a new opening onto the school grounds being formed as part of the school expansion works. This will result in the positioning and extent of the "School Keep Clear" zone needing to be reviewed and repositioned/extended.</b></li> </ul>
263	<p>In my opinion the proposed changes look sensible in themselves but I have just two points to make:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How are the new parking restrictions going to be enforced? Will this be a SCC, Guildford or Worplesdon expense?</li> <li>2. Earlier in the year the SCC expert stated that the expansion of the numbers of children attending Worplesdon Primary School at Fairlands over the next four years will see an increase of approximately 80 cars coming on to Fairlands twice a day during term time. (I believe his estimate might be a little conservative). These cars will have to park somewhere. If the proposed parking restrictions</li> </ol>

	<p>are designed to help the current situation, surely, matters will only get worse as the extra cars build up and that will put added pressure on where to park. The subject of the effect of the school expansion and the additional traffic this will cause was glossed over when the school expansion proposal was first tabled. Are we any nearer a solution? My previous correspondence refers to this problem. However, with the new classrooms already under construction the options for an all round satisfactory solution appear very limited indeed. This problem should be addressed urgently.</p>
<p>272</p>	<p>I wish to object to the Fairlands parking proposals as they will accomplish nothing.</p> <p>To put yellow lines on all the roundabouts will not make any difference as drivers are already aware that they should not park on roundabouts so this will <b>not</b> accomplish the stated aims of the council. As we know the problem is the school (mainly Envis Way, Brooke Forest, Louis Fields and Brocks Drive) which is presently undertaking building works will lead to a further 100+ cars coming onto Fairlands and parents will do and park anywhere so that their children do not have far to walk into school. So unless the council intends to enforce the parking restrictions this will be a waste of time and effort. To slightly ease the pressure i would suggest that Envis Way from Louis Fields to Brocks Drive is made one-way this will stop the road being jammed up when anyone comes the other way.</p> <p>Turning now to Fairlands Avenue and the service road leading to the shops the proposals will be damaging to the shops. The stated aim is to increase turnover by limiting waiting times to 20 minutes; i am sure that this is probably already the average waiting time. This will seriously damage the hairdressers whose appointments are up to 2/3 hours; this does not seem to have been taken into account. Any parking restrictions will just move the problem and as this <b>has not been requested by the residents</b> i hope this proposal will be cancelled.</p>
<p>305</p>	<p>We strongly object to the proposals for the parking restriction contained in the consultation “proposals for parking restrictions Fairlands estate - proposal KN/16/0003”</p> <p>Our objections/comments are specifically made in relation to the road surrounding the school namely, Brocks Drive, Brooke Forrest, Louis Fields, Envis Way and Wallace Close.</p> <p>The problems with illegal parking at the junctions and inconsiderate parking in general which these proposals seek to address only arise during school term time at drop off and pick up times i.e. Monday to Friday between 8.00 - 9.30am and 2pm - 3.30pm.</p> <p>Whilst we acknowledge the serious and potentially dangerous nature of the problems caused by these parking issues, by their very nature they occur for a very limited lime each day during term time only. The proposals put forward for yellow lines go way beyond the extent of the existing white corner hatching that currently exists at the corner of Brocks Drive and Louis Fields (directly outside of our property) which are designed to act as a deterrent.</p> <p>The proposed solution to the careless, inconsiderate and illegal parking during school pick up and drop off times is disproportionate to the problem. A more sensible, measured and considered solution would be the introduction of drop off and pick up time, term time only yellow lines at the junctions. This is a solution that many local authorities have opted for and one that in practice works well and offers a sensible solution to the problem.</p>

	<p>A practical example is Surbiton School for Girls where term time only restrictions are in place in Surbiton Crescent Kingston</p> <p>The proposals put forward will greatly and unfairly affect those residents whose properties will have yellow lines in the road outside them and appears to be one that have received very little imaginative and considered thought for all those affected both by poor parking and by the proposal put forward.</p>
306	<p>Further to the proposal to introduce parking restrictions on Fairlands, as a resident in Kiln Meadows my comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You are considering taking a sledgehammer to crack a nut!</li> <li>• There is not a <u>residents</u> parking problem on Fairlands.</li> <li>• The only problem is around the shops (slip road and adjacent part of Fairlands Avenue) on occasions and the roads around Fairlands School during term time and school hours (due to use by non-residents).</li> <li>• This problem could be easily solved by having parking restrictions /limited waiting applied at the busy times in those areas.</li> <li>• I am not sure if proposed yellow lines would extend across residents access drives. If so I would suggest that this is rethought as many residents use their access drives to park their cars. The inability to do this would mean parking at appropriate places in the roads causing further congestion which could be a particular problem at night, particularly as Fairlands has no street lights and is very dark at night. It would also be very unsightly and potentially dangerous.</li> </ul> <p>In these days of austerity, to implement the proposals seems very reckless. This is taxpayers money that is being spent and the proposals I feel are wasting our money on things that are not needed.</p>
324	<p>Surely the parking issues around Fairlands do not require such drastic measures as double or single yellow lines. The problem peaks when the school starts and finishes. On Fairlands Avenue parking is short term with people visiting the shops. It would be more practical to restrict parking for larger vehicles delivering to the shops, especially the Convenience store as there is adequate space at the rear of the shops. Also the tenants of the shops should be required to park their vehicles at the rear. This would free lots of parking outside the shops.</p> <p>If you are allocating money to be spent on Fairlands, then please spend on it on refurbishing all the pavements around the Estate, which are in a terrible state and in some places seriously dangerous.</p>
328	<p>I am concerned about the scope of the proposals and their enforcement.</p> <p>I note that the rationale for this review of parking is - <i>to assist with safety, access, traffic movements, increase the availability of space and its prioritisation for various user-groups in various localities, and to make local improvements.</i> [Report of the meeting of the Local Committee (Guildford) held on 17/6/15 (<i>Guildford On-Street Parking Review – Proposals For Geographic Areas</i>).]</p> <p><b>Catch-all approach</b></p> <p>I am concerned that not all the proposed restrictions are required, so incurring unnecessary expenditure in installing them and increasing enforcement requirements and costs. I refer to the report of the above meeting.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.33 states:</p>

*Therefore, although a clear majority opposed controls in their own roads, respondents expressed more general concerns about parking associated with the school and shops. This is broadly similar to the issues highlighted in unsolicited correspondence received prior to the commencement of the review.*

So the consultation confirmed the concerns of local residents of where the problems were and forms a solid foundation on which the Committee were able to formulate proposals to address these problem areas. It does not provide a mandate to impose blanket coverage across the estate as a whole. The table *Initial Questionnaire – Fairlands – Summary*, Item 15, Annexe 8 in the above report shows that 75% of respondents did not want parking controls in their own road, while there was a more balanced view in respect of adjacent roads.

Paragraph 2.34 goes on to state such an approach:

*In terms of a solution, by far the most popular option ([from] 13 of the 15 roads) was the introduction or amendment of limited controls, such as yellow line waiting restrictions at junctions, bends and other strategic places.*

This is an obscure conclusion from the earlier consultation. I consider it to be an assumption rather than an analysis and response to the data provided by the consultation. The underlying response from that exercise is that there is not a problem across Fairlands. The above report identified very specific areas of concern (the school and shops) from both residents who lived in these areas as well as those who did not live in these areas. So why on earth are controls being imposed where there is not a problem?

Q5 of the consultation was flawed in that it is the epitome of a closed question. As drafted, it did not take account of the possible view that residents did not think that their road should be subject to parking controls at all (Q2). The message was in fact that 75% of respondents did not support installing parking restrictions on their roads. So in this event, Q5 is saying that, even though you do not want controls in your road, if a gun were held to your head, and you had to have controls, what form of control would you prefer? The answer has already been given – none but respondents were forced into selecting a control option. The majority of options incurred a cost or severely restricted reasonable expectations and the soft option was therefore yellow lines.

The underlying theme is spelt out in paragraph 2.33 – controls are only needed where there is a measurable problem – i.e. around the school and shops. The solution referred to in 2.34 is not “popular”, as that question (Q5) did not provide respondents with an option to confirm that they did not want restrictions

While I agree that some elements of the proposed controls have merit there are others that appear to have no justification. In this respect I confirm that -

1. I fully support the proposals that address the problems occurring at school drop-off and pick-up times. I have experience of the problems when taking children to and from the school as a pedestrian. From my experience the proposals for the junctions at Envis Way/Brocks Drive, Envis Way/Wallace Close, Envis Way/Brocks Drive, Brocks Drive/Louis Fields, Louis Fields/Sandpit Heath, Littlefield Way/Sandpit Heath, Littlefield Way/Littlefield Close and Brooke Forest/Dynevor Place and the roundabout at Louis Fields/Brooke Forest will help to deter parking that adversely affects residents access, free passage of traffic and improves the safety of pedestrians. It is also pleasing to note that the School Keep Clear markings will become enforceable, although I am confused as to why they are not at the moment.

2. I support proposals to limit the parking duration in the shop slip road, improve the free flow of traffic around the shops and improve sight lines when exiting the slip road on to Fairlands Avenue. However, there are knock on effects from the proposals that need to be considered. I am not convinced, from reading the report, that they have been considered.
- a. Those working at the various shops and residents of the flats above the shops and in Fairlands Court still have to find somewhere to park. By limiting parking time, where would long stay drivers park their vehicles? Would this not just be increasing the parking demand on nearby roads? I suggested in my response to the consultation that more use should be made of the land behind the shops for parking for these individuals and assume that the Council has little influence over this private land. But has any approach been made to the freeholder or tenants of the shops/flats to encourage the use of the land to the rear of the shops for parking? If parking is restricted in the slip road where will these residents park? Outside the houses in Fairlands Avenue opposite the shops? This would defeat the object of the exercise.
  - b. The imposition of restricted parking in Fairlands Avenue itself, outside the shops, would greatly improve access for traffic coming off the roundabout into Fairlands Avenue but inconvenience will be caused to residents living in the house on the North side of the road where there will be free on street parking. Access to and egress from these properties will be severely affected as sight lines will be impeded and invariably parking will not always be as courteous as it should be and drives will be blocked. Would there not be greater merit in imposing the parking restrictions on the North side of this road rather than the South side?
3. I see no rationale for the inclusion of the remainder of the provisions.
- a. Roundabout – In the 34 years that I have lived on Fairlands, I have never seen anyone park on the roundabout road, or on the access roads immediately adjacent to the roundabout. The roundabout cannot accommodate two cars passing. Parking is not an issue here and does not need controlling.
  - b. The proposed controls at the remaining junctions (Brocks Drive/Gumbrells Close, Brocks Drive/Quakers Way, in St. Michael's Avenue, and Fairlands Road/Fairlands Avenue and the corner of Brocks Drive/Fairlands Avenue are unnecessary. There are no parking problems at these locations – people just do not park there – they have more sense. And even if they did the amount of traffic using most of these junctions is insignificant.
  - c. These proposals seem to be the result of a desktop exercise to highlight the bad practise of parking on or near junctions by creating a visual deterrent in the painting of yellow lines on all junctions on the estate. There is not one junction that has escaped; even junctions in cul-de-sacs have been included. There is no need to treat all junctions in the same way just to demonstrate an even-handed approach.
  - d. Each proposal should be supported by evidence of a problem and a need to impose controls. You have not provided any such information in support of these specific proposals. There is already legislation in force that can deal with parking that results in obstructions in these locations. Do you have any information, which justifies the proposals, as to when or how often such enforcement action has been taken?

#### **Enforcement**

The more controls that are imposed, the greater the burden there is on the need to enforce them. At the moment enforcement has been totally ineffective where problems have occurred (eg near the school or shops), even in using powers under existing legislation

for causing an obstruction on the highway. By imposing controls there is an inherent requirement to enforce. While there would be a definite benefit for policing the controls in the school and shop areas, I see little merit where the proposed controls have not been justified. I am not convinced that there would be any constructive benefit policing all the controls. The process of policing all the controls would be an unnecessary burden on the Police Force/Traffic Wardens and not be cost effective. Would these costs be passed on to residents in the Parish Council precept?

### Cost

There is a cost to implementing and enforcing these controls, in terms of their installation and signage as well as the cost of enforcement. Unless the case is made to justify the implementation of all the controls the scheme is fundamentally flawed and the Council is not acting in a financially astute manner. Can you please let me know the cost for implementing the controls on the ground and their enforcement?

In conclusion, I am concerned at the apparently arbitrary way in which the scope of the controls has been formulated.

- The evidence base has not been fully explained to justify the implementation of all the proposed controls.
- The interpretation of the consultation responses is flawed and the data does not support some of the proposed controls.
- The responses do not support the introduction of controls in those areas not adjacent to the schools and shops.
  
- I would be grateful if you would consider the following specific questions (raised above) and inform me of your views:
  1. Has any approach been made to the freeholder or tenants of the shops/flats to encourage the use of the land to the rear of the shops for parking?
  2. Has the impact of double yellow lines been fully explored in respect of properties in Fairlands Avenue?
  3. Do you have any information, which justifies the proposals, as to when or how often enforcement action has been taken for poor parking at the locations listed in the section numbered 3 under the "Catch-all approach" heading?
  4. Can you please let me know the cost for implementing (installing) the controls on the ground and their enforcement?
  5. Would the costs of enforcement be passed on to residents in the Parish Council precept?

I would be grateful if you would refer my concerns to the Committee for consideration before the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is made.

349

I have studied the map and have no further comments to make concerning the proposed controls.

356	<p>Fairlands is residential as the name implies, was constructed for those who live there. The local school was an afterthought and already causes considerable traffic problems. To increase its size without the advice or opinion of local residents should not be our concern. It is therefore the responsibility of the school authorities to provide its own parking arrangements and not intrude upon others; there is surely adequate space and it not, why not?</p> <p>To install the suggested restrictions will only move the problem elsewhere, mainly to the grass verges which will be ruined in no time at all. Furthermore, I assume the reduction of safety for all has not escaped your notice.</p>
360	<p>My observations only refer to the parking around the shops, since I live adjacent to them and are abundantly aware of the parking issue.</p> <p>Restrictions should rightly be place on the south side of Fairlands Avenue from the roundabout and extending down to, and around into, Brooke Forest (preventing parking on the corner). Justification being that double parked vehicles in Fairlands Avenue cause a hazard as any vehicle leaving the service road is unable to see if the road is clear. Likewise, traffic travelling in either direction in the avenue often has to wait due to the reduced road width.</p> <p>Your current plan for the service road of time limited parking is unnecessary.; it will only push shop workers vehicles and those belonging to the residents above the shops into other areas, particularly outside Fairland Court. This in turn causes problems for me and other residents. Should you proceed with this timed parking how are you going to police compliance.</p> <p>Having lived in Fairlands Court for some 25 years I know the area well. There really is no justification for restrictions at the roundabout, St Michael's Avenue, St Michael's Road. The only safety problem is that detailed in my second paragraph.</p> <p>To proceed with your proposed plan is overkill and an unnecessary expense. Additionally, such bright yellow line aesthetically distract from our pleasant environment.</p> <p>What will be required is more wooden stakes places around the entire grassed area to prevent vehicles parking thereon and damaging same. This is often witnessed already.</p>
361	<p>I would like to reiterate my objection to any form of parking restriction being implemented.</p> <p>If you insist on bringing in parking restrictions, I would suggest that the yellow lines on Fairlands Avenue are moved to the north side of the road. Having cars parked on the residential side of the road will make it more difficult for residents to safely gain access to the highway from their drives as the sight-lines will be affected by cars and vans parked each side of the dropped kerbs.</p> <p>One of my objections to parking restrictions is still that it would likely impact adversely on the trade of the shops and Post Office. Apart from some minor inconvenience from time to time I do not feel from my observations that there is a parking problem in Fairlands.</p>



367	I agree with all the proposals suggested.
387	<p>I am in full agreement with the proposed parking restrictions on Fairlands. The traffic has got considerably worse in the last twelve months especially on the corner of Fairlands Avenue and Brocks Drive with the community centre and doctor's surgery entrance on that corner. When there is something happening at both places, cars are being parked all around that corner the buses (although hourly) can't get around and we don't want to lose our bus service.</p> <p>I notice the double yellow line is to go up to No.50. I live next door and would really like it extended to come up to my home, because if there are lorries and large vehicles parked outside, it is quite dangerous coming out on that corner without being able to see what is coming around.</p>
393	<p>I wish to repeat some of the comments I made during the initial stage of consultation.</p> <p>Fairlands does not have, and never has had, a residents' parking problem. The only areas of congestion caused by non-Fairlands residents are on the access road to the shops and the adjacent part of Fairlands Avenue and, during term times, in the road around the Fairlands School. Parents taking their children to the Fairlands school DO cause problems with speeding, parking on verges and blocking the roads to other traffic and buses.</p> <p>The currently proposed parking controls would see TROS placed around all junctions throughout Fairlands for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Since DfT rules state that these TROs should extend 15m (50ft) beyond the junction, this will prevent a large number of residents parking on their access drives, as they do at present. On the other hand, the TROs will do nothing to prevent non-resident parking beyond the restrictions, possibly causing consequential obstruction to residents' driveways.</p> <p>I realised that the new extension to the school will see a significant increase in the number of cars in Fairlands during the 'school run', and that some will park in roads remote from the school. However, I simply do not see that the current proposals will do anything to alleviate the present situation: parents will simply park their cars at points in Louis Fields and Envis Way beyond the extent of the TROs, making the situation even worse than it is now.</p> <p>I would have thought a more sensible approach would have been for the Council to proposed TROs along the full length of Louis Fields and he relevant part of Envis Way during the school run hours ONLY.</p> <p>This would only inconvenience residents during the daytime on weekdays, and only those residents who are being currently obstructed by inconsiderate visitors. The proposed "Limited Waiting Mon-Sat" along the access road outside the shops seems to be an eminently sensible solution. If it can be implemented there, why cannot the "No Stopping on School Keep Clear Markings" be extended to cover the remaindere of the two roads?</p>

402

This is an excellent idea as I have recently notices that several parents are encroaching on our road (Fairlands Road) which is very narrow and only needs one or two cars to cause a hold up if traffic come the other way.

If / when the school extension goes ahead the parking can only get worse. Even now during the school run the traffic is non-stop down this road.

ITEM 10