

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
	<p>Ash Church Road, Ash (introduced double yellow lines at brow of hill and limited waiting in lay-by) (6 representations)</p>
71	<p>I have a number of comments;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I support the proposal to remove all day parking in the lay by near Ash Station. However, as as been the case in the past, when the lay by is full, drivers park their vehicles on the adjacent grass verge wrecking the only green space we have nearby. There needs to be a low one bar fence positioned around the verge to stop this happening. 2. Controlling parking in the lay by will cause drivers, as the do now, to park over the other side of the road masking observation for residents emerging from our driveways and creating a significant safety hazard to resident drivers, other road users and pedestrians using the footpath. Double yellow lines along the side of the road would prevent this dangerous condition. 3. I support the proposal to control parking on the brow of the hill near St Peter's church and the church hall. 4. Since the introduction of parking charges at Ash Station more and more vehicles are parking along Foreman Road. I use this road most days and find it a significant hazard to drivers as due to the curvature of the road you often cannot see the where the end of the parked vehicle's are from either end. As a result vehicles meet in the middle, causing have to reverse with other vehicles behind them needing to do the same. In addition, there is only a footpath along a short stretch of the road which puts pedestrians at risk as well. Double yellow lines from the junction of Ash Church Road and Foreman Road to near the junction of Grange Road would control the risk. 5. There is ample free parking in two car parks on Ash Hill Road, encouraging well being through physical activity with a longer walk to Ash Station.
75	<p>As a resident of this street, I concur entirely with the proposals in the letter. It is a shame that the station car park has such limited space because that is, of course, the primary cause of the on-street parking situation as it currently stands. I would also request that the proposals are further enhanced to preclude parking in the "no-mans land" between the front boundaries of Numbers 16 to 24 Ash Church Road and the pavement. I understand that this land was compulsorily purchased from the then owners in order to allow the development in Britten Close to proceed and thus to facilitate a good view of the road towards Ash village centre when exiting the street. The "no-mans land" does not belong to those of us who live in Numbers 16 to 24 inclusive and it is very aggravating when members of the public park their vehicles there, usually in order to use the station. Our view towards Ash village centre is thus severely impeded when exiting our driveways. Given the proximity of the right hand bend approaching the brow of the hill towards St Peters Church, it can be a daunting prospect when exiting the driveway to head towards the village centre when one's visibility is impeded, particularly when vehicles coming from the village centre are exceeding the speed limit.</p>

125 Kendall Cars	<p>I am glad the Local Committee propose to remove parking near the brow of the hill close to St Peter's Church and the church hall, and introduce 'no waiting at any time' on the approach to the crossroad with Britten Close - areas marked in amber on your map. In my opinion this is a safety conscious decision, and will benefit local residents, businesses, and other road users not familiar with the area.</p> <p>I must, however, disagree with introduction of 2 hour limited waiting and no return within 4 hours in the lay-by near Ash Station and opposite to the entrance to our yard- marked purple on your map. The lay-by can accommodate five to six vehicles and is used mostly by Ash Train Station customers or visitors. Occasionally you will find there a vehicle which has been parked there by a trade person or private individual with the intention of selling it. The lay-by is not used by Kendall Cars Ltd. My fear is that once the restriction is in place, station customers will start using parking spaces which we provide to our customers in our own yard. We provide 10 allocated spaces to our customers, and parking availability can be increased by additional spaces during busy periods. We have had problems in the past with vehicles left for days in our car park by Station users. If the parking restriction is approved our customers will potentially have no choice but to park in the surrounding area, causing disruptions to local residents, with whom we have good relationship.</p>
Page 189 129	<p>We write on behalf of Holy Angles Roman Catholic Parish Church situated upon Ash Church Road in response to the draft parking proposals for the Ash Church Road area.</p> <p>Our concern is that if traffic is being forced further back along the road, it will put increased parking pressure on top the area opposite Ash Grange Children's Centre and Primary school where the parking situation is already very busy and dangerous.</p> <p>Our church car park is already being utilised by parents of the school, since there is not enough parking space, which is causing many problems for our parish and particularly affects elderly parishioners who find that their parking is already taken up by local parents, many of whom have exhibited aggressive behaviour. Holy Angels Church has consulted with the head of school who is supporting us with regards to the dangerous parking situation. The problem is especially compounded by the fact that there is no parking available for the council cemetery directly opposite the church. Families understandably tend to avail themselves of our car park but believe this is their entitlement.</p> <p>While we understand the reasons behind the parking restrictions we feel we ought to inform you that we are concerned about the increased pressure and traffic overspill on our car park and also the drive to the priests' house which contains a young family who often find themselves blocked in at school pick up and collection time.</p>
153	<p>I am very concerned, to say the least.</p> <p>I can see that the reason for this proposal could be to solve a problem, for example, parents parking their vehicles in this key location, close to Ash Grange School, for pick-up and drop-off of their school children. Painting double yellows in this area, right outside St Peter's Church, on both sides, would prevent the road narrowing down on either side, at either end of the school day; this could, consequently, prevent traffic accidents.</p> <p>However, I would like to ask whether or not there can be any provision made for weddings and funerals that currently take place at St Peter's Church, outside where the proposed double yellow lines are going to be painted. The bride surely cannot be expected to hoist up her skirts and cross the road to her wedding, from St Peter's Centre car park. By the same token, how can anyone be reasonably expected to unload a coffin from a hearse to transfer this from the hearse to the inside of St Peter's Church? I would ask that someone reassure me that, should this proposal go ahead, certain exceptions would be made in these cases - for the bride's vehicle,</p>

	<p>or a funeral hearse, to park outside the church, so that unloading and reloading can be effectively carried out. I'm not certain how this would actually work in practice, as some vehicles can be quite large, therefore not suitable for parking to wait, during the services, in St Peter's Church car park, so it may be that an exception would need to be made for these vehicles to park and wait until the services are over, then move on.</p> <p>I would ask you to give this proposal some serious consideration before this goes ahead, as the consequences of this happening could be quite disastrous for St Peter's Church, Ash, in respect of future weddings and funerals - the double yellow lines would deter anyone from arranging such services to take place there at all. St Peter's Church is a beautiful church and its people and clergy provide an essential service, in many respects, to the local community, within the parish of Ash and surrounding areas.</p> <p>I would like to propose that you include Winchester Road in the double yellow lines proposal.</p> <p>The specific location I recommend is outside of Shawfield School gates, heading down past the Caretaker's bungalow, right down to the end of the road, where it would meet Shawfield Road.</p> <p>The reason for my recommendation is that there are people who use this side of the road to park their car, part on the road, and part on the pavement, thereby narrowing the path for walkers, pram users and other pedestrians, causing a dangerous situation, particularly during certain times of the day during school pick-up and drop-off and also pick-up after the "after school" clubs. They have no consideration whatsoever that there are cars already parked outside the houses on the opposite side and the road narrows very dangerously for oncoming vehicles, potentially causing accidents.</p> <p>Please consider this proposal and, if possible, include this in your overall double yellow line plan.</p>
339	<p>I fully understand the need for additional parking controls as on street commuter parking for Ash station has increased recently. However, as a local resident in Britten Close my concern is that this will cause additional parking concerns in Britten Close, where there is already pressure for parking for residents without displaced commuter parking impacting on this.</p> <p>I am sure this will be the case for all the residential roads located around Ash station and although the proposed parking restrictions do not take too many of the currently used spaces away in this area, it will still have an effect on these residential roads which I feel should be considered in this and any future parking proposals.</p>

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
<p>Foreman Park, Ash (formalise existing disabled space)</p>	<p align="right">(3 representations)</p>
<p>Page 182 1</p>	<p>I am writing regarding the formalization of the existing disabled parking bay. This bay does not enable many disabled drivers to use it due to the location of the bay. I regularly have a disabled friend visit who uses a wheelchair , and this bay is completely unsuitable. Should she drive in forwards then being next to the kerb stops her getting out of the car. should she reverse in she can not open her drivers door as there are cars parked next door. We also have the same problem when elderly relatives who have blue badges visit. This would make much more sense to have it on Foreman Park road not in the bay, i.e. about a metre away from the existing bay, so that any disabled driver could use it, or is it only aimed at those who are disabled but don't need walking aids?</p> <p>The person who parks in the disabled bay owns the white van ! He blocked it so he couldn't get back in so parked further down road. His cars are the black and silver ones ! Ho got out of space as no car next door to his originally</p> <p>Please tell me that with the bay becoming compulsory that this is not madness!</p> <p>This is why this disabled space needs to be on the road not in this bay.</p> <p>In 25 years of living here we've never had parking problems until this bay was put in. The original person who wanted the bay walks with two sticks yet parks by his garage now. The bay on the road would have enabled him to park closer to his back gate.</p> <p>Just wondering why there are to be no new restrictions in Foreman Road, to the right as you come out of Foreman Park?</p> <p>The parking there is manic leaving us having to overtake up to 18 parked cars. We can't see what is coming. It is so dangerous and won't be long until a serious accident happens. We can't see to exit Foreman Park and the Parish Council have been unable to cut back the hedgerow this years.</p> <p>I feel this really needs looking at.</p>
<p>192</p>	<p>Firstly I'd just like to say the majority of these proposals look sensible and will improve safety. One area I think you would be advised to extend the no waiting at all times restriction would be on Foreman Road outside of Foreman Park. We've lived in Foreman Park for nearly 5 years now and steadily the number of people parking here to use the train station has increased which up until recently hasn't caused any safety issues (as people are just parking in Foreman Park).</p> <p>What people have recently started doing is parking on Foreman Road (and at the entrance to Foreman Park) which I've tried to highlight on your map in green:</p>



The cars parked in the green area reduce the road to a single carriageway and as its a 40mph road (and not everyone reduces their speed for this hazard) leaving Foreman Park to turn right can often lead to a potential head on collision with fast moving traffic from the south of Foreman Road. Cautiously coming up from the south you can be met by fast moving traffic from the North as by the time people reach this point after entering Foreman Road their speed is up. This hazard is increased further as this is a bend. If parking restrictions cant be imposed further down this road the speed limit should be reduced to ~20mph.

The parking in the green area at the entrance to Foreman Park is also a safety issue as it means people leaving Foreman Park have to be on the wrong side of the road, meaning people entering are met with a potential head on collision as well.

I'd recommend those responsible for parking changes visit the area during a working day to see how bad this can be. I don't doubt there will be an accident at this part of Foreman Road soon.

Thanks for your time and if possible I'd appreciate some feedback on these comments from those involved in these changes.

252

I live on Foreman Park, I have no objection to the formalising of the disabled bay.

I do have a big issue however with the vehicles parking on Foreman Road by persons using the rail station. The current double yellow lines have eased the issue in one respect, however it has now pushed the parking on Foreman Road further up towards Ash Green.

There are at times up to 30 vehicles parked here, meaning vehicles travelling from Ash Green towards the level crossing have to pass them on what is a blind bend and often meet on coming vehicles.

This has resulted in a number of very near miss collisions - I myself have been subject to some verbal abuse on my motorcycle when negotiating these parked vehicles and having to take avoiding action with on coming vehicles who technically have right of way but as the bend is blind because of these parked vehicles it was impossible to know either of us was coming.

In summary please extend the current double yellow lines from Foreman Park up to Grange Road to prevent this dangerous situation.

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
	<p>Ash Street and Star Lane, Ash (introduce various double yellow lines and limited waiting) (38 representations)</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 184</p> <p>12</p>	<p>I am a resident of Ash st., having just seen the notice regarding proposed parking changes, I read the online details in the pdf, and straight away I see proposed changes that will definitely cause big problems for residents from the petrol station to the Greyhound pub, with knock on affects to other residents & traffic (particularly during the rush hours).</p> <p>As the parking situation is now there is already insufficient parking spaces available. If I go out during the evening, I often find when I return I am forced to park nearly 1/4 of a mile away outside the hairdressers (no 47). Whilst it doesn't take long to walk there, it is a pain, (particularly if it's raining!), but more importantly if the alarm goes off in my car I won't hear it from home, which would cause a nuisance & I would miss the possibility to see what the problem is. Likewise if my car is hit or vandalised (it's been hit several times over the years & vandalised twice here!) I have zero chance of seeing who did it & so won't discover it until much later, & if anyone were to witness it, no one there is likely to know who my car belongs to.</p> <p>But this secondary choice of parking for me is where you propose to put double yellow lines!! And worse, the parking restrictions you propose outside the shops (not all spaces I realise) means it's unlikely I could park there either (not that I'd want to park that far!). I don't take my car to work as I walk in, (I'm lucky enough to work on the same street at the garage at No 62-66), so I leave it parked up near home.</p> <p>So if you get rid of the parking spaces outside the hairdressers, I & other residents will have to park much further away! (making the above problems worse). Although legally I could park on Shawfield rd (I believe), I have previously ruled out parking there as it would block 1 side of the road & cause traffic problems during the rush hour.</p> <p>Clearly no one has visited this end of Ash street after 6pm on a week day as anyone would of seen that all parking spaces are taken up between the Greyhound pub & the pedestrian crossing (the vast majority of the time), & nearly all are taken between that crossing & the area outside the hairdressers. As it is, some people are finding 'unofficial' parking spaces.</p> <p>I can only think that myself & other residents at this end of Ash st. who can't park here will either park on Shawfield rd or on Manor rd , obstructing those roads. (I'm sure those residents would be delighted about that!).</p> <p>I counter propose that you ditch the plans for double yellow lines between 47 Ash St. & the library (just that side, the other side it does make sense to put double yellow lines there & would cause no parking problems). Also I propose that you ditch a small part of the double yellow line proposal outside of no 6 to no 4 (I believe, no 4 is not shown on your map) & instead create 3 spaces with marked bays being 1/2 on the road & 1/2 on the pavement, the path is sufficiently wide enough to accommodate 1/2 of a cars width and still allow a double width pram to pass through with ease (I have seen it been done). The road is also wide enough to still allow cars & vans to pass both ways when cars are parked there, although admittedly not wide enough for lorries, coaches or buses. I have seen</p>

	<p>marked parking bays on paths before so I know this is not without precedent, however I don't know what the regulations are regarding the difficulties for buses & lorries etc to pass. I also wonder if it would be made possible for residents to park on the school slip road overnight only on weekdays & over the weekend, it wouldn't help me directly during the week but it would other residents.</p> <p>Even if the 3 bays I suggest is not possible I strongly object to your current parking proposals which would turn a current parking nightmare into a parking hell! I shall be speaking to our neighbours over the weekend about this & I'm sure you'll hear from at least some of them.</p>
15	<p>I am writing to advise I fully support the parking proposals for Ash Street.</p> <p>The introduction of No waiting at any time double yellow lines where indicated is fantastic news for the residents of Ash Street and is a necessary and long overdue change.</p> <p>I live in Ash Street and the cars and vans that currently park on the road opposite our house make it extremely difficult and dangerous to leave and enter our driveway and the constant congestion caused directly outside our house is not only an extremely bothersome noise and access issue but also a serious health and safety one for various reasons but especially the fact that cars/vans/regular buses are forced to drive on the wrong side of the road for a substantial distance.</p> <p>I look forward to these No waiting at any time double yellow lines proposed outside our home being put in place as soon as possible.</p>
17	<p>Please add my name as a supporter for the double yellow lines proposal along Ash Street, Ash, Guildford/Aldershot.</p>
19	<p>I would like to voice my support for the Ash Street parking proposals. The road has become increasingly congested thus making the extensive parking an issue for cars turning onto Ash Street. The proposals would ease the issue greatly.</p>
36	<p>We are writing in total support of the proposed parking controls on Ash Street.</p> <p>Although we have moved into the area only for one year, we have been continuously bothered by the people who park wherever they like on Ash Street and disregard other people's safety. Ash Street is not a very wide street, so people sometimes park partially on pavement which in turn obstructs pedestrians with say buggies or mobility scooters, etc. That creates hazards to other road users!! Moreover, due to the location of our house, when we come off our drive and get onto Ash Street itself, our view is always vastly obstructed by the row of parked cars partially parked on the pavement on the near side of the road. There have been many 'near miss' occasions because of the obstruction of views of the on-coming traffic. This is so unfair to us!</p> <p>The irony is that we know a couple of cars that parked there most of the time belong to the neighbours on the opposite side of the</p>

	<p>street which has no off road parking. So conveniently they park on our side of the street when the lay-by parking spaces on their side have been taken. This is a long term nuisance to us as it's not just school run parking, they are there most of the time, even on non school days. I think they have been warned by the police before but it is still happening as I type. I think enough is enough!! That is why we support the proposal 100%. Something needs to be done to improve the situation.</p>
41	<p>I am fully supportive of the proposed parking restrictions for Ash Street as they will go some way to improving the flow of traffic and therefore the safety of pedestrians and drivers. I am surprised that a speed limit of 20mph is not being considered.</p>
56	<p>I would like to object to the above proposals, I am registered disabled and have a motorbility car. I need to park close to my house so I do not have far to walk to my front door. I am in constant pain have had 2 back operations as well as 2 knee replacements and now waiting for a hip replacement.</p>
74	<p>I would like to oppose the suggested parking measures for Ash Street, Ash.</p> <p>Firstly, as a resident on the street, finding a parking spot is difficult at the best of times. Taking away parking opportunities for residents is only going to result in us having to park in other nearby streets. As a pregnant lady with a young child, this isn't great for me to say the least. And thinking of elderly neighbours, they too may have to park further away from their homes, meaning a further distance to walk to get home. There are quite a number of properties that are 100+ years old, with no facility to accommodate parking on their plot of land. Residents have to park somewhere. Considering each property has at least one car per household, I believe too many spaces will be lost.</p> <p>With regards to calming measures for traffic, if there are less cars parked on the road, will only mean cars going at even greater speed than they do now. We are lucky enough to have a traffic light crossing system outside the school to enable us safely to cross.</p> <p>I cannot understand what will be achieved from the double yellow lines apart from causing stress for residents trying to park and resulting in us aimlessly driving around parking in other roads with our cars and potentially having to walk a great distance with children/shopping etc to get to our houses.</p>
95	<p>In reference to the parking restriction proposals on Ash Street, I am writing to express that I am opposed to the plans to introduce double yellow lines. In particular, at the Greyhound end of the road and also outside the Co-op.</p> <p>I live in Ash Street (next to the pub) and parking can only be described as inadequate for the street already, the addition of yellow lines will deplete availability further. Where is it proposed that residents will park if these are introduced? People will have to park miles away from their homes and walk in the dark across the busy road. We already have to park in the pub car park often which is</p>

	<p>not fair on them as their spaces are for their customers. I do not wish to impose on their kind hospitality any further and assume my neighbours feel the same.</p> <p>We have actually just had to have our front driveway paved in order to ensure parking for our two cars (although until the council grant our permission to drop the curb we are unable to use it- that is another matter). Despite this move, there is still not enough parking for the residents, let alone visitors to the school. I cannot see where these cars are expected to vanish to if lines are added. I fear that our new expensive drive will simply be blocked constantly if drivers can see no alternative location. This would be offensive and unacceptable to us.</p> <p>The Co-op further along Ash Street requires parking availability- there is no question of this. It is already a struggle for customers to park and shop in there- this is an observation as we are able to walk there but I often see parents struggling with bags and small children, or older patrons finding difficulty to park nearby or walk to a far-off car. Surely local business are encouraged to thrive in the community rather than be restricted?</p>
116	<p>My concern is that if 'no waiting at any time' restrictions are put in place this could then increase the speed of traffic travelling along Ash Street. As an Ash Street resident when the road is clear, particularly at night, the speed in which cars drive through the village is frightening. I am very concerned that a clear road, outside a school, will not be safe for our children. Whilst I do agree that the parking issues need to be looked at I strongly feel that traffic speed also needs to be addressed.</p>
135	<p>I am a resident of Old Chapel Lane in Ash and am emailing regarding the proposed changes to the parking controls in Ash Street and Star Lane – ref KM/16/0003.</p> <p>I am extremely concerned about the impact of displaced parking to Old Chapel Lane caused by the introduction of parking controls to Ash Street and Star Lane. This is a narrow private road used for access to and from 8 houses near to the Co-Operative shop. There is already a problem with inconsiderate parking by people using the local shops and lorries unloading/loading, frequently making it difficult to use the road and blocking the pavement. On 2 recent occasions, Old Chapel Lane has been completely blocked by inconsiderate parking, which has caused us to be late for work and our children late to school. I know from discussions with the other residents of Old Chapel Lane that they have been similarly affected by the problem. I am very worried that stricter parking controls on Ash Street will cause more people to use Old Chapel Lane to park their cars and will increase the frequency of us being unable to use the road and leave for school/work.</p> <p>May I please ask what consideration is being given to the impact of displaced parking to local residents and if there are any proposals to tackle the problem?</p> <p>While I do understand that parking controls need to be considered, if the end result is that parking will be displaced to Old Chapel Lane, then I would like to object to the proposals please.</p>

161

Page 188

I have been living in Ash Street, Ash, GU12 6LG for 33 years now, having moved in during November 1982 and during that time I have found that the number of cars/vans parked along the street to have increased exponentially.

Having read through the proposed changes to the parking regulations along Ash Street I would like to counter with the following comments.

- A. The two "Ash Library" bus stops are offered no protection whatsoever; at present both bus stops are frequently full of parked cars/vans, causing the buses to double park and bring the flow of traffic to a halt. Indeed the abuse of the Aldershot bound bus stop often results in west bound cars passing the wrong side of the "Keep Left" island outside the Library, an action dangerous to pedestrians looking the wrong way when crossing the road.
- B. Putting a two hour limit on the parking bays outside 65 and 67 Ash Street is rather pointless, unless the purpose is to protect parking spaces for the shop's customers; the problem is not the longevity of the parking but the selfish and inconsiderate attitude of the drivers. Apart from one or two employees at the Co-op at number 69, people very rarely park along this stretch for more than 15 minutes or so.
- C. Numbers 65 and 67 have "Access Protection Lines", Council applied white lines (getting very faint now), which are ignored by a large minority of the drivers and indeed on occasion they are used by some as a marked out parking bay! I have, on average, up to 10 cars a day obstructing or partially obstructing my driveway, each being there for between 5 and 15 minutes which means that for at least one, possibly two, hours a day I cannot leave or enter my driveway with a vehicle, unless I choose to go to the shop and find the driver. Both my wife and I have been verbally abused on occasions when confronting these drivers about their parking. The driveways of these three properties (63, 65 & 67), require better protection from inconsiderate drivers.
- D. I applaud the addition of the double yellow lines to be applied on the North side of the street between the Library and the Walsh Infant School; this should help the flow of traffic along that section of Ash Street, especially buses and other large vehicles which are forced to wait for a gap in the on-coming traffic in order to proceed.
- E. Having said all of the above, the main problem is of course not the application of paint to the road's surface but the enforcement of the regulations. As an example the double yellow lines outside number 61 Ash Street are often ignored by drivers parking to go to the Co-op shop.

211

My husband and I have resided in Ash Street for 25 years, and feel that the proposed parking restrictions are neither necessary or an advantage to the safety of our street.

We think the existing double yellow lines are perfectly adequate, and whilst we can see that a lot of passing cars actually take no notice of these outside shops, that is something that could be policed and if some drivers were actually prosecuted this might make people take notice, as they certainly don't at the moment. That sort of parking of course causes problems.

By giving so many areas with no parking lines you are actually inviting drivers to pass through the this area at much faster speed levels than the current 30 mph. Surely with a school and a library in such close proximity we should have a 20 mph speed limit, now that would definitely make the roads safer for our children, and young and old, as we often see cars travelling through much faster than 30 mph as it stands, more open areas will invite motorists to speed more. We can see this already, once some drivers go slowly along where cars are parked, they speed up.

At least with the existing parking bays where they currently are, drivers, in the main, reduce their speed when approaching parked vehicles.

	<p>To prevent speeding in all drivers, why can we not have speed bumps installed similar to the Shawfield Road area, which I can see has definitely controlled the speed along that road.</p> <p>By doing away with some of the existing parking areas, where are some of these residents going to park their cars, what consideration has been given to us residents, not a lot from what I can see.</p> <p>Are you seriously expecting us and our families to park and then block the roads around Star Lane, Ashley Lodge Drive and even Manor Road and walk back to our houses.</p> <p>Many of us residents are OAP's and that is not a practical or safe solution for us not to be able to park near our houses. We have grown up children with babies and small children coming in to their grand parents, are mothers really expected to park in Star Lane to struggle to come and see us. AND Are we really expected to park half a mile from where are houses are?</p> <p>It would be interesting for you to inform us of exactly how many accidents are caused along our road? As in 25 years I can not remember a single incident.</p> <p>Control the speed through our village, that should be your top priority, by reducing the speed limit as I have mentioned above.</p> <p>Living opposite a school, we can see that the school have done their bit by introducing a drop off system for parents, but even I can see that there needs some roadside parking for mothers, due to the numbers that attend both schools, by taking this away the little parking they can find once home owners have gone to work, you are creating more of a problem with them, they will just park regardless in front of people's drives and create personal problems.</p> <p>We are opposed to your plan as it stands at the moment.</p>
217	<p>I am opposed to your idea of additional yellow lines in Ash Street and outside Gordon Farleys.</p> <p>If these parking spaces are lost I feel there will be a knock-on affect as car owners fight over the remaining spaces and that I will lose the ability to park outside my house. I am 85 years old and have lived in Ash Street for 42 years and understand fully the traffic problem you are trying to solve. The busy traffic along Ash Street at certain times of the day are unavoidable due to the children attending school, but we know these proposed lines will not solve the problem, it will create others. There are several elderly and disabled residents that rely on their cars so please leave the parking as it is.</p> <p>We can put up with the bad traffic, but we cannot cope with the loss of parking spaces that are vital to our everyday living. Please listen to the residents that live with this problem every day.</p>

226	<p>As a resident of Ash Street, i am very pleased to see the proposals and consider they will make the egress from my property much easier, especially at busy times. it will also contribute to road safety, given the number of children and families crossing the road to access the three schools in the area.</p> <p>However, there is clearly a need for adequate parking for those collecting and dropping-off schoolchildren, and it would be interesting to know how you think this need is likely to be met, if the proposed changes go ahead.</p>
245	<p>I am writing this email to lodge my objection to the proposal for alterations to Parking restrictions made in Ash Street and Star Lane, Ash (reference KM/16/0003).</p> <p>My father (who is now 85 years old) and I have resided in Ash Street for over 40 years, during which time we have already fell victim to similar changes Made when a pedestrian crossing was built adjacent to our house, which meant we were then unable to park outside our residence.</p> <p>We had no option but to concrete & tarmac over our front garden at over £1000 expense to us, in order to be able to park within reasonable distance our house.</p> <p>This is especially relevant these days as my father is on full disability living allowance, so requires a vehicle to be in close vicinity to our property.</p> <p>Having no parking - as well as a heavily used pedestrian traffic light - has also had the effect of devaluing the value of our property, so we have personally suffered more than most by previous parking control developments.</p> <p>My main concern with the new proposal is that residents just down from The Greyhound Public House will not have sufficient car parking spaces for their vehicles; There are 22 properties from The Greyhound to where the current zig-zag lines commence that are part of the pedestrian crossing, and if the new proposals were implemented this would leave only in the region of 12 spaces – therefore where exactly do those who live in these 22 houses park if no places are available?</p> <p>Certainly not in Ash Street – as under the new proposals no further parking spots seem to be available in Ash Street at all, with the adjacent Star Lane having new parking restrictions imposed in addition.</p> <p>Another problem I see regularly is a huge build-up of traffic in Ash Street between the hours of 8am & 9.15am & 2.30pm & 3.45pm, due the presence of the two schools in Ash Street (plus two more in close proximity).</p> <p>The new proposals I believe will only lead to worsen the inevitable bun fight for parents seeking to park their vehicles to drop off/pick up their children at the schools in any vacant spaces down from The Greyhound, increasing the already high level of congestion.</p> <p>I also would query how these additional parking restrictions would be policed and therein the extra costs to providing resources to do this, as I have witnessed on many occasions parents during these drop off/pick up times parking illegally in Ash Street, without apparent care or concern as to where they park as they know they are highly unlikely to be penalised in any event.</p>

	<p>My suggestion therefore is these proposals should be rejected, and things left as they are unless a better, more sensible proposal can be made, which protects Ash Street's residents as the first priority.</p> <p>As someone who has been denied this by previous developments, I believe they have a perfect honest right to park outside their own properties, without having to put up with the inconvenience and cost that we incurred previously through no fault of our own.</p> <p>As someone who experiences traffic conditions in Ash Street on a daily basis for many years I feel better qualified than most to comment on this proposal and I hope you will strongly consider the points I have made above in objection to this proposal and its conclusion.</p>
253	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed parking restrictions in Ash Street, initially I thought it was a good idea but when I was walking to the school the other morning and I realised that I think this will actually cause more harm than good as without the parked cars it will become a faster road. Cars have to naturally slow down as they approach the one stop shop as the road narrows a little and there cars park on one side, without these cars they will not decrease speed and I fear a nasty accident. In my opinion a better and safer option would be to install railings down the school side of the road between the shop and the school or pillars which would stop cars mounting the pavement and reassure parents who have heard of people being struck by wing mirrors. Also I think it unfair on parents who drive their children to school as I don't know where they will park and the school only offers a drop off system in the morning, there is no such procedure to pick up your children.</p>
256	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed parking restriction in Ash street, as this would make it impossible to visit my elderly parents with their grandchildren. There will be no spaces left for the residents like my parents to park outside the own home if there is yellow lines there will only be a few spaces left which everyone will be fighting for. It would also cause problems for myself trying to take my children to and from school. We don't all live in walking distance to the school and a lot of the mums have to go straight to work after dropping the children off. Also the parents from both school have not been told about these restriction and I not sure they will not be happy as there will not be anywhere to park which will cause uproar.</p>
258	<p>The traffic around this area on the morning is awful. But we need somewhere to park to drop the children too school.</p> <p>Walking further along this roads with my child make me feel un safe. There are big lorries coming along and fast vehicles. Please could you consider putting in speed bumps and changing the speed to 20 miles per hour.</p> <p>People will still park there to drop their children off even if it is a double yellow line!!</p>
259	<p>I'd like to start by thanking the council for reviewing the parking situation in Ash Street in light of recent issues. I was hit on the shoulder by the wing mirror of a van when walking my daughter to school a few months ago, because the available road space is too narrow for the traffic using it at peak times. I'm a resident on Ash Street and can confirm that peak traffic flow is intense. However, we also have other issues to deal with and so my feedback to the proposals falls into the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Proposal to restrict parking using double yellow lines between the library and Walsh Memorial Infants and Junior schools. Your proposals aim to restrict parking along this stretch of road, permanently, by use of double yellow lines. An admirable proposal and probably better than doing nothing, but not my preferred solution. I feel this is a blunt weapon, causing other problems and in fact only useful if properly enforced. I am, however, fully in favour of enforcement to prevent parking in the bus stop outside the One Stop as this does cause havoc on a regular basis, with buses having to stop in the road and some

	<p>drivers overtaking them, going the wrong way around the central bollard and generally causing a danger to those around them.</p> <p>2) Amenity for local residents and businesses Loss of parking outside of peak times is actually going to be more detrimental to local residents and businesses (the hair salon, library, One Stop and others) and especially outside of peak traffic flow times when it's still relatively safe to park along this stretch. Peak traffic problems are between 8.15 and 9.00 in the morning, 2.45 and 3.30 in the afternoon, and 5.00 to 6.00 in the evening. At evenings and weekends it seems entirely reasonable for visitors to houses on this stretch of road to park here, without causing difficulty to traffic flow.</p> <p>3) Road safety / traffic calming requirements. What Ash Street particularly needs is traffic calming. At peak traffic flow times, parking restricts the available space but nothing stops large articulated lorries, car transporters, tractors, funfair operators etc from using this route as the SatNav recommended route from Aldershot to Guildford and Woking, when the landscape of the road cannot cope with these vehicles. Out of peak traffic flow times, drivers are often tempted to travel along this stretch faster than the mandated speed limit. Physical traffic calming measures would help ensure that large vehicles seek alternative routes while ensuring that regular traffic keeps to a safe speed limit. Personally, I do not like "speed bumps" as I drive a classic car with minimal ground clearance, but would favour the introduction of priority chicanes as can be seen in Tongham. I would also favour a lower speed limit outside the school, with the introduction of textured tarmac so drivers are encouraged to slow down through feedback through the wheel.</p>
269	<p>I wish to express my full support of the proposed, No waiting at anytime yellow lines, between 34&54 Ash Street and 10 Ash Street towards The Greyhound pub.</p> <p>My reasons are wholly due to promote a safer journey to school for the children of Ash Walsh infants and juniors.</p> <p>On numerous occasions, over the last year, pedestrians on the pavement, on their walk towards the school (and many years previous I speculate), on the pavement between 34&54 Ash Street, have been stuck by passing vehicles wing mirrors. The reason for this is due to the cars parked cars on the opposite side of the road, between 47&55 in particular. It forces vehicles travelling in both directions through a narrow passage way, forcing cars to travel so closely up against the kerb stone that the vehicles wing mirror overhangs the pavement. I myself have been a recent victim to such an issue, incident reported to the police, ref OR-5101267-777 where upon, as a result of the vehicles collision, it has caused injury to my wrist, that now requires medical attention.</p> <p>Having said that though, I am aware that if the road is clear of parked cars on both sides of Ash Street, then the speed at which vehicles travel at will then increase, posing a further danger to the children. Perhaps, in addition to the yellow lines you could introduce railings outside house numbers 46-30????????</p> <p>I am AGAINST new parking restrictions (yellow lines) down Star Lane. Parking down Star Lane allows working parents to collect their child straight from work, there is not other parking solution. Yellow lines placed where you have proposed will only cause a parking issue further down Star Lane, a pointless exercise! cars will just park on opposite side, solving nothing.</p>

275	<p>I write to register my opposition to the proposed parking controls for Ash Street and Star Lane. I refer specifically to the drawing "Draft proposals, Ash Street and Star Lane, Ash" where the diagram shows that further areas will be covered by double yellow lines.</p> <p>Congestion and parking problems in the vicinity of my property are primarily caused by parents of children at the two nearby schools. The issue that affects me is the very frequent blockage of the drive to my house on school days.</p> <p>The likely effect of the proposed controls will be to cause there to be more vehicles parked in the vicinity of my property and significantly increase the likelihood of my drive being blocked. I suspect that the situation could become so bad that I would have to leave my car outside on the street, rather than on the drive.</p> <p>The only way to resolve the parking issues in the area will be to require the schools to provide adequate parking on site, such that parents are not parking inconsiderately in the area.</p> <p>At school pick up time I have seen cars parked on private property outside no 47 and no 32. Attempting to prevent people parking outside a narrow defined area will likely lead to a greater frequency of such incidents.</p> <p>From my point of view, the issue of my drive being blocked could, in theory, be solved by further extending the double yellow lines so that they reach to no 43, however I am sceptical about the effectiveness of enforcement. It seems to me that people frequently ignore the double yellow lines that currently exist in the area.</p> <p>If any change to the parking in the area causes me increased problems, then I will have to be in contact with the planning committee to suggest further amendments.</p>
277	<p>I would like to <u>OBJECT</u> to the proposed Yellow Lines in Ash Street.</p> <p>Ash Street is already a fast road, if you add yellow lines and take away the parked cars this will make the road much faster. As there are two schools on Ash Street this really isn't a good idea!!</p> <p>Also, where are all the residents who have lived there for years going to park?? Some have lived in Ash Street for 40 years they have got used to the fact they can't park outside their houses at school pick up and drop off, but not being able to park at all is madness, where will all the cars go??? This will impact on the value of their houses as well.</p> <p>Where will all the school parents and visitors to the school park, not everyone can walk to school. The school have also asked that no one parks on the school site when collecting from afterschool clubs... Where are they all going to park when collecting??? I can see its going to be mayhem, with all parents driving round trying to find a space. I would assume they will all park where the yellow lines stop so further down star lane etc... making those places even busier.</p> <p>Lots of school parents park on the Front of Gordon Farley's shop, I see he has put in planning for 5 flats, which will bring probably another 10 cars to Ash Street and the school parent won't be able to park there either.</p> <p>The parked cars on Ash Street, aren't the reason for slow traffic in Ash Street, the only time its slow and busy are school times/rush hour. The other day the co-op delivery Truck double parked outside the co-op causing a huge traffic jam both ways down Ash Street</p>

	<p>they were stand still for ages.</p> <p>I really don't know how the Yellow Lines will help anything, I believe they will make it worse.</p> <p>If these yellow lines do go ahead, what are you going to do about the speed on Ash Street, how will you slow the traffic outside and near to the schools??? I believe you will cause more traffic problems, with parents driving round and round trying to park.</p>
284	<p>As a resident of Ash Street for 45 years I would like to strongly object to your proposals and appeal to Guildford Borough Council to reconsider the necessity of this scheme. I would also suggest that views of the local residents that are affected by such changes should be considered at a far earlier stage.</p> <p>The real issue for Ash Street is the completely inadequate provision of parking for both Walsh First and Walsh Middle Schools which creates chaos twice a day where parents dropping off and picking up school children park anywhere and everywhere.</p> <p>This is compounded by the poorly considered decision to allow a co-op store to be built within a few hundred yards again with no provision for parking other than along Ash Street.</p> <p>It should be noted that outside of school opening and pick up times the street provides sufficient parking for local residents and users of both shops and is neither unsafe or affects traffic flow.</p> <p>It seems patently obvious that far from improving the situation, decreasing the number of available spaces will actually make things far worse and in view of this we strongly reject the proposals.</p>
297	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed parking controls on Ash Street and Star Lane.</p> <p>I live in Ash Street, on the corner of Ash Street and Star Lane, and currently have no off-street parking available. When I purchased this property, I was able to park directly outside the house. But then double yellow lines were extended along the entire frontage of the property which caused friction between myself and my neighbours in competing for space.</p> <p>There is now precious little space available, and I cannot understand how reducing the available parking further is going to help. I would suggest that you should look at providing *more* parking, rather than further restrictions. Perhaps the car park at Ash Library could be left open?</p> <p>Looking at your map, please note the white spaces which it might be assumed are available for parking are in fact in front of driveways and a bus stop. Although the bus stop is not indicated on the ground, I have had the police on one occasion call on me at home to ask me to move my car from the vicinity of the bus stop. So it will essentially not be possible for me to park anywhere near my home.</p> <p>There is a serious problem with parking in the area, due to both customers visiting the Co-op and, more seriously, parents dropping off and waiting for children from the junior school. Due to this intense competition people often park outside my house on the double yellow lines, or in the bus stop. Employing a two-hour restriction will do nothing to deter this behaviour, but will only serve to penalise residents who need somewhere to park their vehicles when at home.</p>

	<p>I also believe that the proposed restrictions will adversely affect the value of my home because prospective buyers will be aware that there is no parking available for themselves or their guests.</p> <p>Please don't do this. It's enough of a struggle to find a parking space as it is. These proposals would make my life hell.</p>
300	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed changes to parking restrictions along Ash Street, Ash.</p> <p>The section of road between the library and greyhound pH consists mainly of pre-war housing with no driveways or other form of off-road parking. There are a significant number of young families and older people in the road who rely on the current parking arrangements and their ability to park outside of, or very near to their properties. Additionally, people visiting the post office rely on the small section of on street parking near to the library.</p> <p>We feel that the current parking situation is just about adequate for residents needs, and for those visiting the shops and school. A further reduction in on-street parking would cause chaos along this busy stretch of road.</p>
327	<p>We are writing to express our concern regarding the proposed parking changes to Ash Street.</p> <p>As residents of Ash street we believe the proposed changes will lead to greater congestion in the area where '2 hours no return for four hour zone' is proposed. The majority of traffic that parks in this area does so to pop in and use the Co-Op shop. The cars are therefore parked for about 5 - 15 minutes and restricting it to 2 hours maximum will not reduce this. As the other part of the road is set to become double yellow this will cause cars to park in this 2 hour zone and also in Ash Lodge Drive, or for cars to risk it and park on the double yellows if they just plan to pop into the shop.</p> <p>Parking is already difficult for us, we live in the proposed two hour zone and we believe this will make parking for us even more difficult as cars that could park more towards star lane will not be able to so will park in the zone outside our house.</p> <p>We believe a possible solution, if the proposed changes are agreed, could be for the residents in this section of road to have permits which allow them to park in this zone with no restrictions.</p> <p>We appreciate that there can be congestion in this area, particularly during peak times. This is often caused when larger vehicles such as buses or lorries pass through - particularly when the large delivery lorries for the Co-Op are parked. Implementing the proposed changes will not solve this problem as there is no-where else for the lorries to park and traffic is only able to pass in a single flow at these times.</p>
332	<p>I disagree with the traffic proposal for ash road, near the Walsh infant primary.</p> <p>There us already lack of parking to get to school and this would just make it even harder for parents go park and get to school.</p> <p>Also what is needed down this road is traffic calming measures as cars speed down this road and also across pedestrian crossing whilst people still crossing. I have personally documented events like this that have happened to me and complained to school in hope to get some traffic calming measures or a lollipop lady or longer time on crossing that us there.</p>

	<p>I believe that taken out yellow lines would in fact increase speeding that is already present and make the road faster than it already is!! Presenting and even harder problem to keep children safe whilst using the road.</p> <p>The crossing in front of one stop on ash road is frequently a trouble spot as motorist unwilling to wait for those crossing and rush through leaving mothers stranded with large pushchairs and you children on a very small crossing.</p> <p>There is not enough safety measures on this road and not only have over four near misses with careless drivers on the way to school I have heard and seen on the PTA at school that there has been many a reported near miss.</p> <p>The yellow lines ,would like I say, would just make it a speedway , which it already is a problem. Plus even more lack of parking for parents using cars.</p>
335	<p>I have recently moved to Ash and live on Ash Street so these proposed changes would have a significant impact on me. I am aware that having on street parking affects the flow of traffic through Ash but I see this as a positive impact as it slows traffic, making this a safer and potentially quieter road. I believe cars would frequently far exceed the speed limit with these parking restrictions in place. There is also little opportunity to park else where so if there is no on street parking, where are residents, visitors and shop users supposed to park?</p> <p>In conclusion, I am strongly opposed to these planned parking changes.</p>
338	<p>I live on Ash Street near the pub and the parking situation this end is dangerous. We have cars parked with 2 wheels on the pavement most evenings and weekends and often during the day too, especially at school start and finish times. This makes our view of the oncoming traffic from the right towards the roundabout very restricted and dangerous when we are trying to pull out. This road can be very busy at times especially as it is a main route to Aldershot from the station. The other problem is access on the pavement for wheelchairs and buggies. There is a disabled bungalow down this end and I have seen the staff have to push the wheelchairs out into the road to get round the cars because there isn't enough room on the pavement. They have called the police before who spoke to the owners but they soon come back again. I really think it is only a matter of time before an accident occurs here.</p>
375	<p>Our concerns are that this will not leave enough parking spaces along the Ash Street section form the pedestrian crossing zig zag lines to the traffic islands by the post office so we would object to these parking restrictions. I did notice that your map does not show the existing pedestrian crossing of zigzag no parking lines which already restricts parking in this area. If your plans go through it will leave five parking spaces outside our houses and one of our neighbours will be putting in for a disabled bay shortly, so we would be lucky to get one of the other spaces when everyone including school workers are fighting over the last few. Also the rest of us are not getting any younger and can do without having to carry shopping from miles away + the supermarkets will not stop on yellow lines to deliver goods. So if this goes through as I am usually the last one home on shift work I will have to park in one of the estates outside someone else's house.</p> <p>A couple of years ago we did have a meeting with the police and council members on Ash Street traffic (they left the crossing off their diagram as well) and the decision was that parking in Ash Street was good because it slowed the traffic down to a reasonable speed which was a good thing.</p> <p>It seems to me that most of the problem are caused by the parents twice a day going to school and then they do most of the</p>

complaining but they cause the problems because they park anywhere and you never see any police on site to advise these drivers of their mistakes.

If these restrictions happen that means we can say goodbye to any visits from family of friends who at the moment have to work around school drop off and pick up times or they have nowhere to park.

We did apply for planning to have a dropped kern (not cheap) and we were turned down by the council for this and now will be lucky to park outside our house if these restrictions go through.

There are not that many parking bay between the roundabout and pedestrian crossing so I guess they will also be trying to park down this end as well.

I notice there will be no parking outside the local shops so I guess these will probably close once customers drop off so no more local shops either.

Obviously this will also devalue our properties with the restricted parking in the street.

Unfortunately, the traffic problems seem to be insoluble, given the ever increasing volume of traffic.

However, I do have a couple of points concerning Star Lane which over the last 7 years has become a cut through between Ash Street (A323) and Shawfield Road (B3206). As you are doubtless aware, there is frequently gridlock at the top end, particularly between 14:30-15:30 when parents park to collect children from the schools. It is quite alarming witnessing the antics and impatience of some drivers – driving on pavements is common.

Regarding the introduction of 'No waiting yellow lines' I would suggest that these should be mirrored on the other side of the road, otherwise motorists will merely changes side to park, thus creating a chicane effect. If this small section which happens to be just about where the road bends, it kept clear it will help keep traffic moving. I also suggest removing the single parking space.

Finally, I should mention that a number of other residents have queried whether it would be possible for a temporary parking space to be provided behind the schools for parents collecting their children.

NO TO PARKING RESTRICTIONS in ASH ST.

I would like to strongly oppose your plans to control parking in Ash Street and Star Lane. Our community in Ash Street feel our parking arrangements are as good as they can be for shops, school and library. There residents have adequate overnight parking at present but this would be lost with your plans for new parking restrictions.

Your plan of the area is very misleading. Opposite the school in Ash Street it shows a parking area in front of 22 hours, this area is reduced by 50% by existing 'no park' road markings that you have omitted to show. Your new arrangements only allow for 16 spaces when most of my neighbours are 2 car families. Why do you wish to prohibit parking in front of the shops leading to the library, it's ideal for school/shop/library and residents overnight parking with no adverse affect to traffic flow whatsoever. I have not met anyone that can see any merit in your proposals. Drawing a few coloured lines on a map and discussing it at a meeting does not show a true picture of what these palns will have on our community.

	<p>These parking restrictions will have a damaging effect on those that live along Ash Street and I hope you will take not of our protest and valid reason for retaining the parking arrangements we have.</p>
<p>Page 198 379</p>	<p>I am very worried about our proposed plans to alter the parking arrangements in Ash Street and Star Lane. The reasons for the proposed changes do not seem to relate to Ash Street directly and would not improve the situation at all.</p> <p>We have adequate parking at present for residents, if things stay as they are.</p> <p>Children from 2 schools can be 'dropped/picked up' without undue inconvenience close to the school. Under our present conditions the road is busy but traffic flow is unaffected.</p> <p>Roads signs direct unnecessary traffic to Woking along Ash Street for some reason, perhaps new signage could steer them down the A331 and M3 to Woking instead (this would eliminate some goods and lorry traffic).</p> <p>I have lived in Ash Street nearly 40 years and I can see no reason at all for change with regard to parking. Everything is running fine, traffic speed self regulates itself and there is a natural traffic calming affect with school children are about which is an important safety issue. If anyone from the council was worried about pupil welfare we would have had a '20 mile flashing speed limit' by now.</p> <p>Could I please recommend that someone goes to Ash Walsh School as there seems to be enough land to draw up plans for off road parking for school users and residents. That would be a positive step forward.</p> <p>Ash Street residents were involved in a meeting, 10-15 years ago when yellow line parking controls were suggested then. After a reasoned debate the conclusion was that in fact No improvement to traffic flow of safety would benefit from restricting Ash Street parking.</p> <p>Your yellow lines are not needed. Leave well alone.</p>
<p>380, 399 & 408</p>	<p>Could I draw to your attention to your plans to restrict parking in Ash Street between The Greyhound PH and The Library.</p> <p>I note with interest you believe your plans will improve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Our turn over of space in regard to local facilities ii) Safety iii) Access iv) Traffic flow <p>As a resident for over 35 years we have had no problem with the items you list above and think you can improve.</p> <p>At present there is ample space for local residents overnight parking + deliveries can be made during work hours and at peak times</p>

9am & 3pm, 'School Mums' cope without undue hindrance to others and legally park in the area without any risk to anyone's safety. You are trying to solve a problem that does not exist.

Your new yellow lines will do nothing, if 2 lorries meet one will yield and they will pass as they have always done. The school children will come and go as usual, so safety – access – traffic flow are not valid reasons for change.

Parking is your plans biggest failing, 22 houses will be left with spaces for 16 cars. Some have their own drives but most households have 1/2/3 cars and as your plan shows there is absolutely no where else they can go.

This road runs through the heart of our community and would be improved in anyway by your plans. LEAVE THINGS AS THEY ARE PLEASE.

There is considerable unrest, worry and in some cases anger at your new parking proposals. This part of Ash Street had the original housing from the 1900s and is solely residential and very, very dependent on the existing parking arrangements. We have always had kerb-side parking outside our homes, there is absolutely no alternative for us. Many home-owners are retired, we have 'disabled' and 'children with special needs' living along Ash Street, totally dependent on their vehicles. Parking arrangements work very well with room for all.

Twice a day (30mins at 9am & 3pm) we share the available spaces with dozens of mums and their cars, as they park and then walk their children to and from 2 schools situated across the road from our homes. The road becomes overloaded with the additional traffic but the main reason for slow moving traffic is the Pedestrian Crossing continually showing a red light as children cross over and safely reach their schools. I have been monitoring traffic conditions through school 'comings & goings' over several days and although the system is under strain, never does grid-lock occur or come close to it. Even when bus meets lorry there is no significant hold up. This daily event has passed without mishap*and we have accepted the situation and the inconvenience for years.

Your plans for yellow lines outside Gordon Farley will make little difference to traffic flow, safety, etc., please believe us, we know. It would reduce parking to 16 spaces, 3 spaces would be lost to a Bus Stop and another to a Disabled space already agreed by SCC so the total of space would be 123 spaces to service 2 schools – 22 homes – 2 shops – pub – post office and an ATM machine.

We can tolerate the traffic but we residents should not have to bare the added penalty and hardship of not being able to park our own cars outside our own homes.

23 hours out of every day is trouble free, there is not problem to solve. We were threatened with 'yellow lines' several years ago and a public meeting exposed the weak argument and the idea of parking restrictions were dropped immediately.

A local Councillor had offered some advice after visiting Ash Street. Reading between the lines it appears you could take our letters to a council meeting and make a decision behind closed door and then stream roller through what you want.

Talking to neighbours who totally understand how parking and traffic work together along this part of Ash Street, we could offer better alternatives to the poor idea of yellow lines.

[* I have recently heard how a pedestrian was frightened by a passing vehicle as she walked close to the pavement edge. Could you please comment on this event, are crazy Health & Safety laws affecting our parking? Our friends in Ash Vale had the chimes on their 100 year old village clock silences because a new resident had a problem with noise under Health & Safety, it's madness]

We, the local home owners, feel that we may have been seriously misled by your letter. As residents we would like the existing parking to remain unchanged from Studio 12 hairdressers / Gordon Farley and along to the library on the A323 Guildford carriageway. (there are no objection to other parking restrictions).

We have provided our reasons to the Council in writing. We totally understand the situation concerning traffic flow and the need for parking for i) shoppers ii) residents iii) school mums, and all have lived with the current parking arrangements for many years. We have had meetings before regarding restriction Ash Street parking and they have been rejected.

A GBC document has come to light today** which indicates that parking restrictions will be applied due to 'accident history'. This was not stated, nor the GBC document which indicates that parking restrictions will be applied due to 'accident history'. This was not state, nor the GBC document referenced within the initial parking consultation document. This suggests that residents concerns, specifically relating to parking, will be ignored.

The school have informed us of a mother bruised, by a passing car door-mirror.

Could we have details / dates of other accidents your have on record please. Have the police got the details?

Nothing is more important than child safety. Could a study be made of what would be required for children to be dropped off / picked up on school premises. They appear to have plenty of space. Safety worries for children from both schools, parking, traffic flow / congestions would be solved instantly, forever.

Mums that bring children to school have no idea at all that parking close to school will be impossible. It seems they also have been deliberately left out of the information loop. We feel that reducing parking within the street, this will encourage drivers to increase their speed along an already busy road.

Someone with the full facts must inform all interested parties.

As part of the local community we would like to help, get involved and move the situation forward for the benefit of all. We have some safety points of our own but lack someone we can communicate with.

381	<p>The first thing I notice is that you haven't even got the pedestrian crossing (outside 29 Ash Street) on your map. Therefore the zigzag markings, have made no parking in that area for over 20 years.</p> <p>On top of that, several houses have drives or off road parking, with white lines across the entrance, so even more places can't be use for parking. From the Greyhound pub to the library area, there are 22 homes, and with the white lines, there are only 16 spaces for car to be parked, and lots of house have 1/2/3 cars.</p> <p>I have live in Ash Street for over 34 years and don't have any problem getting parked. On top of this, people have visitors coming and home deliveries etc, where would they park, if you plans go ahead? Putting yellow lines down will only make cars etc race along, and this road is not a motorway.</p> <p>The Ash railway crossing is close for 30 minutes every hour, and we then get a build up of traffic, but is soon passes along the road. In the past a meeting was held re: traffic. The police also attended, and the police found no problems with how things were being managed, and nothing has changed since then.. I have found out that lots of lorries use this road from the A331 to get to Woking – the reason is its signposted Woking on the road signs on the A331. This road the A323 doesn't go to, it the road road to Guildford. It seems to me "someone" hasn't a clue of where Ash is, or what road should be taken to Woking. Ash isn't even on the road sign on the A331 – apparently there was no room for it. Three letters!!!!</p> <p>DO NOT CHANGE A THING IN ASH STREET. THERE ARE NO PROBLEMS – LEAVE THINGS AS THEY ARE NOW, AND GO AND DO OTHER THINGS, THAT DO NEED SEEING TO.</p>
400	<p>We would like to object to the proposed parking restrictions in Ash Street. There is currently a large chunk of road where it is not possible for residents to park due to the school crossing which is of course perfectly right for the safety of the children. The new introductions would make it difficult for residents to park.</p>
404	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposed parking restrictions in Ash Street, as this would make it impossible to visit my elderly parents with their grandchildren. There will be no spaces left for the residents like my parents to park outside their own home if there are yellow lines there will only be a few spaces left which everyone will be fighting for. It would also cause problems for myself trying to take my children to and from school, we don't all live in walking distance of the school and a lot of the mums have to go straight to work after dropping their children off. Also the parent from both schools have not been told about these restriction proposals and I know there will be a lot of mums that will not be happy as there will not be anywhere to park which will cause uproar. I think the cars which park along Ash Street are a good thing as it slow the traffic down a lot. If no cars were parked there you would have cars speeding down Ash Street.</p>

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
	<p>Cabell Road area, Guildford (introduced various yellow lines around junctions and bends) (6 representations)</p>
	<p>I reside in Broomfield in the house right on the corner with Pond Meadow. Having looked at the plan I see that the parking restrictions will be enforce right outside my home.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate that safety is vital on our residential streets I feel these restrictions will have a severe impact on my day to day life.</p> <p>My next door neighbours (number 55) have 3 cars in their house hold so parking here is already limited. The houses opposite have all got dropped kerbs so parking there is also not possible. I did apply for a garage in the council garage block behind my home in Pond Meadow but got turned down due to planned development there. The area in Pond Meadow beside my house will also be covered by the restriction and further down Pond Meadow where the restriction will end is already used by the residents who live there!!</p> <p>This just leaves me one question. WHERE AM I SUPPOSE TO PARK???????????</p> <p>There are only two solutions I can see to resolve this major problem for myself. One is to convert a section of my front garden to off street parking. This will of course involve dropping the kerb outside my house (which is dropped on the bend already) and paving/concreting a section of my front garden. (many properties in the same area of the road as my house have already had this done so a president has already been set)).</p> <p>Two is to convert a section of my back garden to off street parking. This could also be achieved by removing a section of my back fence and replacing with a double gate and then creating a section of hard standing for my car. My back garden directly backs onto the access road for the Pond Meadow Council garage block so access would be easy (again this has been done by other residents). This would mean I would have to use my side door rather than front door for ease of access to my home but This wouldn't really be a problem.</p> <p>Obviously making these changes would come at a cost, a cost that I am not in a position to pay due to being a single parent with two school age daughters and therefore only being able to work part time.</p> <p>I do feel that as GBC want to implement these changes which would make it impossible for me to park anywhere near my home then it would only be fair for them to carry out either of the changes I have suggested at GBC's cost.</p>

113	<p>Thank you for the letter about the new proposals for parking restrictions on roads in Park Barn, Guildford, including Pond Meadow. The changes seem quite minor and common sense and we have no objection to them at all.</p> <p>Anyway, we were also surprised that the changes do not include outside the shops on the corner of Southway / Pond Meadow as this is the only trouble spot we've noticed in the area in terms of parking. I think maybe that's because lines on the road are already in existence there and people ignore them to pop into the shop and park right on the corner. I guess you can only do so much! We hadn't noticed a problem further down the road, but then we do have a driveway so we just park on that.</p>
145	<p>I have seen the proposed parking restrictions for Cabell Road and whilst I understand why they are being considered, in reality what will happen is that those people who cannot park where they usually do will simply move further down the road making an already difficult parking position worse. Can you not turn some of the grass verges into parking areas?</p> <p>The reason parking has become such an issue on Park Barn generally is that Guildford Borough Council has permitted single family homes to be turned into houses of multiple occupation (mostly for students), meaning more cars per dwelling. I was under the impression that the original transfer from GBC provided that right to buy homes continued to be used as single family dwellings. Is this the case?</p>
262	<p>Regarding the Parking controls around the Park Barn area, I agree with the proposals on parking in this are. but on studying the Map, I have some questions, I see that you propose to restrict Parking for a few Metres opposite the old driveway next to number 7 Cabell drive, I could understand it if the Drive was in use. also the Residents in Cabell road at the Park barn Drive end, are getting fed up, with Hospital staff , turning up at 8am parking anywhere they like and Blocking access to properties sometimes, they treat this area as an overflow car park for the Hospital, any chance of extending a parking restriction a few more Metres, from the Junction of Park Barn Drive? it might stop them, but I doubt it.</p> <p>I have one more moan! regarding Foxburrows Avenue at the Junction with Southway, cars completely blocking the Pavement pedestrians have to walk into the road, even worse with mothers with push chairs.</p>
331	<p>Hi I live further down Cabell road, I am concerned that it will have a knock on effect especially as it's Broomfield just behind us as well. There is only just enough parking as it is. They will all move down effecting parking around us.</p>
354	<p>I live in Stoney Brook. While we agree that parking should be controlled in some areas, the main concerns is where are these cars going! Some houses have two to three cars with only one hard stand. What happens then? The flats across the road from us have many cars with parking on the grass as their option. Can some of this grass not be converted into a hard stand?</p>

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
	<p>College Road / Ash Hill Road, Ash (introduced double yellow lines near junctions) (6 representations)</p>
64	<p>In reference to proposed parking controls in Ash Hill Road and College Road.</p> <p>No objection to proposed parking controls as they are required for safety reasons but the issues that will arise due to these additional parking controls will need to be addressed. Currently parking on Ash Hill Road is difficult for residents due to staff and customer parking from the Sassy Hairdressing business. Customers frequently park in a hap hazard fashion, some distance away from the kerb causing obstructions for passing cars and other cars pulling out into traffic. Parking is with little or no consideration to other road users frequently occupying one to two car lengths therefore restricting other parking spaces. The proposed controls will further decrease parking spaces exacerbating the current issues.</p> <p>Can additional parking measures be introduced to assist in considerate and safe parking in the now reduced area ? ...such as marked bays?</p>
66	<p>I am writing in regards to the proposed parking changes to Ash hill road, to which I oppose.</p> <p>I don't believe that these measures will help in any way, there are more issues on the road in regards to sheer weight of traffic that passes down there than there are with inconvenient parking. I believe that these changes will cause problems with parking spaces for those that live in the houses near the junction.</p>
180 & 271	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed parking restrictions at the junction of Ash Hill Road and College Road. We live on the north corner of Ash Hill Road and College Road and our hedge extends some 40-metres up the north side of College Road. The proposed parking restrictions would effectively wipe out all the on road parking space outside our house, both in College Road and Ash Hill Road. In College Road we would be the only house to be affected in this way, as all the houses opposite on the south side of College Road have off road parking space and with the exception of our one car garage we do not. We note that the proposed double yellow lines for the north side of College Road would extend some 40 metres, right to the wall of our garage, making it much longer than any other proposed for a side road in current plans, or in current use in this area.</p> <p>The letter of 30th October states that ' the proposals in Ash Hill Road and College Road are intended to improve access and visibility around various junctions.' Having emailed Mr Andy Harkin about the rationale for the inordinate length of the yellow lines in College Road, Mr Harkin replied that the road at this point was narrow and that the remaining running aisle was 'less than desirable.' Without giving any details, Mr Harkin's email mentioned damage to properties on the south side caused by lorries delivering further up the road, and said that the same access problems could apply for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Access</p>

Surrey's own guidelines for the access of emergency vehicles recommends a minimum carriageway of 2.75 metres. The running aisle from a parked car outside our back gate in College Road is 2.95 metres. Not surprisingly, the recycling lorry that comes weekly has no difficulty passing without damage to either our cars or the properties opposite. Even wider vehicles do certainly have to slow down to pass, but College Road is not a wide road at any point and the road is narrower at many points further up College Road, where no restrictions are proposed; and as with the recycling lorry, even the wider lorries pass on a regular basis without causing damage either to our cars or to the properties opposite.

Visibility

The stretch of College Road from the junction with Ash Hill Road is perfectly straight for at least 200-metres, affording excellent visibility to all traffic going in either direction. The only difficulty is for traffic turning right from Ash Hill Road into College Road where the angle is extremely acute ; but instead of using the full width of the road and entering College Road on the left hand side of the road, drivers are on occasions tempted to cut the corner and enter on the right hand side, so can find themselves facing oncoming traffic. However this is a problem of the geography of an acute turn compounded by poor driving, and would not, we would argue, be ameliorated by parking restrictions. College Road is well lit at night at this stretch, with excellent visibility of all parked cars.

Damage/Safety

As mentioned above it has been stated that a number (not specified) of incidents have been reported of damage to properties on the south side of College Road. Without details it is difficult to comment, but if the inference has been drawn that a car or cars parked along our hedge have been to blame, careful consideration needs to be given whether the damage was simply the result of careless driving for, as stated above, the running aisle by our hedge is above the recommended minimum for the access of emergency vehicles.

No aspect of any changes can be more important than safety. As has been stated College Road is narrow at many points. Many cars are parked throughout the length of the road, effectively limiting the road to one carriageway. There are also stretches of road without pavement and driving up or down College Road on a daily basis one comes across pedestrians, including families with children, walking in the road. Yet in practice College Road is not dangerous and having lived here for 33 years I know of no incidents of injury to pedestrians. The reason of course is the acknowledged traffic calming effect of parked cars: people drive more carefully. The stretch of College Road under consideration also has no pavements and families with children use it daily. The most careful consideration must surely, therefore, be given to the positive advantages of cars parked, as ours are, by our hedge. Obviously when either injury to people or damage to property does not occur there can be no statistics to cite, but in over 30 years the most potent danger to life and limb in College Road has come from the very occasional incident of speeding over 30 mph either up or down the road. To place parking restrictions in the manner suggested would in our view present reckless drivers with at least 60-metres before forced to slow down, and the result would be a road made less safe.

Displacement in College Road

The letter of 30th October states that 'we recognise the introduction of parking restrictions can cause the availability of parking to reduce and for it to displace to other areas.' We are a 3 car family and 2 of our cars would be displaced to the barely wider length of

College Road between our garage and New Road. While we would naturally make every effort to reduce any inconvenience to our neighbours, inevitably the addition of our cars to any cars displaced from Ash Hill Road would lead to friction and ill feeling because whatever the legal right, few people like to have neighbours' cars parked outside their house.

In conclusion it is our view that under the criteria of access and visibility cited in the letter of 30th October, the case for the proposed controls in College Road has just not been made. The proposals are highly discriminatory in their scope and resulting impact on one household and as well as the added congestion, the proposals would, crucially, make the road less safe.

We would like to propose 2 alternatives for the northern side of College Road:

1. Our preferred option - either no controls or the 10-metre legal minimum within which parking is illegal

Or:

2. A slightly longer stretch of double yellow lines but which still leaves room for parked cars along our fence and hedge. (See attached photos).

We hope very much that the lines do not extend beyond the newly cut back area of the hedge that now enables us to park partly on our land and thus widen the road. It should not be inferred from either our installation of fencing, or cutting back the hedge, that we acknowledge the existence of underlying problems, but have done so in a spirit of community cooperation.

If double yellow lines are placed on College Road and Ash Hill road then at least 5/6 vehicles will need to relocate. The natural place to which vehicles will relocate would be further down College Road, towards the cusp of the hill. The road is barely wider than the part of College Road where double yellow lines have been suggested and also suffers from poor visibility due to a slight bend in the road over the hill. This will have a negative impact on many of the residents of College and Ash Hill Road whilst only placating one or two.

Visibility for the first 200m of College Road is excellent. Moving parking from the end of College Road to the cusp of a hill with reduced visibility would, in my opinion, be short sighted and would make pulling into College Road from New Road virtually impossible. I also feel the reduced visibility coupled with an influx of parked cars would make this pinch point of the road dangerous for all road users and would increase the likelihood of an accident. There have been no such accidents on College Road over the last 30 years whilst parking has been self-governed by the residents.

Access is another reason cited for introducing double yellow lines on College Road which is not an issue at all. In the 'Surrey County Council Traffic Calming Good Practice Guidance' you state that the required width for any vehicle (bar agricultural) to pass a road is 2.75 metres. At all points where double yellow lines are proposed there is far more than 2.75 metres clearance from any parked car. The road has been accessed in the past by emergency vehicles and the refuse collection vehicles pass this part of the road with no troubles at all – not even a wing mirror has been clipped!

In response to this Mr Harkin has suggested that the preferred width of road would be 3 metres – this begs the question as to why the parking restrictions are only being proposed to part of College Road when large swathes of the road do not meet this 'preferred'

target. I can only feel this is discriminatory or over compensating for a vocal minority.

Mr Harkin has also cited 'a number' (later confirmed as 2) of incidents that have caused damage to properties on College Road as a justification for these parking restrictions. The only damage I am aware of was to a small brick wall that was recently built on the road and knocked down some weeks later. There is absolutely no substantive evidence that the damage inflicted to this recently built wall was due to cars parked on the other side of the road. It seems far more likely that this was caused by careless driving and could just as easily have happened if 2 moving vehicles passed each other outside of this property, which parking restrictions would not prevent.

It is stated in the Highway Code that no car should park within 10 metres of a junction. On College Road this is not and has never been a problem. The car that parks closest to the junction at the end of College Road is at least 15 metres away at all times. Therefore the cars that park on College Road already follow best practice and to make this change would be unnecessary and discriminatory to the few houses at the end of the road that would be affected.

In local committee meetings the following statement is made regarding to parking restrictions:

There is often a balance to be made between traffic flow and parking and on occasions parking can help to reduce traffic speeds and improve safety.

This is exactly the situation on College Road. Currently there is a 'slalom' effect where road users slow down to weave in between parked cars, which helps reduce the speed of the traffic. Many of the residents have young children as well as driveways that lead blindly into the road. Again, having cars parked outside people's houses causes traffic to slow and increases safety.

Security would also be a concern. If these restrictions are put in place then I and other road users would no longer be able to park our cars outside of our own houses. They would have to be parked out of earshot which would mean insurance quotes will increase and peace of mind will decrease.

In summary these proposals are short sighted. If there had been a single accident, pedestrian injury or near miss along College Road due to the cars parked towards the junction with Ash Hill Road then I would be the first to support these changes. But there has not. In over 30 years nobody has been hurt and no cars have crashed. The few reasons that the council have provided to justify these changes do not seem to line up with your own best practise guide and can be seen only as discriminatory with the potential to make the road dangerous.

I would urge the decision makers in this case to walk/drive up college road to assess for themselves as I am sure if this is done then common sense would prevail and the parking restrictions on College Road would not be approved.

Furthermore, cars do park in the sections of College Road may be the same width as in the length where controls are proposed. The road is at its narrowest just after the junction with New Road, yet cars park there regularly. Further down approaching the junction with Heathcote Road but before the pavement begins, cars also park. Cars are also parked on the pavement in Grove Road, meaning pedestrians have to use the road, and leaving a running aisle certainly no wider than where controls are suggested.

We stress this to point out the discriminatory nature of the current proposals that extend so far up College Road from the junction with

	<p>Ash Hill Road. We make no complaint whatever about the fact cars park at these points as all it needs is to drive slowly and carefully to get past and not endanger pedestrians. Although parking in our section of College Road may have attracted complaints, while the other stretches had not, in light of the arguments we have made and the evidence provided, we do hope any decision will be based on a thorough appraisal of the merits of those complaints, as it appears to us that a degree of sensible tolerance prevailing in the rest of the road has not been extended to the stretch outside our house.</p> <p>No details were given of the alleged instances of vehicles failing to gain access to College Road. Nevertheless, I hope common sense is applied, and if these vehicles were too wide to gain access at the College Road junction, they would not have got beyond the New Road junction where a parked car leaves even less space to pass.</p>
<p>190 GBC Refuse & recycling</p>	<p>We have experienced some problems accessing this road, we do service this road with a smaller lorry though.</p>
<p>194</p>	<p>On returning from holiday we were pleased to see that a proposal for double yellow lines was being put forward in College Rd until we went into your website and saw that the proposal did not include the junction opposite no 41 and 42. This junction is by far a more a safety issue than cars parking at the beginning of the road, the short time we have lived in no 41 there has been two crashes and our wall has been knocked down five times the last time it was not repairable at our expense a new wall has been put up, this is due to vehicles parking and obstructing the view of people using this junction these incidents have been reported to Guildford Council and Mr Jason Lewis at Surrey Highways, the answers we received was that there should be Yellow lines to avoid another accident which could be a fatal one, cars use this road as a 30 mile limit not knowing that View road is there. you are prepaid to put Yellow Lines at the other end of View Rd and Ash Hill Rd so why has this end been disregarded? We would also like to add that at the moment cars parking at this junction restrict us from using our drives so if certain cars are relocated this will make things worse at this junction. Yes we agree that yellow lines are needed in College Road so please put forward a proposal for the Yellow Lines to include this dangerous junction. We would appreciate your help in solving this problem because as we have tried to explain that the View Road junction is more of a priority than cars at the beginning of College Road which are visible to road users, the most logical solution would be to put Yellow Lines from Ash Hill Rd to the junction of View Rd. Will await your comments and hope you will act on our comments.</p> <p>We have yet again had our wall damaged by an unknown vehicle. This new wall has only been up for 3 or so months. The old wall was replaced because it was getting dangerous due to continuous damage.</p> <p>We have made every effort to warn users by placing reflectors etc however this continues to be ignored. The offending vehicle has not bothered to tell us of this damage which occurred yesterday afternoon.</p> <p>This is the sixth time damage has occurred on our wall. In light of the imminent yellow lines for this road we would appreciate some thoughts on what other measures could be taken to avoid this in future.</p> <p>The main offenders appear to be large vehicles turning off View road into College Road.</p>

232

I totally agree that there should be parking restrictions along Ash Hill Road where View Road which runs along side the War Memorial joins, I first contact Guildford during 1980's when the shop in Ash Hill Road was a C/B Shop then a Video Hire Shop,, It is now a hairdressers.

It is good that Guildford now recognize that it is a problem after all these years. I was told at the time that because View Road was a private road leading on to Ash Hill Road it wasn't a Guildford problem..

The council did agree to paint some white lines, there are only patches of it left, about about 2 years ago , I spoke to a man marking the road with blue paint, who said it needed repainting.. the blue paint has since worn away.. and the white was never done.

My address is College Road, however the driveway and entrance to my property is in View Road.

What we don't want is for more cars / white vans etc parking in View Road because of the restrictions.

Many times we have problems trying to turn left out of View Road (we never turn right to dangerous).

The restrictions in College Road / Ash Hill Road has only been a problem since the owners of the corner property park on/near the corner, many a lorry has had to reverse back down College Road as they couldn't pass on there way to Ash Hill Road.

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
Ferry Lane, Guildford (curtail existing bay to accommodate newly created access)	(8 representations)
250	<p>I write concerning the proposed change in Ferry Lane.</p> <p>I enjoy walking my dog by the river and often park on the railway bridge in Ferry Lane for about 40 minutes. Space is already tight there and it will be even tighter if the double line space is increased.</p> <p>I guess the reason for the proposed change is to allow access to the ad hoc mud car park which has sprung up over the summer. This seems a poor trade off to me.</p>
293	<p>I absolutely object to converting part of the existing parking bay to a no waiting at any time double yellow line.</p> <p>We, as residents already have great difficulty with the limited parking spaces available to us. There are only 6 parking bays that are available to all the 11 households that live on Ferry Lane as well as their visitors and the general public who park here to visit the river or Guildford Town Centre. So when there are no parking spaces left (which is often, especially in the Summer months) where are we meant to park?</p> <p>Every time there has been an parking issue or planning application Guildford Council have always put the residents needs last and have given more parking rights to the contractors working streets away as well as to the general public. It has become clear that whatever objections we have aren't given the consideration they deserve, especially as we pay tax as well as paying for parking permits. It seems to us that these procedures you have in place to allow us to object are there just to make us feel like we are able to, but really you have already made up your minds to give your approval.</p> <p>Firstly, Surrey County Highways gave permission to give access to the land now used as a car park on Ferry Lane without asking or speaking to any residents here. I was told that the contractors have more rights to have access to this parking area then we do to park the road in which we pay to park in. This consent was given before planning permission was approved to change the land into a car park.</p> <p>Secondly, planning permission has been given to change this conservation area into a car park regardless of the many objections given by the residents of Ferry Lane and the surrounding area. As the permission for the use of this conservation land as a car park is only temporary and will be returned to it's natural state, does that mean the parking space will also be returned back to the original size at that time?</p> <p>Yet again, you are about to give these people more access to entering this land by taking away our limited parking bays. Why are you doing this? In all this time not one of you has spared your time to contact any of us separately or as a group about these issues which makes me question whether you really care or whether there are financial benefits given to you to approve these matters. This is</p>

coming across more and more clearly as time goes on because the people that should benefit from living here are the residents but unfortunately this doesn't appear to be the case.

The contractors have been parking on this land for nearly a year without needing more space to reverse into this small area of land. We need more parking spaces here on Ferry Lane not less. Where do you suggest we park when there are no spaces available? Especially for those residents who are over 80 and those with children who have to carry shopping etc. They would have to park far away and cross over a busy road and walk a long a foot wide pavement alongside that busy road just to get access to Ferry Lane.

We also often have rail track vans down here parking while they maintain the track. There is a major electricity generator where this area of land in question is and sometimes the electricity company need access to park there. The nearest parking is over a hundred metres away and that's if you can get parking there. This lane is very small and is the last road accessible in walking distance to Guildford and the river on the Portsmouth Road. There isn't anywhere else for us to park.

What you should really be approving is changing the parking bays to Permit Holders only at all times not restricting our rights to park.

In April this year I wrote a letter strongly objecting to the proposal for a temporary change of use of an open space in Ferry lane for car parking for the use of contractors working on Langton Priory. The space had been used for several months illegally without permission and causing havoc and distress to local residents because of the increase in traffic, leaving the road in a very muddy and slippery state , and abuse from contractors on occasions when a resident's car might be positioned perfectly legally but causing difficulty for contractors driving in or out of their (at that stage) illegal parking area.

Residents who pay for parking permits and visiting friends and relatives are suffering great difficulty in trying to find parking spaces; I am told that some contractors who are worried that in wet weather their vehicles would get stuck in mud in the car park have been seen to park in Ferry Lane in one of the Resident/Visitor/Limited parking spaces. To have one of the already limited number of parking spaces for the use of residents and their visitors removed is totally unacceptable. It is particularly unacceptable because the main reason seems to be to allow easier access to the contractors' car park. Does this not suggest that it pays to flout planning laws because in the end the parties in the wrong get everything they want?

298

One great concern about this is that the "Temporary change of use of the amenity space to parking" is that after nine months the space will revert from parking, yet the residents will still be a parking space short, and this does not make logical sense . . . unless the developers have other plans: i.e. to apply for planning permission to develop the site for housing and the proposed street parking restrictions will suit this aim. I would be grateful if someone in the Guildford Borough Planning Department could confirm that this type of development will never be granted permission.

My daughter and son-in law live at St. Catherine's Hill and their cottage backs onto Ferry Lane exactly opposite the contractors' car park and the proposed reduction in visitors parking spaces. My wife and I both visit regularly to baby sit our two small granddaughters, and have recently suffered delays when we arrived in Ferry Lane because of the lack of parking spaces.

If the main reason for wanting to reduce the number of parking spaces is that the contractors are demanding easier access to their parking, has it not been considered that a much more amenable solution for the residents is for the developer to move the position of the access gate onto Ferry Lane.

	<p>I hope that you are able to see the reasoning of the points that I have raised, and realise that it is important to consider the views of residents and their visiting families over the demands of wealthy developers who have no, or at the best, very limited interest in the adverse effect their money making schemes have on the local community.</p>
303	<p>I understand the Council is proposing to reduce the number of parking spaces for residents in Ferry Lane in order to give even more access to site vehicles from the distant building site at Langton Priory, and I would like to object to this for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The loss of just one bay might seem insignificant to the Council but to the residents of Ferry Lane it represents an enormous loss - which certainly gives rise to tensions and anxiety amongst the residents - 2 very elderly ladies who struggle with heavy shopping, and two mothers with babies and very young children amongst them - who all need easy access to their homes. 2. Ferry Lane is a narrow single-track lane for much of the way leading down to the river, and until recently mainly used by walkers, both as part of the North Downs Way and as a pleasant walk into Guildford. It's in a Conservation Area, to the rear of a group of listed cottages of historic interest, and in an area regarded as a local beauty spot. 3. Unnecessary enlargement of the access to the quagmire created by removal of topsoil in the land now used as parking by the site vehicles is in the only part of Ferry Lane wide enough for cars and deliveries to the houses would create even more damage than has already been done - the site is full of cars and vans from 6.30 am - my car has twice been damaged by the swinging unlocked gate, and the road has been damaged by JCBs having to haul vehicles out of the mud. 4. A more practical proposition would seem to be to place Resident and Permit Holders only signs, as for many other roads close to the centre of Guildford.
304	<p>I am writing to formally object to any changes proposed to the parking bays in Ferry Lane. From looking at the documents provided, the changes are due to take place in order to provide better access to a temporary car park which is providing car parking for local contractors. This car park has only been given permission to be there (against strong objection from the local community) until July 2016, 9 months from the date the permission was granted. From reading the information Guildford Borough Council has provided on their website regarding the proposed changes to the parking, I quote: 'If changes to the parking restrictions were agreed, we would anticipate their implementation in mid-2016.'</p> <p>By mid-2016, the parking area concerned will be being restored to its original state, meaning there will be no access to it from Ferry Lane. Therefore, unless there are plans in place to the contrary, there is no reason for this change to go ahead.</p> <p>Since the car park has been created, well before permission was actually granted, residents have been battling to find spaces to park. When it rains, the 'car park' becomes a mud pool which results in contractors parking in the road rather than getting stuck in the car park. I have attached a photo to show what we have to put up with on an almost daily basis - it has resulted in an absolute mess and should never have been allowed, especially not in a conservation area. We have also learned that nobody can receive a parking fine as the lines have been worn away. I reported this to Surrey County Council on September 11th 2015 and still nothing has been done about it. We have two elderly residents living in our row of cottages who park on Ferry Lane and I have two children under three so it</p>

is imperative that there is enough room for us and the other residents who pay for permits each year, to be able to (or at least have a chance of being able to) park near our homes. This should take absolute priority over a temporary car park which will not be used after July 2016.

Despite all of this, the four parking spaces do not actually block the entrance to the car park and there has never been an issue with them doing so.

Since the car park has been created, the parking situation has caused no end of stress to the residents. There are no valid reasons as to why this change should go ahead so I hope this case can be closed without further discussion.

I am strongly objecting to this proposal for several reasons.

There are currently only 6 parking spaces available to the residents of Ferry Lane of which there are 11 households and parking is already oversubscribed in the immediate area. In addition to the residents vehicles Ferry Lane is used by people visiting both St Catherines Hill, the ruin, Shalford Common, walkers parking to enjoy the North downs way, and fishermen using the river Wey.

This situation is compounded further by Rail Track using the Lane to access the railway for engineering work and line maintenance and both Southern Electric and BT Open Reach also undertaking regular work in the lane on the communications Hub and Sub station. All of the above park for long periods whilst work is undertaken.

In addition, we have a bail hostel at the top of the lane whose visitors use the parking provision on a regular basis.

Let's be clear, we are discussing a single track lane with a width in places of just 8 feet that was not designed for nor is suitable for the regular use of large numbers of utility vehicles. The lack of parking provision leads to illegal parking by contractors vans and sometimes lorries. On a number of occasions residents of St. Catherines Hill have been blocked in by these vehicles and access to and from Pilgrim and Ferry cottages and Ferry Lodge have been restricted.

I have serious concerns that should an emergency vehicle require access to attend a medical emergency or fire there could be serious damage to property or loss of life due to the continuing lack of enforcement by Guildford Borough Council and the unsympathetic treatment of the area by Surrey Highways and Local planning.

The recently approved planning application for the use of land on Ferry Lane for the builders at Langton Priory has made the situation intolerable. Rather than solve the issue it has exacerbated it by increasing traffic. On many occasions when the approved planned parking provision is full the very limited parking at Ferry Lane has been utilized by the contractors and builders giving residents no viable parking alternative.

In an area where there are sufficient parking alternatives this would not be so much of an issue but I am at pains to point out that the nearest alternative (Chestnut avenue) is over a 100 meters away.

Living on St. Catherines hill are four residents over the age of 75 and two families with children under the age of 4 so it is not practical or even possible to expect elderly residents and families with children to have to carry shopping this considerable distance. I would also add that the pavement between Chestnut Avenue and Ferry Lane, as it passes the ship pub, is very narrow (2 feet wide) and

has fast moving traffic, it is dangerous.

It is difficult enough to traverse In daylight hours when conditions are good, but with shopping and children or for an elderly person it can be difficult, in adverse weather conditions its plain treacherous!

As you can see the consequences of the recent planning decisions have undoubtedly diminished the quality of residents lives on a daily basis and are even putting their safety at risk. Compounding this further by removing a much needed parking space makes no sense.

We have sadly already had one residents much loved pet run over and killed by a contractors van. Given how narrow the lane is and with no pedestrian pavement section I would also be concerned about the safety of residents and their children with the increased traffic. Most of us access our properties from Ferry Lane and use the lane as pedestrians on a daily basis.

I would also question why additional access is required? The contractors currently manage to park 15-20 vehicles daily with the parking provision as it is. In short, the parking permission granted to the Langton Priory builders should remain temporary. No further action is required to facilitate the use of this land as such, as they have been parking without issue for around 9 months (since before permission was granted). Leaving things as they are will at least ensure residents and regular visitors to the area have some chance of seeing things return back to normal when the disruption has ceased.

As well as the practical concerns Ferry Lane and St. Catherines Hill this is a conservation area, is it really appropriate that parking permission was granted in the first place to an area deemed one of outstanding natural beauty? We now have to deal with the daily disruptions of contractors vans arriving noisily from 6am as well as a previously pleasantly overgrown piece of land being a mud pit with vehicles parked on it for most of the day.

In closing, any decision that reduces residents parking capacity has unintended consequences that I can only assume planners were not aware of. Had they have been I cannot understand how a decision that puts so many vulnerable people at risk and negatively impacts on the quality of their lives on a daily basis could have been made.

We have as a group contacted our local MP with our objections, we are collectively upset at the heavy handed and unsympathetic way we have been treated regarding changes to the area that we live in by both Guildford Borough Council and the Highways Agency. Neither seems aware of the consequences of their decisions or indeed the actions of the other. It has taken considerable time to discover who is responsible for what. In future, I suggest some joined up thinking is required by both Parties rather than the mindless and pointless bureaucracy we have had to deal with so far, which has just served to create stress in an already difficult situation.

Should this apathetic and insensitive treatment of the residents continue we can only assume that there must be considerable financial incentives for those involved or that there has been an astounding degree of either incompetence or indifference demonstrated by both.

329	<p>I understand the Council is proposing to reduce the number of parking spaces for residents in Ferry Lane in order to give even more access to site vehicles from the distant building site at Langton Priory, and I would like to object to this for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The loss of just one bay might seem insignificant to the Council but to the residents of Ferry Lane it represents an enormous loss - which certainly gives rise to tensions and anxiety amongst the residents - 2 very elderly ladies who struggle with heavy shopping, and two mothers with babies and very young children amongst them - who all need easy access to their homes. 2. Ferry Lane is a narrow single-track lane for much of the way leading down to the river, and until recently mainly used by walkers, both as part of the North Downs Way and as a pleasant walk into Guildford. It's in a Conservation Area, to the rear of a group of listed cottages of historic interest, and in an area regarded as a local beauty spot. 3. Unnecessary enlargement of the access to the quagmire created by removal of topsoil in the land now used as parking by the site vehicles is in the only part of Ferry Lane wide enough for cars and deliveries to the houses would create even more damage than has already been done - the site is full of cars and vans from 6.30 am - my car has twice been damaged by the swinging unlocked gate, and the road has been damaged by JCBs having to haul vehicles out of the mud. 4. A more practical proposition would seem to be to place Resident and Permit Holders only signs, as for many other roads close to the centre of Guildford.
359	<p>As a resident of the area I am concerned that there is a possibility of the area in Ferry Lane at the rear of the Ship pub, currently used as a temporary car park for use by builders working on a local site may become a permanent area for the public.</p> <p>It is in a conservation area, and would increase traffic in the lane considerably.</p> <p>The lane is narrow and is used by pedestrians as it is part of the North Downs Way.</p> <p>I trust that due consideration will be given to the foregoing and that the use of the area will cease on completion of the building work.</p>

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
	<p>Greville Close, Guildford (formalised existing disabled bay) (4 representations)</p>
90	<p>In the recent parking proposals, why is there no plan to make roads, such as Greville Close, residents' parking only – or else introduce some permit-holders only scheme?</p> <p>Parking in roads such as this road has become a nightmare for residents, as much of the available space is taken up by people who do not live in the area, such as hospital workers, and, believe it or not, even Tesco workers or customers!</p> <p>The new proposals, which would appear to be increasing restrictions on surrounding roads, will surely exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>It is not fair that when residents such as myself, on returning home from work, or being at home during the day and deciding to pop out in the car for ten minutes, cannot find a reasonable place to park!</p> <p>Please can this issue be investigated further and some action taken.</p>
123	<p>Reference the above amendment why are there no mention of parking restrictions in Humbolt close.</p>
159	<p>Formalisation of Disabled bays is always good. However, imagine my disappointment when i realised that this seemingly is the only change proposed to the parking here.</p> <p>The council is well aware that this little cul-de-sac is used on a very regular basis as a car park for non residents who work elsewhere. I know the council is aware of this because on more than one occasion i have received letters containing the phrase "... we are aware that there is a problem with non resident parking, however...". Why then are there seemingly no plans in this proposal to address this issue? During the week it is nigh on impossible to go out in a car if you're a resident because if you do, there is a high chance that you won't be able to park here when you get back. You either have to go out and stay out or not use the car. This is not a recent situation, either – it's been going on for years and nothing seems to be being done. I've seen non residents queuing up to look for somewhere to park in the morning, before leaving when they find the road's already full. I've also seen people parking their cars on the pavement <i>on a corner</i>, outside Anston Court then walking off to go to work leaving barely a car's width to get through. Surely this can't be acceptable? At weekends the parking is clear, with far fewer cars, so it's clearly people using it as free workplace parking, and this, as a resident, i find unacceptable when it deprives me of the right to come and go as i please from my own home.</p>

In addition, may i suggest that the double yellow lines on the roadside at the entrance to the road are extended on both sides? It's a very narrow, tight entrance from Southway, and virtually all the time you are forced to enter Greville Close on the wrong side of the road into the path of oncoming traffic heading out of the Close around a blind corner. Surely this is a safety issue if nothing else?

So, in conclusion, i have no objection to the formalisation of disabled parking bays, but why are the existing issues seemingly not being addressed?

I am writing with regard to the proposed changes to disabled parking in Greville Close. In principle I have no objections to the formalisation of one disabled parking space if this would be of benefit to a resident. I have personal experience of how difficult and stressful parking here can be for any resident, and especially those with the added difficulties caused by mobility issues. However, I am concerned that your choice of bay puts my own independence at great risk. I would therefore very much appreciate it if you would consider finding an alternative solution that ensures everyone's needs are best met.

My reason for objecting to the particular choice of bay for formalisation is that it appears to be the bay I currently park in – the bay immediately adjacent to the kerb. If I am wrong about which bay has been selected, then I have no objections at all to the plan. I am fully aware that I have no right to this bay, or any other, but it has allowed me to retain a little independence, and so I'm concerned about giving up regular access to it. I believe the bay in question is the one shown in the letter I received following my application for an advisory bay. Had an alternative location been suggested in that letter I would have questioned its suitability, but this location is a good fit for my needs.

The bay I usually use is the closest of the advisory bays to my own property. When I park here I park very close to the kerb to leave the maximum space available for those parked in adjacent spaces, also allowing me to get directly from car to pavement, or to hold my car for support as I climb the kerb. In addition, the pavement provides space for me to fully open my doors to load my wheelchair when necessary. Neither would be possible if I were to park in the other advisory bay. If the bay I usually use were to be formalised, I would feel it only fair to vacate it for whichever resident requested its formalisation, but I would then find it either difficult or impossible to properly access my car, hence my concerns for my independence.

In addition to the direct implications for residents with disabilities, there are wider implications to other residents and visitors too. Where I currently park, it is possible for a second car to be parked end on to mine, following the line of the pavement, whilst causing minimal disruption to movement of other vehicles or pedestrians. Those visiting to care for me on a formal or informal basis make use of this. The driver from Wiltshire Farm Foods parks there whilst he delivers my box of meals. My care workers park there whilst they are caring for me; if they cannot find parking they risk being late for me and all following clients on their rota, or worse, have to cut somebody's care short to make up for the lost time. Desperate neighbours sometimes park there when they have no other choice – with my blessing. Providing I know who the vehicle belongs to, I can just ask them to move it in the rare event I wish to use my car at a time they are parked there. All these people would be forced to park potentially substantial distances away if the kerbside bay is formalised, as cars doubling up in the adjacent bay are more likely to disrupt traffic flow to the garages.

I would therefore like to propose two alternative suggestions. If the advisory bay furthest from the kerb sufficiently meets the parking and access needs of whichever resident would benefit from a formalised bay, that this other bay is formalised instead. If the alternative bay is not suitable for any reason, it is returned to a standard parking bay once an alternative formalised bay is provided at a location which is suitable for the resident concerned. This should allow maximum benefit for everyone.

So to summarise, whilst I greatly appreciate your efforts to improve parking for disabled residents of Greville Close, I'm very concerned that the current proposal has the potential to make the parking situation worse for many residents and visiting workers, exchanging one problem for another. I hope you will be able to consider the issues that this proposed formalisation would create, and find a more suitable solution.

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
	<p>Prospect Road, Ash (introduce various double yellow lines) (34 representations)</p>
4	<p>As a resident of Gorselands Close, Ash Vale, I am in complete agreement with any proposal that reduces the chronic parking congestion that we now face in the area adjacent to Gorselands Close, Elleray Court and Crescent Lane - this congestion, on occasion, is dangerous especially when cars are parked right opposite Gorselands Close! My concern, though, is what will happen to those cars that currently park in the proposed restricted areas - will they then park in in Gorselands Close? This would not, of course, be acceptable given the narrowness of Gorselands Close and the potential for severe constriction in that Close. Is there not a way in which additional parking bays could not be provided in Elleray Court, by remodelling some of the grass verges?</p> <p>On another point, is there any move to provide similar restrictions at the junction of Hutton Road and Heathvale Bridge Road, adjacent to the Swan Public House?</p>
24	<p>I am writing in connection with the new parking proposals concerning Elleray Court/Prospect Road in Ash Vale.</p> <p>I currently rent a flat in Elleray court and I work as a chauffeur in Farnborough airport which does men I have sometimes to bring my work vehicle home ready for the next day's work.</p> <p>The vehicles I drive are either a Mercedes S Class or a Mercedes Vianno, both of which are fairly new and very presentable vehicles to have parked in a residential area but this also means they are not cheap so I would rather not have to park them any distance from my flat.</p> <p>My work means that I return home late at night to find all parking spaces taken in Elleray court which I totally understand but also find quite frustrating, especially when the quality of parking by some people is so selfish that two small cars can take up the area needed to park three average size vehicles.</p> <p>My concern with your proposal is that you seem to taking away areas currently being used by residents to park their cars but you are not giving alternatives, so a situation which you have highlighted as being a problem will only get worse.</p> <p>Not wanting to do the same and just make an objection without supplying a potential resolution, can I suggest that the layout of the area is changed so that cars can be parked nose-on to the flats as this will mean that two cars can park in a space currently being used by one car. This could one step further by allotting each flat one parking space and if there were any extra spaces these could be left for visitors on an ad hoc basis.</p> <p>I am sure my idea might upset some of the residents or the resident's committee as some of the landscape of the area will be lost but times change and when the flats were built the parking requirement would have been much less than now and by allowing cars to park properly will be better and safer for all.</p>

	<p>On top of this, most if not all flats have access to a garage which some use as storage but I know others choose to rent theirs out which is fine. as long as they then don't take up excessive space in the parking areas with other vehicles.</p>
55	<p>I am really glad that this is finally being sorted out. I live in Prospect Road, opposite Ellery Court. This year alone I have had about 5 or 6 near accidents trying to get out of my drive because of the cars that are parked either side of my drive. I have also on numerous occasions had cars parked two or three feet across my drive, which causes me sometimes to have to mount the kerb opposite to get round the vehicles.</p> <p>My neighbours at Nos.44-66 along with myself have had several arguments over the last two or three years with people parking all over the place who have no thoughts for our safety in trying to get out of our drives.</p> <p>I fully agree with your proposals and look forward to them being put in place.</p>
98	<p>Please can you advise why, yet again, there had been no inclusion of the junction outside the Swan public house on Hutton Road, Ash Vale? This junction is an accident waiting to happen as it is sometimes impossible to walk or drive past when cars park on pavements along both sides of the road.</p> <p>As a resident of Wharf Road who is already troubled by the parking restrictions imposed on us a few years ago which we were told "would have no considerable impact" I am concerned that any additional restrictions will make the area unworkable.</p> <p>The time restrictions in place around the village centre currently have forced workers and visitors to the parade of shops and offices to travel further into the surrounding residential areas. I am usually unable to park close to my own home between 9am and 6pm, and with two young children this is having a detrimental effect on our quality of life as I am unable to transfer goods from my car to home, and fear for the safety of my children crossing an increasingly busy road. We were advised at the time that there was 'adequate space' at the Ash Centre for people to park, however this is not the case as the car park is almost always full. There is also no signage in place for the additional parking further up Ash Hill Road, opposite the Victoria Hall which again we were told 'car owners could use'.</p> <p>Is there a proposal or way of looking into residents only parking in the area?</p> <p>Does this proposal also take into account the ongoing planning application for another supermarket/convenience store that Morrisons are proposing along Vale Road?</p>
99	<p>I would like to support the recommendation for NO PARKING in Prospect Road outside property's (Nos.36-48. Prospect Road) as we are finding it increasingly difficult to safely get in and out of our driveways due to parked vehicles blocking our view of oncoming traffic coming from both directions.</p> <p>I would strongly recommend the NO PARKING proposal be implemented without delay on safety grounds as over the years we have experienced many close encounters where we have had cars driving at use at speed and nearly hitting our vehicle as we try to get in</p>

	<p>and out of our driveway.</p> <p>I would Also recommend drooping the speed limit to 20 MPH in Prospect Road & Hutton Road as clearing the road of parked vehicles will enable drivers to travel faster without the restrictions of the parked vehicles.</p>
<p>107</p>	<p>I live in Prospect Road GU12 5EL. The new proposed parking changes I feel will have a huge effect on my property. Although I can see why the proposal is being made I feel it will only shift the parking problem further down the road where there will be no restrictions and therefore outside me and my neighbour's houses.</p> <p>If you look on your plans if any car parks outside or opposite our house.....which under the new proposal they will be allowed to do, it makes it very difficult and very dangerous for us to exit and enter our driveway. This does on rare occasions happen when neighbours etc. have visitors and it takes several manoeuvres for us to exit our driveway. In addition we are very close to a sharp left hand bend which leads to Hutton road, if there are cars parked as I have already discussed it causes a very dangerous hazard very quickly, and with cars coming blindly around a bend it could potentially be a very dangerous situation.</p> <p>I feel the parking restrictions should be extended to the end of Prospect road otherwise all that will happen is that the problem will be shifted a few hundred metres further down creating an even more dangerous situation.</p>
<p>111</p>	<p>There is already an acute shortage of parking in Ash Vale. This has been exacerbated by new housing developments in the area, which have increased the number of vehicles and traffic on the roads. The on-street parking is already heavily used both by local residents and commuters working in Ash Vale. There is scant additional car parking capacity available for visitors and shoppers to Ash Vale.</p> <p>My perception is that the new proposed parking changes will have a significant and negative impact on my property leading to a loss of privacy and amenity. There may well also be an endangerment to highway safety.</p> <p>In their current form, the new proposals make little or no provision for additional off road parking. As a result, cars displaced by the new parking restrictions will be forced to park further on down Prospect Road and toward Hutton Road. It is highly likely that cars will then park adjacent to my garden and home causing a loss of privacy and noise and pollution at all times of the day and night. It will make it difficult and dangerous for me to exit and enter our off road driveway in my car.</p> <p>Prospect Road is increasingly becoming a busy and congested road; the changes to the roadside parking will cause traffic problems and create a safety hazard for motorists and pedestrians. I'm concerned that this could develop into an accident black spot. This will not be conducive to providing a safe environment for local residents. Furthermore, an increase in the problems of illegal parking (in terms of double parking) and trespass (parking on private land) are highly likely.</p> <p>I invite you to visit my home to verify that these objections are valid.</p> <p>The application has not demonstrated that it has considered the problems of parking relating to the increased the number of vehicles and traffic on the roads, let alone how it would alleviate those issues. Therefore, I ask that the</p>

	proposal be refused.
121	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed parking controls along Prospect Road and Elleray Court.</p> <p>I vehemently oppose introducing these new proposals as I believe it will not achieve the desired results for other than the residents who own the houses in the immediate affected area, and further displace the parking issue to surrounding areas.</p> <p>For as long as I have been living in Elleray, I can say that drivers have shown due care and attention while travelling along the road and to pedestrians. Therefore, I have no reason to feel concerned or threatened by the current situation.</p> <p>What is more, I am a mother to a 6 month old baby and having to walk to and from my car everyday already poses issues which I am just about managing, and so you can imagine if the council were to go ahead and implement these new parking restrictions it would serve to add an extra stress and inconvenience. Consequently, I view this plan as not being child-friendly in anyway to residents who have young children on the estate.</p>
138	<p>I am writing regarding proposed parking restrictions in Ash Vale. My husband and I have lived in Hutton Rd, Ash Vale for 35 years and drive up and down Prospect Rd every day. We understand why these and other proposals for parking restrictions along further stretches of Prospect Rd are being mooted. However, the stretch of road from Elleray Court to 15m North of Richards Close has never been problematical due to excessive parking. Yes, there are cars frequently parked on this particular stretch but drivers take it in their stride, driving and giving way where necessary, in a responsible manner. We have never come across any accidents or near accidents resulting from parking there.</p> <p>The reason we feel why free parking usage, in that area only, should remain, is that Elleray Court does not have sufficient parking. Restricting that particular area in the way suggested will merely push the problem further along Prospect Rd or on to Springfield Rd. We feel more attention should be given to attempting to add parking spaces within Elleray Court's grounds.</p>
167	<p>I am pleased to see that no waiting is to be introduced on the brow of the hill incorporating Milton Grange and Crescent Lane, and also on the bend and hill further along Prospect Road restricting waiting opposite Gorselands Close and Elleray Court which all seem sensible and necessary.</p> <p>Having lived in Gorselands Close for 15 years and being a regular driver along this road, I would like to point out that I have never had any problem finding a pulling in space to allow oncoming vehicles to pass, in the section of road from Elleray Court and up past Richards Close, and so see no point in restricting those living along this section of road from parking there, the only need here if any, is to restrict parking directly on the junction to Enfield Road where vision for emerging traffic would be impeded by cars parked too close to this junction.</p> <p>I am surprised and somewhat disappointed that there seems to be no plan to restrict parking along the dangerous section of road near The Swan Public House, this area is on a long sweeping bend with little chance of a pulling in space when an oncoming car is</p>

	<p>met, notices from the police, pinned to the fences there advising no parking are blatantly ignored and have been for a number of years, I request that you consider dropping the idea of yellow lines as described above and give more thought to putting yellow lines in place near The Swan.</p>
<p>173</p>	<p>Having been a resident of Gorselands Close for the better part of 10 years, I have seen little, if any evidence that parking along Prospect Road [between Enfield Road and Gorselands Close] causes traffic disruption or poses a hazard to safety. If anything, I strongly believe that parking actually aids safety along Prospect Road as it forces traffic to slow down [cars already drive too quickly in my opinion along this road irrespective of the stated speed limit], I fear that should you impose these parking restrictions it will further encourage people to speed along this road, reducing overall safety.</p> <p>I am also extremely concerned that should these parking restrictions be imposed, where the cars that currently park along Prospect Road will park. There are few roads in the locale where these cars will be able to park, and I fear that people will park in Gorselands Close, either in the road's designated parking bay, or more unfavourably along the side of the road along Gorselands, making transit along our road more difficult and even dangerous for our children who play in this usually quiet Close [it is one of the reasons that first attracted us to this road in the first place]. I would value your thoughts on where you think the cars will park that currently park along Prospect Road, or indeed whether this has actually been factored into the thinking for these parking restrictions?</p> <p>I also trust that you are also focusing your attention on putting no waiting, double yellow lines down by The Swan Public House [from the map we have access to, the Swan does not appear]. This has been a long term problem and I'm frankly amazed that double yellow lines have NOT been imposed along that section of the road. Not only do the pubs' patrons park on the road, they often double park and as the road has a long sweeping bend, it is impossible to see round the corner to see whether the road is safe to drive along. Again I would value your insight as to why the council has not placed double yellow lines along this section of Hutton Road before.</p> <p>Needless to say, I am not supportive of these new parking restrictions along Prospect Road, and urge you to reconsider.</p>
<p>176</p>	<p>As a resident of Gorselands Close have over the past years brought up the subject of parking in Prospect Road at our Ash Parish Council meetings and the local Police meetings.</p> <p>I fully endorse the recommended proposals restricting the parking in Prospect Road.</p> <p>It was brought to my attention some time ago that the Residents Association in Elleray Court Estate did not wish to have any commercial vehicles parked on the Elleray Court Estate, this then forced their residents to park their vehicles elsewhere,(Prospect Road).</p> <p>It must also be stated the all the flats in Elleray Court have a garage, but as with the residents of Prospect Road find it more convenient to park outside their properties rather than use their garages than consider of the dangerous implications of their actions.</p>

184	<p>we will be one the first houses in the road that will be immediately affected by the current number of cars having to move from where you are proposing to put yellow lines.</p> <p>As it stands at the moment we already have, from time to time, cars parking directly opposite our driveway which in turn makes manoeuvring off our driveway difficult and these parked cars also impair the visibility and access for our opposite neighbours, this is without the extra cars parking outside ours and our neighbours houses.</p> <p>From the point where you are proposing to end the yellow lines this leads onto our stretch of road where the possible parking positions will be squeezed between many individual driveways making access difficult.</p> <p>We query these proposals as there are already problems with cars driving too fast along our stretch of road and, also, at the end of our section of road are dangerous bends.</p> <p>These changes you are proposing will only create mayhem in the future.</p>
202	<p>We have examined the document referred to and can find no mention of Hutton Road where local residents all too frequently are put at risk by the uncontrolled parking in Ash Vale at the junctions of Hutton Road, Cuthbert Road and Heathvale Bridge Road.</p> <p>This frequently results in the creation of blind bend as well as effective closure of the footpath.</p> <p>We note that there are occasions are notices posted on fences but these have little effect.</p> <p>We do recommend that serious thought be given to adding this area s to your proposals.</p>
213	<p>I have lived in Prospect Road, Ash Vale since 2004 and in that time have witnessed a small number of accidents and many near misses. I do not think the proposed parking restrictions will increase the safety so am writing to oppose the proposed parking restrictions in Prospect Road, Ash Vale on two grounds, firstly the detrimental impact on my property and secondly on safety grounds.</p> <p>1. <u>Adverse impact on my property due to loss of amenity.</u> As far as I can tell, my property is the only one (between the bend and the brow of the hill) that will be directly effected with double yellow lines outside that does not have off-street parking at the front of the property. The only option for my visitors and I will be to park outside my neighbours house and that may cause disagreements if they are then unable to park. It is highly likely that the cars that currently park further along Prospect Road will be displaced so there will be nowhere to park for myself <u>or</u> my neighbours. I have not taken professional advice yet, but believe this will have an adverse impact on the value of my property.</p> <p>If the proposal is adopted I would like to know whether the council would be prepared to fund and install a dropped kerb outside my property alongside the double yellow lines so I could convert my front garden for off-street parking.</p> <p>2. <u>Higher risk of serious accidents due to increased speed</u> In my view the parking restrictions are tackling the wrong problem. The parked cars are not actually a problem and they act to provide a degree of traffic calming. The real problem is the speed at which some people drive along Prospect Road. The introduction of the parking restrictions will result in traffic travelling faster and a serious accident will happen.</p>

In my view the most dangerous point along Prospect Road is the brow of the hill by Milton Grange. Cars travelling in a northerly direction from Wharf Road come over the brow of the hill to find cars on their side of the road passing parked cars. The introduction of parking restrictions further back by Elleray Court means those cars on the wrong side of the road will be travelling faster and the accidents will be more serious.

Suggested solutions

1. Traffic calming. To solve the problem of safety you need to slow down the traffic, not remove the parked cars. A proper "sleeping policeman" speed hump before the brow of the hill by Milton Grange would have the single most significant positive impact on safety. Further speed humps by Gorselands Close, Elleray Court and Richards Close would reduce the risk of accidents far more than removing the parked cars.
2. Whilst I am certain that parked cars are not the real problem I do appreciate that some cars do park dangerously right on the junction of Elleray Court. Having spoken to people who live in Elleray Court it is clear that there is not sufficient parking for the number of cars there. There are large lawn areas and if some of that area could be converted to parking spaces the problem would be reduced. Parking bays at 90 degrees to the road along the entrance road into Elleray Court would be a good solution if the necessary funding and red tape could be resolved.

I hope you will take this objection seriously and not adopt the proposed changes. If the changes go ahead I would appreciate knowing whether a dropped kerb will be installed outside my property.

As a resident in the affected area I would like to support the proposed parking controls in the Prospect Road.

The reasons for my support are as follows:

1. Safety – currently when exiting on to Prospect Road vehicles can be approaching from either direction on the same side of the road as the junction. Consequently having looked in both directions prior to joining Prospect Road, the lag between looking left then right can mean there is time for a vehicle or bicycle to have approached from the direction of the first observation resulting in a near-miss or collision.
2. Improved access for emergency vehicles – with cars or vans parked directly opposite of adjacent to the junction there is minimal space for larger vehicles to enter. This has meant that large vehicles drive onto the footpath causing damage to the pavement, which in turn results in a trip hazard for pedestrians.
3. Improved access for service vehicles such as for refuse collection – with cars or vans parked directly opposite of adjacent to the junction there is minimal space for larger vehicles to enter.

Additional areas of concern

Prospect Road is in front of houses number 30 to 14 (direction of travel towards Wharf Road), a solid row of cars is frequently parked in this area throughout the day. On this inclined road it is not possible to see if vehicles are approaching from the Wharf Road direction.

I am surprised that there has been no proposal for parking controls near the Swan Public House in Hutton Road, in this area cars are frequently parked on both sides of the road, sometimes also obstructing the footpath.

241 & 242	<p>With reference to the proposed parking controls -</p> <p>On the whole the parking doesn't generally cause problems, it is the speed of some vehicles that causes issues. Reducing the parking by the extent proposed may mean the road will become a bit of a race-track; speeding drivers will have a clear run. Whereas at the moment they have to slow at regular intervals because of parked cars.</p> <p>I work from home in a property between the bend and the brow of the hill and see a few patients a day, I rely on them being able to park close to my house.</p> <p>If the area outside our stretch of Prospect Rd is one of the few parking areas left then there will permanently be cars parked along this stretch. There is not enough off-road parking in the area and they will all fight for the few spaces along this stretch of road. Some of the cars in our area appear to be permanently parked - I'd assume they will relocate to this stretch and become immovable.</p> <p>I fully appreciate the residents near The Swan Pub suffer parking issues during opening hours, but surely the Pub owners need to be pressurised to take more responsibility for this.</p>
247	<p>I am pleased to see that no waiting is to be introduced on the brow of the hill incorporating Milton Grange and Crescent Lane, and also on the bend and hill further along Prospect Road restricting waiting opposite Gorselands Close and Elleray Court which all seem sensible and necessary.</p> <p>Having lived in Gorselands Close for 14 years and being a regular driver along this road, I would like to point out that I have never had any problem finding a pulling in space to allow oncoming vehicles to pass, in the section of road from Elleray Court and up past Richards Close, and so see no point in restricting those living along this section of road from parking there, the only need here if any, is to restrict parking directly on the junction to Enfield Road where vision for emerging traffic would be impeded by cars parked too close to this junction.</p> <p>I am surprised and somewhat disappointed that there seems to be no plan to restrict parking along the dangerous section of road near The Swan Public House, this area is on a long sweeping bend with little chance of a pulling in space when an oncoming car is met.</p>
249	<p>I would like to make the following comments in favour of new regulations.</p> <p>Firstly I would like to say that I have been a resident of Milton Grange situated off of Prospect Road, for the last 19 years. During this time I have been aware of three serious accidents that have taken place at the bottom of the hill on Prospect Road. This is due to the fact that cars and large vans park directly on the road, restricting the roads use down to one lane and causing a blind spot on the bend. Along with the issue of the bottom of the hill, I must stress that approaching the top of the hill becomes even more dangerous as I have no choice but to drive on the wrong side of the road up a hill with the prospect of oncoming traffic fast approaching head on.</p> <p>In hand with this, on occasions, I have found cars parked directly on the brow of the hill (including commercial vans) which means I have to enter Milton Grange on the wrong side of the road increasing my own risk of having an accident.</p> <p>The issue on the hill is also encountered from a third direction, which is leaving Milton Grange on the brow of the hill. There have been many occasions where I pull out of the road and turn left (unable to clearly see whether there is oncoming traffic approaching</p>

around the bend) and find myself half way down the hill as another car has already started their way up the hill. This then makes the situation extremely dangerous as either I now have to reverse blindly back up the hill unaware of any vehicles approaching over the hill, or the other car has to blindly reverse back around a bend that they are unable to see due to the parked cars blocking their line of sight.

Once past the hazards of the hill, the next approach near Elleray Court again is met with many cars parked along the roads, causing a large majority of the road to be restricted again down to one lane. When approaching from the opposite direction it means the cars have to drive for a long stretch of time on the wrong side of the road hoping they are not met with any oncoming traffic.

May I also stress in both areas of the road that when faced with hazardous weather conditions, these stretches of road become even more dangerous.

I believe the houses along the stretch of the hill originally had garages situated at the rear of their gardens with access via Crescent Lane, therefore I believe there is land where their vehicles can be re-situated, removing the issue of having to find space to relocate their cars.

I am very pleased to see this situation has been brought to attention as I have wanted to address the issues for many years but have been unsure of who to direct these concerns to.

I have been a resident of Elleray Court for over 10 years and although I do not drive and therefore do not own a car I understand why the changes have been proposed. However I can also see that there are a number of the flaws in the proposed changes and why if the proposed changes are introduced they should be amended making them less restrictive for people with cars and safer for road users and residents.

Traffic calming measures

As you know Prospect Road is often used by drivers an alternative (rat-run) to using Vale Road. I imagine that you have, but if you have not been around Prospect Road and Elleray court on a weekday when a lot of the parked cars are not around, cars tend to drive through a residential area dangerously and far too fast. I know that some residents along Prospect Road have been saying that the parked cars are a potential cause of collisions. However, based on my experience the parked cars are the only things that currently force cars to slow down, drive at a safer speed (under 20 mph) and pay more attention to other road users including pedestrians. If any of the proposed parking restrictions are introduced then some traffic calming measures (speed bumps, chicanes with integrated parking spaces etc.) should also be considered as a means to slow traffic down and pay attention to other road users.

Consideration for where people can park

Elleray court was built in the 1960s when many families still didn't have more than 1 car and some didn't even have a car and children tended to leave home for good at a young age. As a resident I know that the Elleray Court committee is looking into parking options but we all know that due to current lifestyles no matter how many spaces are created within the private land around Elleray Court there will never be enough spaces. Has any consideration been made to parking options, for example widening the section of Springfield Road which leads directly into Elleray Court so that cars can park on both sides of the road? Are the residents around Prospect Road also aware that the proposed restrictions will apply to them any anyone visiting them?

278	<p>I would like to forward my comments on that matter and will start with positive aspect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Marking double yellow line could improve visibility for motorists around the junctions. -It would finally show the 10m space from the junction where the cars should not park ending disputes with police about how the 10m is interpreted (currently it is subjective and depends on individual Police officer). <p>Points against DYL around Prospect Road and Elleray Court:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -This area is already suffering problems with parking spaces and that forces residents to park in proximity of junctions and along Prospect Road, marking DYL will only make resident's life miserable and parking close to home impossible -There has been no accidents related to cars parked along the street and even during rush hours the traffic flow is smooth (around 5 years ago during works on the canal bridge the whole local traffic was diverted through this area and there was no problem) -Marking DYL in this area will only force residents to park elsewhere along Prospect Road so in matter of time there will be proposal to extend DYL. <p>Proposal is unacceptable without offering to residents additional parking spaces in place of those lost as result of painting DYL therefore I am AGAINST the proposal.</p>
280	<p>Having lived in the immediate vicinity of Prospect Road, Gorselands Close and Richards Close for the last 10 years we feel that the current arrangements for parking around this area are more than adequate.</p> <p>Restricting parking on Prospect Road between Gorselands Close and Richards close onwards will displace a large number of vehicles who are currently unable to park anywhere else (predominantly from the Elleray court area). We note that you have provided for some small areas without restriction (2 spaces possibly) along that stretch. If these cars were forced to seek alternative parking we are concerned that they would be parked in the residential roads and closes off of Prospect Road. In particular we believe this would cause additional issues whereby such roads are not wide enough to safely allow this restricting the ability of residents to move on and off driveways and to allow for emergency vehicles as necessary. We would be interested to understand where the council expects these displaced cars to park.</p> <p>The current arrangements on Prospect Road have not caused significant dangers in our opinion. There are frequently sufficient pulling in spaces along the road and the use of cautious and sensible driving and parking in adherence with the Highway Code negates the necessity for such parking restrictions.</p> <p>We are however surprised that your parking proposals do not consider the roads around the Swan public house. This problem has been exacerbated since the public house lost its overflow car park with the closure of the St John's ambulance facility. Cars are often double parked which makes driving past this area particularly challenging and potentially dangerous. Whilst we do not believe that putting parking restrictions on both sides on this road would be necessary we do think that some action to avoid double parking would be beneficial. This would need to be balanced with the benefits of having a successful restaurant and public house in the area boosting the local economy</p>

281	<p>Whilst I have no objections to the parking changes at the above, I need to bring to your attention, a current parking problem that arises frequently between Springfield Road and Elleray Court.</p> <p>Springfield Road was originally built as a no through road, with bollards before Elleray Court. This meeting point of these two roads is very narrow, so there has been occasions where emergency services / fire / ambulances have been unable to access premises due to parking which occurs at this juncture.</p> <p>With the changes to the loss of parking spaces on Prospect Road, this problem will only increase and may give rise to someone coming to harm as services may not be able to get through. I have also conversed with the local police regarding this issue and they have told us to contact the council.</p> <p>The problem could easily be solved with approximately 15 metres of double yellow lines on the side of the road between number 23 Springfield Road and the corner of the first side road on the left as you go from Springfield Road on to Elleray Court.</p>
282	<p>I am writing to register our objections to the proposed parking restrictions in Prospect Road, Ash Vale.</p> <p>The reason for the large number of cars parked on Prospect Road is that a large number of properties, in particular the flats in Elleray Court, do not have sufficient parking for the residents in those properties. The proposed introduction of double yellow lines on Prospect Road will do nothing to reduce the number of vehicles requiring somewhere to park, it will simply move the problem elsewhere. Furthermore, the parked cars provide natural traffic calming, without them the road will become more dangerous as cars will be driven at higher speeds.</p> <p>Prospect Road is a residential road; the majority of residents drive at a sensible speed, i.e. no more than 20mph, because they are aware of the nature of the road (narrow, bends, hills as well as parked cars). The occasional idiots who drive at unsafe speeds now will be able to drive even faster with no traffic calming in place. The road is also used during morning and evening rush hour as a rat run by people wanting to avoid traffic on Vale Road; this is likely to increase if the road becomes easier to navigate.</p> <p>We live in the row of houses, numbers 14-28, which is one of the few places which is still going to be available for parking. This portion of the road is used currently by residents of those houses because we have no driveways. The proposed introduction of the yellow lines will reduce the number of parking spaces available along this stretch of road, while also increasing the number of cars wanting to park there as it will be the only available parking. We have lived here for over 25 years and have not been aware of many accidents, and the few that have occurred have been minor and always caused by someone driving too fast.</p> <p>If this proposal is designed to make the road safer then the council should look at introducing traffic calming measures rather than restricting the parking which will not only inconvenience the residents but will also make the road more dangerous. It will also affect our quality of life if we have to constantly look for somewhere to park the car and will potentially affect the desirability and therefore the value of our properties.</p> <p>We feel that this proposal is ill-considered with no thought given as to how it will affect residents of the area who have to live here all the time, not just occasionally use the road.</p>

285	<p>We oppose the parking controls as they are overly restrictive and it's obvious that there is already a lack of parking places in the area. Where will these cars go?</p> <p>The plans do not propose any restrictions on the side of the hill outside 2,3,5 Prospect Road which seems to be daft when the proposals mention they are for safety at the brow of the hills and then the same proposals only cover one side of one of the hills? This side of the hill will also surely be impacted by the proposals as it will be one of the few areas to park? Vehicles already speed up this side of the hill – especially vans and larger SUV style cars.</p> <p>The fact that there are cars parked on the road seems to be more of a safety feature as the traffic must drive more cautiously. The main current safety issue is not the parking on the road it is the fact that people use Prospect Road and Hutton Road as a way of avoiding the speed bumps on Vale Road.</p> <p>A more sensible and justifiable safety proposal would be to introduce traffic speed reduction, steps such as speed bumps near the brow of hills and other potential safety problem areas.</p> <p>There are two very unsafe road sections without any proposals in the immediate area and they are the s bend on Hutton Road just before it joins Prospect Road and the area outside the Swan pub.</p> <p>These current proposals are flawed as rather than creating a safer road they will make it easier for people to drive faster as there are less parked cars in the way.</p>
291	<p>I have not been able to find a plan of new or extra car parking in and around Wharf Rd, for the Doctors Surgery and Abbeywood care home.</p> <p>I live in Wharf Rd, and have double yellow lines across my drive way, that help slightly, but not much due to lack of enforcement.</p> <p>WHARF ROAD NOT LISTED</p> <p>Why not to take away the earth bank , in front of Abbeywood, and create a WIDER ROAD , and underneath the car park put a large silt trap, to store rain water. So that you would help (not cure) two problems by doing one thing.</p> <p>If you are just putting in extra restrictions on car parking in the local area then people will dump their cars anywhere as the chances of being caught are tiny.</p> <p>As Guldford Brough Council are supposed to plan, then plan, you have allowed more houses to be built, so the doctors surgery has had to get bigger to serve more people, and there is a very small (inadequate) car park, hence all local roads are a car park.</p> <p>When are GBC planning to do anything about it?</p> <p>Hopefully there will be extra car parking for the doctors surgery and Abbeywood Care home, along with Surface Water holding tanks to help prevent flooding in the local area.</p>

I hereby formally object to the majority of the Council's proposed parking controls in the Prospect Road area of Ash Vale.

Having resided in Elleray Court for over five years I have been witness to the increase in parked cars as well as, regrettably, the ignorance and lack of consideration with which some residents park; this will only be perpetuated by the controls you propose.

I have spoken to local police officers previously regarding the parking on Prospect Road (where it meets Elleray Court) and they have said that it, and I quote, provides "a natural traffic calming measure" with which they have no problem.

This section of Prospect Road is straight and drivers have a clear view of oncoming traffic, so there is little or no danger of vehicular accidents due to not being able to see oncoming vehicles.

In the time I have lived in Elleray Court not one accident has occurred because of the parked cars. In fact, with the proposed controls, lives will only be put at risk.

At night, vehicles can be heard travelling at some speed along this straight section of Prospect Road; without cars parked in the manor they are able to now, this will also become a regular occurrence during the day.

Pedestrians, such as dog walkers, regularly cross this section of the road to go onto Ash Ranges. As moving vehicles currently have to slow at this section of the road, pedestrians crossing are able to do so more safely.

Should the controls be put in place, there would be no reason for vehicles to slow and this will endanger the lives of those pedestrians.

With the proposed controls the displacement of vehicles will antagonise an already oversubscribed area for parking. I have, on at least four occasions, called Surrey Police to report numerous cars (it has been known for numbers to reach more than five) blocking the pavement running along Elleray Court towards Springfield Road (as marked on 'Map of Proposed Controls – Comments and Suggestions' document enclosed). This remains a daily occurrence with cars parking there from the early evening onwards. Cars are then left, sometimes until late in the morning (or, on occasion, all day) until their owners leave. This behaviour, which will in no doubt increase, means that pedestrians, often the elderly walking to the local shops and parents with pushchairs taking their children to school, have been forced to walk into the road to be able to pass.

As proof of this reoccurring problem, cars already overflow into Springfield Road and cause issue for residents in enabling them to access their driveways, this will increase with the proposed changes. In particular, Elleray Court residents/visitor cars are often seen parked outside 23 Springfield Road, directly opposite the drive of number 50, where the road is already narrow, thus creating a very tight 'chicane'. This, in conjunction with cars parked to the left (as you look at the house) of 50 Springfield Road, means that ingress and egress of any vehicle greater in size than a family estate car, is prohibited. This endangers the lives of all residents by increasing the response times of emergency vehicles.

Vehicles already park right at the end of 50 Springfield Road's driveway. When a car parks opposite the drive a major access issue is created. It is therefore my suggestion that parking restrictions are put in place opposite the driveway of 50 Springfield Road.

	<p>Elleray Court has already lost some of its grounds (in particular behind Block B) to additional vehicles of owners wishing to park responsibly and without inhibiting access to other vehicles or blocking pavements and forcing pedestrians into the road.</p> <p>We already experience problems with an excessive number of vehicles in the area.</p> <p>While I understand the Council's wish to remove the 'spurious' yellow lines on an access way to some of Elleray Court's garages, I am against their removal. My understanding is that the lines were painted as there was a significant problem with vehicles parking at the entrance and blocking access for garage owners. These lines should be left unchanged or the problem will reoccur. That particular access is very narrow.</p> <p>The introduction of yellow lines from number 8 to 16 Prospect Road is welcomed. This is a blind hill and where vehicles are currently allowed to park they greatly increase the chances of a head on collision caused by drivers not necessarily appreciating the circumstances.</p> <p>In brief, my objections and acceptance to the proposed controls and suggestions for alternative measures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objection to the introduction of yellow lines from approximately number 28 to 52 Prospect Road - Suggestion to introduce white lines in front of drives in the immediately above stated area - Objection to the removal of the 'spurious' yellow lines on an access way within Elleray Court - <input type="checkbox"/> Suggestion to introduce yellow lines on the road opposite the driveway of 50 Springfield Road - <input type="checkbox"/> Agreement to the introduction of yellow lines from approximately 8 to 16 Prospect Road.
326	<p>I am in support of the majority of your proposals, except for the following:</p> <p>Concerning the proposal to introduce double yellow lines from just before Richards Close, where the letter box is, past Enfield Road I wish to comment that, being a straight part of the road, I do think the current parking permitted along this stretch does act as a traffic calming measure. To introduce no parking at all along here, I do think would invite people to speed along this part of the road. To proceed as you propose may require additional traffic calming measures to be introduced. An unnecessary expense if you were to bear in mind along this stretch there is no accident history.</p> <p>Note, I do not use this area for parking as I have my own off street parking.</p>
358	<p>It is encouraging to know that you are tackling the 'brow of the hill' problem in Prospect Road, which has been a concern for some time. With cars parking as one approaches that brow unable to see oncoming traffic; such traffic often taking the brow far too quickly creating an accident site waiting to happen.</p> <p>Living in Crescent Lane the turning into its narrow lane virtually on top of the brow one often finds oneself in a vulnerable position in the middle of the road especially with cars also often parked at the top end of the lane.</p> <p>Your proposals to tackle other problem areas is encouraging.</p> <p>I do however wonder where these cars are going to go being that the village is always very congested and the limit on parking which was introduced recently has only succeeded in cars parking further down the road where traffic is always busy with the Doctor's</p>

	<p>Surgery and Chapel usage. It is mostly impossible at certain times to find a parking space.</p> <p>With the village expanding and the recent planning applications and with the imminent building of a Morrisons replacing the Standard of England pub, associated car parking and delivery lorries, I anticipate an increase in traffic problems in that area.</p>
389	<p>The implementation and “strict enforcement” of parking restrictions in Prospect Road, in accord with, and reinforce the Highway Code is long overdue and we, that is my wife and I, wholeheartedly support the proposals on the following grounds.</p> <p>Prospect Road residents risk like and limb endeavouring to leave their driveways by car, they are generally blind to traffic from both directions because of on-street parking. The same applies to residents exiting Gorselands Close, Enfield Lane, Crescent Lane and Elleray Court. Traffic travelling along Prospect Road, in either direction, regularly experience running the gauntlet, the thrill of negotiating a chicane and forever having to stop and start to avoid fast moving vehicles coming from the opposite direction.</p> <p>It is a sad state of affairs when young mothers struggling with prams and trying to keep other walking children in check, together with elderly members of the community heading for the health centre or local shops, are obliged to skirt around vehicles illegally parked on the pavement and walk in the road. To compound the offence, it is very often the case in locations where the road bends sharply.</p> <p>It is something of a nightmare when the bin men arrive – and all traffic is brought to a halt for a serious length of time.</p> <p>We cannot remember when the road was last thoroughly swept because of obstruction by on-street parking.</p>
390	<p>I wish to object to the double yellow lines proposed in Prospect Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would create an open road which encourage speeding. The current parking acts as a traffic calming measure. A number of people cross this road to access the common land / ranges and therefore any increase in the traffic speed would be unwelcome. 2. There is already insufficient parking for these properties (Elleray Court) in the surrounding area and the proposed parking restriction will only make the situation worse.
391	<p>I wish to object to the double yellow lines proposed in Prospect Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would create an open road which encourage speeding. The current parking acts as a traffic calming measure. A number of people cross this road to access the common land / ranges and therefore any increase in the traffic speed would be unwelcome. 2. There is already insufficient parking for these properties (Elleray Court) in the surrounding area and the proposed parking restriction will only make the situation worse.

392	<p>I wish to object to the double yellow lines proposed in Prospect Road</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is already an appalling lack of parking for the properties in Prospect Road. 2. The current parking assist in slowing down traffic. 3. This road has a number of hills and sharp corners and the new proposals will open up the road and increase speed of the traffic which will make crossing the road more dangerous. 4. It will affect the business of the shops in Ash Vale as many people have nowhere else to park when doing their shopping.
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 234</p> <p>397 (Elleray Court) Mgmt Company</p>	<p>I write on behalf of the company which is the property management company responsible for the 72 flats forming Elleray Court estate. As a company we try to ensure that the residents park sensibly and safely and thus we have more than a passing interest in your proposals for parking in this part of Ash Vale.</p> <p>Having closely studied your proposals we accept the need, from a safety point of view, for some restrictions at road junction between Elleray Court and Prospect Road but must express doubt regarding many of the other proposals.</p> <p>The first doubt relates to enforcement. Where restrictions are in force such as the Wharf Road area where the majority of the shops are bases, it is a very rare thing to see any parking attendant and thus many of those visiting the shops are prepared to 'take a chance' and park on double yellow lines. After all the chances of getting caught are pretty minimal.</p> <p>There are two cars parking in the vicinity of Wharf Road. One, on the site of the "Ash Centre" is inevitably full during most weekdays with people employed in the Council Offices, those working in the CAB and visitors to the centre. The other parking area is some walk from the shops and thus appears to be under used. The forthcoming opening of the new Cooperative store will only make the problem worse and we wonder if any consultation takes place between the council and the developers of such new stores.</p> <p>To the layman the sight of the existing car park areas such as that around the long derelict public house in Ash Vale must present a possibility for use as a public car park even if a small charge was levied to cover any costs involved.</p> <p>Apart from those who 'take a chance' the other doubt or concerns arises from the migration of parking from the Wharf Road area towards the Chandlers Road / Prospect Road areas which is beginning to "overflow" Chandlers Road to the detriment of parking of users of the Health Centre and Aged People Home. It must only be a matter of time before there is a major accident at this junction.</p> <p>Finally, it is difficult to envisage the impact if the restrictions as illustrated come into effect. Where the cars are supposed to park is a mystery. The only possibility seem to be that they will migrate to side road such as Enfield Road, Richards Close and Elleray Court. The latter of these is of particular interest to the company as we are already in a situation where we have parking problems with little way of improving matters as the majority of parking places are on adopted road normally full of vehicles.</p>

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
Rose Lane, Ripley (introduce formalised disabled bay)	(2 representations)
58	<p>I am writing to object to the proposals to introduce a formalised disabled bay outside nos. 6 and 8 Rose Lane, Ripley, Surrey. At the moment, the area outside nos. 4 - 18 is being used as all-day parking for non-residents and it is virtually impossible to park near my own house between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00. At times, I'm forced to walk significant distances rather than take my car for fear of being unable to park on my return. It is impossible to go shopping and park to off-load packages near my house, meaning I am forced to walk backwards and forwards with heavy bags.</p> <p>The grounds on which this objection is made is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are already significant issues regarding parking for residents of 4 - 18 Rose lane and this proposal will only exacerbate the problem further. 2. At the moment, the area outside nos. 4 - 18 is being used as all-day parking for non-residents and it is virtually impossible to park near my own house between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00, weekdays and weekends. At times, I'm forced to walk significant distances rather than take my car for fear of being unable to park on my return. It is impossible to go shopping and park to off-load packages near my house, meaning I am forced to walk backwards and forwards with heavy bags. 3. I have written twice to Guildford Council requesting residents parking because of the existing issues. 4. I have seen no evidence that disabled bays are necessary, particularly in the case of no 6. 5. Should this proposal go ahead, it will benefit the few to the detriment of the many, having a significant negative impact on the quality of life for residents in no 10, 12, 14, 16. 6. It will mean that residents, especially single females, may be put at risk by having to park a significant distance from their homes on dark evenings. 7. For the sake of fairness and equality to all residents of this stretch of Rose Lane, residents parking is a far more appropriate course of action. Should this proposal go ahead, it will have a significant negative impact on the quality of life of residents in nos. 10, 12, 14 and 16.

197	<p>I would like to object to the addition of a disabled parking space on Rose Lane. There is already a severe shortage of unrestricted parking for residents of Rose Lane – most of us do not have any parking for our historic cottages except what is on Rose Lane. I would <u>not</u> object to an additional disabled spot on the high street which makes more sense. If the attempt is to provide a disabled space for elderly residents of Rose Lane then you will have to provide many more than one space as I am a OAP and most of the residents of the lane are! The location of the space, in any case, is not at all convenient for someone disabled as that location is always blocked at one end or another and is very tight. There would be more ease of access for any disabled person in front of the bus stop where there is currently 1 ½ spaces of high street parking.</p> <p>I see that the disabled parking spot has already been put in on Rose Lane and painted with the disabled words on the Tarmac. So what is the point of a consultation?</p>
-----	--

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
	<p>Middle Street / Gomshall Lane, Shere (introduce / formalise disabled spaces and improve turnover of spaces near shops) (4 representations)</p>
	<p>My particular concern relates to the suggestions regarding the disabled parking bay in Gomshall Lane. This was installed around 12-13 years ago at my request to the parish council for my disabled daughter as I am in the unusual position of living in the middle of a school playground and I am duty bound to park on the road during school hours. I was told at the time that it could not be classified as a residents bay as there were no other parking restrictions in place in the village and that I would have to accept others may use the space in my absence. The solution has worked as well as could be expected during this time.</p> <p>It has been all too frustrating over the years to be accused of inappropriate use of this bay by the school, the police, and now it seems the council too! I have a separate vehicle which I use for my daughter, who has cerebral palsy and is confined to an electric wheelchair and/or walking frame. This vehicle is registered as disabled with DVLA, is driven solely for the purpose of transporting my daughter to and from school, activities, town etc, and displays a blue badge at all times. My daughter lives with me full time and is currently in her final year at college. She is currently learning to drive through Motability and should she be successful will have her own Motability car which will take over from my vehicle as her primary form of transport. There will therefore be a continuing need for the foreseeable future for the disabled bay in question to be reserved, particularly during the school day, for resident use. I would emphasise that I have my own alternative transport for my use when not transporting my daughter.</p> <p>I am very much in favour of reinforcement of disabled bay use in general and I am amongst the many frustrated drivers who have to tolerate inappropriate parking around the country. Living on site I am very aware of the useage of this bay and regularly check windscreens to see if a driver is entitled to park there. I do not agree with the suggestion that there is misappropriate use of this bay as all drivers, other than the occasional few dropping off/picking up children from school, appear to be displaying a valid blue badge.</p> <p>I understand from a phone call with Andrew Harkin that the proposals to formalise the bay should have no impact on my useage whatsoever. I also understand that no time limit will be imposed which is important as it is required at a minimum from 7.30am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday during school term time. I felt it was important however to highlight the history of this bay and the essential part it plays in my daughter's life given the widespread perceptions of my use in particular!</p>
310	<p>General Comment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 All parking restrictions need to be enforced if they are to work. 2 There is virtually no enforcement in Shere and what little there is tends to be concentrated on the yellow lines at the northern end of the east side of Middle Street, those designed to stop people parking close to the junction of Middle Street & Gomshall Lane [to the north of the proposal below]. To all intents and purposes none of the other restrictions are enforced and many of them are ignored with impunity.

3 I see no point in introducing more restrictions that will not be enforced.

Proposal 1:

Introduce Mon-Sat 8:30am-6pm 2 hour limited waiting, no return 4 hours parking place

Comment:

I live just around the corner and I have rarely come across any parking space hogging in this small area. It is primarily used by people going into the Co-op who then leave.

I see any restriction as unnecessary and if any restrictions are introduced, it will involve additional signage to clutter up the street scene.

But if any time restriction was to be introduced it should be for say 30/45 minutes, not 2 hours.

Proposal 2:

Introduce new formalised disabled only parking place [outside Ivy Cottage]

Comment:

Blue badge holders already park wherever they feel like in this area.

Providing a dedicated space will not help as it won't be enforced and will need additional signage.

Proposal 3:

Formalise existing advisory disabled only parking space.

Comment:

I support this although I doubt it will be formally enforced.

Suggestions

Suggestion 1

1 The area outside the school is No Parking Mon- Fri, 8am-6pm

2 This implies that it's OK to park outside these hours. This is one of the narrowest points in Gomshall Lane and parking in this area causes obstruction.

3 It should be No Parking at all times.

Suggestion 2

1 The yellow lines at the western end on the south side of Gomshall Lane near the junction of Middle Street imply that it is OK to park at the eastern end of them which, since they were introduced, people have from time to time, despite the fact that there is parking on the northern side of Gomshall Lane at this point, which leads to obstruction. I have lived here since 1978 and prior to the introduction of the yellow lines I cannot recall anyone parking in this area since it was obvious it would cause obstruction.

2 These yellow lines should be removed.

374	<p>The proposed disabled bay in Middle Street:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is going to be situated in the narrowest part of Middle Street.2. Co-op attracts large vans, cars and lorries.3. There is no dropped kerb for disabled people.4. The Co-op in Middle Street has no disabled facilities for shoppers. I mention this in case you are putting a bay here for disabled shoppers. There is a large entrance step.5. There is a recessed parking bay between the fire station, WCs and the Dabbling Duck tea shop – which I once owned.6. There is a dropped kerb – which disabled people need. Being recessed they can alight from their cars without being killed on busy Middle Street.7. It's ideally place for the Co-op and green grocers.8. I am going to assume that you have looked at this site – why has it not been considered. The dropped kerb is not for cars. I have been there since I owned the teashop in 1986 and before.9. I live opposite the tea shop and parking bay. I am severely disabled and in a better position than able bodied people to understand the difficulties of walking and shopping in Shere – you can't alight from a car on to a busy road. That is why the recessed bay is perfect.
412 Shere Parish Council	Agree with the disabled bay proposals but believe that there is no justification for the proposed limited waiting bay and the associated street clutter.

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
	<p>South Hill, Guildford (improve access to No.8a) (3 representations)</p>
235	<p>I understand the reason for making the proposed changes to the two bays in South Hill. The change gives needed better access to No 8a.</p> <p>My comment is to emphasise the importance of keeping all the car parking spaces we have in South Hill – and to increase the number if possible. I live opposite No 8a and have to leave my car in the road.</p> <p>Reducing the bay DOWNHILL of the affected gap will not create a problem: it is currently too small for three cars and larger than needed for two cars. Therefore that bay should be reduced in this exercise by more than the uphill bay. The UPHILL bay should be reduced by as little as possible so that the full length of the bay is available: it does fill up frequently. There is room to enlarge it at the top end of the bay to allow equivalent space, or MORE space, to be added: there is plenty of room to enlarge this bay before the next driveway</p>
384	<p>It would appear that the map is inaccurate and entrance to 8 South Hill is for the garage only, with no allowance for the gate which opens into the courtyard in front of our house. The total width for garage and gates is 5.10m. The section currently controlled by a single yellow line includes a fire hydrant. In the circumstances would it be preferable to mark this section with double yellow lines indicating – “No waiting at any time?” I recently spoke to the local fire officer who agreed that this should be done.</p> <p>I have previously written in February 2014 on this matter to explain how difficult and dangerous it can be. It was suggested that it was not necessary at the time but that the situation would be reconsidered if issues persisted.</p> <p>Parking in the bay up-hill of the gate means that vehicles parked legally can still cause issues by virtue of their overhang. This does impinge upon the gateway causing a further hazard.</p> <p>Since my previous correspondence, we have suffered from various thoughtless parking incidents which makes life very difficult, and in some circumstances, dangerous.</p> <p>p.s. Suggest a 20 mph sign painted on the road might help.</p> <p>My thoughts are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a pedestrian crossing was placed at the multi-junction of Castle Street, Sydenham Road, Tunsgate and South Hill, traffic would be automatically ‘calmed’ and slowed down. It is a very dangerous crossing area, and not all drivers indicate when they turn. • Introduce 20mph limit to South Hill with signs painted on the road surface.

- Continue to permit free parking after 6pm and on Sundays, but paint double yellow lines across every house drive entrance. This would allow passing areas when the traffic is congested. We would never allow our friends and family to park across the entrance. This only encourages others to do the same, and we have experienced a number of unpleasant situations.
- The map is not accurate and the blue box annotation obliterates our No.8 problem.

Guildford is a most attractive town, and being the county town of Surrey, must be encouraged to remain so.`

I welcome any proposal that will improve vehicular access and therefore safety, not only to my property, but also those of my neighbours in South Hill.

Presently, when leaving the property, visibility both up and down South Hill is severely restricted especially when vehicles park up to the parking lines immediately either side of the gateway. Often such vehicles are high sided i.e. a van or four wheeled drive and then access is totally blind. It is then necessary to drive out extremely slowly using hazard warning lights and listening out for car horns. I have lived at the property for almost two years and experienced several near misses. It is a matter of time before there is a very serious accident. I have witnessed my neighbours experience the same difficulties.

The danger is exacerbated by the excessive speed of many of the vehicles particularly in the rush hour. Vehicles often park over the parking line severely narrowing and sometimes blocking the access and even when wheels fall within the line vehicle overhang has the same effect.

For these reasons a widening of the gap either side of the gates would improve visibility and therefore safety. The wider the gap the safer it would be. Ideally the gaps outside numbers 8 and 8a should be widened by another car length either side of each gate. This would also give access to the fire hydrant which is often blocked by parked cars thereby improving safety to the area as a whole. It is difficult to tell the width proposed from the plan.

South Hill is a very busy stretch of road being so close to the town centre but also due to its junctions with Sydenham Road, Pewley Hill and Castle Hill and the proximity of the nursery at the top of South Hill only 45 metres from my gate. If the speed limit were to be reduced to 20mph in South Hill by clear road surface markings and or a flashing road sign then this, together with wider access gates, would greatly improve safety not only for residents but also other road users in particular parents and children going to and from the nursery.

I appreciate that parking in Guildford is difficult having lived here for over 30 years. However safety is, I believe, far more important than the loss of a small stretch of parking bearing in mind that the multi-storey car park is less than 200 metres away.

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
<p>Poyle Road and The Street, Tongham (introduce double yellow lines and a disabled bay)</p>	<p align="right">(3 representations)</p>
<p>Page 242</p> <p>14 Poyle Road Campaign Group</p>	<p>Please accept the following comments on behalf of the Poyle Road Campaign Group -Tongham Care - for the prevention of Flooding and Speeding.</p> <p>There are occasions when people park in the entrance to the Recreation Ground - even when the gates are open and when there is space available in the car park. The introduction of double yellow lines in the area proposed will provide some safety comfort for those</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that worry the parked vehicle is not seen until the last minute turning into the area or - that leaving the area have a sight line problem when coming out onto Poyle Road. <p>We understand double yellow lines are proposed - who will enforce this proposed highway marking feature?</p> <p>-----</p> <p>There is very much concern for the need for additional parking in the Tongham Village area covered by your Restricted Parking proposals forThe Street Village.</p> <p>The layby immediately in front of the shops is very small and difficult at the best of times to fit in - besides taking up a reserved space for special need drivers.</p> <p>Would it not be better to pinch another space across the road next to the existing layby reserved space?</p> <p>Such new reserved spaces will not be enforced for the shopper that pops in and out quickly - with Police cut backs it will be tempting to take a chance as per the silly parking in the immediate area of St Paul's School in The Cardinals - see attached a few pictures showing silly parking in the Village Shop Area.</p> <p>People have parked on the pavement when there has been plenty of space, bollards recently installed knock down, litter bins and hanging basket posts knocked down, the special reserved space used by unauthorised people. You have seen it all - what can be done to help busy people as well folk needing some reserved space.</p> <p>Some shops could do with reserved space to enable their suppliers to deliver and collect - so many demands and not enough room.</p> <p>We strongly support the need for available money to be used to create additional parking space where cars go in at an angle - this could be introduced along The Street opposite the existing layby from the Bridge Mews to almost Lambourne Way.</p>

	<p>The Cardinals is in need of a similar parking arrangement around the area of St Paul's School - the demand is there but is the money?</p> <p>-----</p> <p>We wish to request you provide Restricted Parking/double yellow lines in the following areas:</p> <p>1 - at the west entrance to The Cardinals between dwelling 14 and 22 Poyle Road - stop cars parking on grass verge. 2 - on bend at dwelling 50 around to The Cardinals east entrance - area used opposite the Scout Hut/Fellowship Church. This is a blind spot - road bears to the left. 3 - at the entrance to the garages between dwelling 102 and 104 Poyle Raod - stop cars parking on pavement. 4 - on the bend in The Street from near the Manor Farm Business Area upto near The Ambulance Station. This is a blind spot - road bears to the left.</p> <p>Please advise if you are willing to include these extra areas for Parking Restriction.</p> <p>The cost of a few metres would so much help to relieve driver concern.</p>
<p>243 Clerk, Tongham Parish Council</p>	<p>I am writing on behalf of Tongham Parish Council to advise that we do not feel restrictions in Poyle Road outside the community centre would be helpful; in fact this would cause considerable problems elsewhere in the village. It is not felt that there is a problem in this area, under normal circumstances.</p> <p>In addition, the proposal of an extra disabled bay in The Street, opposite the shops, would only serve to exacerbate an already difficult problem, caused by insufficient parking spaces. Not one of the Councillors is aware of any disabled person regularly using the existing bay.</p>
<p>248 Chairman, Tongham Parish Council</p>	<p>Thanks for logging this information as its important that GBC are made aware that both the proposals mentioned would be unwelcomed in the village and only serve to make matters worse.</p>

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
254	<p data-bbox="112 323 2067 432">Vale Road, Ash Vale (small extension to existing double yellow lines to improve visibility on approach to bridge over canal) (1 representation)</p> <p data-bbox="320 440 2056 635">I wish to oppose in the strongest possible terms to the proposed changes in parking that you have advertised for Vale Road in Ash. The centre of Ash vale never has enough available parking, I am aware that you have spaces outside of the shops but these are always oversubscribed. There is little or no alternative parking in the centre of Ash vale and parking there is always a problem. As a result I often park outside of the convenience store and bike shop in Vale Road and this is a very convenient place to park. Many other people also use this and I believe it contributes to the footfall to those businesses. The shopkeepers also seem to have no issue with those cars parked there.</p> <p data-bbox="320 675 2056 869">If the spaces are taken away, and one has to negotiate the bunfight that is the parking situation in the centre of Ash vale then personally I would be opposed to stopping and shopping in my village. I would most likely go elsewhere where I can easily park. Have you witnessed the parking problems in the village? It is ALWAYS busy with cars parked in the available spaces. Finding a space is always a problem and cars frequently double park outside of the solicitors. I have also witnessed an accident outside of what was until recently Budgens when a lorry delivering to the store crashed into a car parked outside. We need MORE available parking - not less! Even the community centre car park is full each day.</p> <p data-bbox="320 909 2056 1007">Speaking to other people locally, they have also expressed the same opinion. If the council is not prepared to provide adequate parking in the village centre then my view is that those businesses will suffer as a result. Furthermore, parking cars in Vale road does not pose a significant risk or problem to either pedestrians or traffic. It does not impede the flow of traffic significantly.</p>

ANNEXE 12 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
Oak Hill and The Oval, Wood Street Village (introduced double yellow lines and formalise existing school keep clear marking)	(2 representations)
	<p>I am a resident at 70 Oakhill and am writing with concerns about the above proposals.</p> <p>I have lived here for 28 years and the parking outside the village school has been a growing problem during this time.</p> <p>The building of the community car park, although alleviating some of the problem, was never going to solve it completely because it is just too small. I know there were various restrictions imposed by Surrey Wildlife and local residents but common sense should have prevailed in building car parks on either side of the school with in and out access going round the back of the premises.</p> <p>Imposing yellow lines on the main road will result in a queue backing up onto the main road with too many drivers trying to access the mini car park during school hours. This will create an additional safety hazard to other road users.</p> <p>The overspill of cars will inevitably end up being parked in our service roads, which are a in a pretty poor state of repair. Saying that, we in fact prefer it, as it does discourage non resident parking and also slows down the vehicles which at times their drivers assume it is some sort of race track.</p> <p>I have had my driveway blocked on various occasions, although it is perfectly clear that it is my access to my house. I have had the driveway widened in order to be able to use it as I should. That has made some difference but it was an expensive solution.</p> <p>Also the service road entrances have been blocked by parked cars and I have been verbally abused by ignorant drivers when I request they move out of the way.</p> <p>I also wonder about the policing of the parking on yellow lines. Currently drivers seem to have one purpose in mind and that is to get their children to school by parking as near as possible to the gates. This includes parking on the school entrance restricted access areas. The drivers can't be bothered to use the carpark, a) because there are not enough spaces at busy times, b) it takes up more time than they allow for the drop off and collection and c) it's quicker to park on the road.</p> <p>I am not adverse to having parking controls put in place BUT in order to protect the villagers, sensible alternatives have to be provided to the poorly planned existing car park facilities.</p>

237 Wood Street Infant School	<p>We are very pleased to see these proposals as the area outside our school can be very dangerous, especially around the entrance and exit of the new community car park.</p> <p>We agree with the proposed double and single yellow lines positions, and believe that this is a good balance and still allows parents to park on the main road if necessary (parallel to the school) where it is a straight piece of road, and therefore safer.</p> <p>We are very keen to see double yellow lines outside the community car park especially, as it seems that some parents think nothing of parking right outside the entrance and exit (AND in the small space between the entrance and exit!) making it extremely dangerous for all other drivers attempting to leave the car park. More worryingly parents with children are trying to cross the road, having to peer around parked cars to check it is safe to cross. Despite a number of messages to our school community, some still park there and there is very little we can do. This is our main area of concern.</p>
413	<p>Is it possible for the disabled bay to be placed entirely outside No.19 The Oval? This would allow the disabled resident to park outside his property, and we outside ours (No.17). No.19 is closer to the curve of the road but it is not on the bend. It wouldn't be common sense to formalise the bay with no one using it!</p> <p>As an alternative, is it possible to set up an official GBC sign indicating no parking?</p>