

ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

Ref. No.	Representation Comments
	<p>Burpham shopping parade area and Burpham Lane, Ash (introduced various yellow lines, limited waiting restrictions within the parking bays and formalise a disabled parking bay) (54 representations)</p>
8	<p>I propose that from the <u>existing yellow lines to Marlyns Drive</u> is changed to either 3 or 4 parking bays Or single yellow no waiting Mon - Sat 8.30 to 6pm.</p> <p>Paddocks Road and Meadow Road residents do not want Aldi staff (who currently park in Burpham Lane so that their customers can fill their car park) or Aldi customers, using their cul de sacs to park.</p> <p>I run a bridge club in the evening at the cricket pavilion where the average attendance is 30 and age is probably 75. Less parking availability in Burpham Lane will deter some of these people from coming. I cannot see a problem with allowing parking in this area in the evening.</p> <p>I suggest that a well lit walkway from the car park in Sutherland playing field is made to the cricket pavilion. This could be used by members of my bridge club, and anyone else who uses the pavilion, and also by Aldi staff/customers.</p> <p>I feel that double yellow lines for the whole straight stretch of Burpham Lane is over the top. Cars have to park somewhere - it is just moving the problem on. And will increase speeding along this route.</p>
11	<p>I would like to give my support to the plans as outlined under the above reference for parking restrictions in the Burpham Parade Area.</p> <p>The parking , particularly on the dangerous bend and narrow areas of Burpham Lane has become extremely dangerous over the past few years.</p> <p>Hopefully this may reduce the danger to young children walking to school who daily face cars mounting the pavement without slowing down to weave around oncoming vehicles and parked cars.</p>
12	<p>I wish to object to the draconian proposals for parking restrictions in Burpham Lane.</p> <p>Since double yellow lines were introduced, after the opening of Aldi supermarket, it has become very difficult to park in order to use Sutherland Park, in particular the Pavilion which is NOT reachable by path from the Sutherland car park.</p> <p>Chicanes were introduced in Burpham lane as a traffic calming measure but if parking is to be curtailed at all times this road will become a Rat run once more.</p>

	<p>I feel that a single yellow line would suffice in the remaining area which would enable evening use of the park and Pavilion whilst keeping the road clear at busy times (Rat run or not).</p> <p>If this compromise cannot be agreed it is essential that the footpath from the Sutherland car park be fully lit and also a branch of path should be directed to the Pavilion which backs onto Burpham Lane and is used by a Playgroup during the day as well as Bridge and Cricket club meetings in the evenings.</p> <p>I'm sure that you must be aware of the "displacement" parking which will occur when large areas of roadside parking become restricted. The problem will not go away but just move elsewhere in the area causing a new set of problems. When hundreds more houses are built at Gosden Park things will get a lot worse for people wishing to support the local shops. I feel the current policy of making life difficult for vehicle users is unrealistic in an area where the buses are infrequent and unreliable.</p> <p>At nearly 70 with arthritis, I live too far to consider walking to Burpham Lane, particularly at night, and the bus is not a viable option.</p>
15 Page 68	<p>We are in the process of purchasing a house on Burnet Avenue (currently resident elsewhere in Burpham) and welcome the possible introduction of yellow line at the junction of Burnet Avenue and New Inn Lane. This will prevent the congestion caused by parking effectively turning this part of the road into a single lane and will improve safety for those turning into Burnet Avenue.</p> <p>As you note, the introduction of double yellow lines at the entrance may push those cars further down the road. I am concerned that this will mean cars will then park outside numbers 49, 51, 53 and 88. Obviously this is not ideal in terms of safety.</p> <p>May I suggest that you consider permit parking on Burnet Avenue. Properties on Burnet Avenue all have off street parking and visitors' passes would eliminate any inconvenience to guests. As London Road becomes busier and busier it is likely that Burnet Avenue will see an increase in traffic flows. Reducing the amount of on street parking would have safety benefits and ensure residents are able to enter/exit properties without any hindrance.</p>
17	<p>The 3 hour parking allowance is too long. If introduced, this would allow shoppers to Aldi, using the Burpham Parade parking facility as an 'Aldi overflow'; preventing those customers wanting to use the Burpham Parade shops, from Parking and adversely impacting on the vibrancy of these small, local and much needed shops.</p> <p>The free parking period should be limited to 30 minutes.</p> <p>Shop keepers in Burpham Parade should be provided with 'free customer parking permits' for longer periods - up to 3 hours - enabling visits to businesses which require longer eg. the hairdresser, restaurant etc.</p> <p>With respect to the the double yellow lines proposed in Burnet Avenue, these should be extended at least 1000 yards along Burnet Avenue, to prevent parking outside residential properties to work/visit Aldi.</p> <p>I trust the above mentioned - logical and sensible - recommendations are taken into consideration. The 3 hour period proposed would be another negative step in the saga concerning the recently introduced facilities (including the building of the Aldi store), which have done absolutely nothing but serve to adversely impact on local business; plus cause unacceptable traffic congestion. You would understand the above if you have ever tried to gain access into Burpham Lane, while waiting in the traffic queuing into Aldi; a totally unacceptable and ludicrous situation!</p>

	I trust common sense will prevail.
18	<p>We live in Meadow Rd. and find the use of Burpham Lane very difficult on account of vehicles parked there.</p> <p>Yellow lines would seem to be the best control for the whole length of the road, ie to Clay Lane.</p> <p>There is free parking in the Sutherland Playing Fields Car Park.</p>
21	<p>I totally support the proposals, ref KM/16/0004-6, which I have viewed online.</p> <p>I live in Burpham Lane.</p>
23	<p>I would just like to say that I am definitely for the proposals to limit parking in areas outlined last Autumn for Burpham Lane and part of Howard Ridge. I am a resident of Howard Ridge and it is extremely difficult for residents to turn right out of Howard Ridge as it is almost a blind spot to see if any traffic is coming along Burpham Lane at that point and you have to carefully edge out before you can see if the road is clear.</p> <p>The entrance to Howard Ridge during the week has cars parked on the left hand side as you come up to Howard Ridge and this may be parked vehicles from Howard Building offices which seem to have many more occupants than it ever used to. The electrical Company often has its vans parked there when they should be in the parking spaces provided for the building at the front and back. At school times this is also very congested with parents parking their vehicles in Howard Ridge and at the bottom of the entrance to Howard Ridge on Burpham Lane.</p> <p>Also a new property was built in Burpham Lane near to the sharp left hand corner and vehicles I assume from that house or other residents near the corner are parking vehicles almost on the corner which is extremely dangerous.</p> <p>Since moving to the area some 5 years ago parking over the last 2 years has increased considerably and in the evening both sides of the road are full of parked vehicles. No sure if maybe the flats have now been made into bed sits and this has caused a great increase in traffic in the road? I know when I moved in, the flats were for use by the residents who owned them.</p> <p>Any help with regard to making the road safer by putting in either single or double yellow lines in some parts would be gratefully appreciated.</p>

26	<p>Largely I do not have issues with the proposals, however I have deep concerns about the crossing point on the North side of the Sutherland memorial Park and the area outside St. Luke's Church.</p> <p>My concerns are those of safety. This crossing is the main crossing point for parents and children accessing Burpham Primary and the Christopher Robin Day Nursery by foot. It is also used frequently by those generally visiting the playing field.</p> <p>This crossing is frequently used by adults and children, often on their own, not only during school start and end time, but also during the evening and at weekends.</p> <p>The layout of the road is such that you need a clear view of approaching traffic and your proposals will not allow for this at times when parking is allowed either side of this crossing.</p> <p>Presently you have to go into the road to see whether the road is clear and this is not acceptable.</p> <p>I am sure your first concern is the safety of road users, particularly pedestrians, so please would you review these proposals.</p>
28	<p>I would like to register my support for the proposed parking plan for the Burpham area.</p>
31	<p>I strongly object to any parking controls being put in place in Burnet Avenue for the following reasons-</p> <p>The people who park here are predominantly visitors to Raynham Close which is directly opposite to Burnet Avenue. Visitors to Raynham Close have no choice other than to park here as the council did not force the developer of Raynham Close (Bellway Homes) to make ANY provision whatsoever for visitors parking in Raynham Close. The alternative to parking safely by the kerbside in Burnet Avenue for these visitors is to park illegally on the pavement in Raynham Close which poses significant risk to children in the street and obstructs the pathways for pedestrians. A quick visit to Raynham Close will make it abundantly clear to you that the parking in this road is already dangerously overcrowded and it is nothing short of miraculous that no pedestrians have been injured here in the four years since the development was completed.</p> <p>Imposing parking restrictions at the entry to Burnet Avenue will simply push the parking further down the road from an uninhabited kerbside zone to outside people's homes in Burnet Avenue. Note that some of these areas are already overcome with parked cars, particularly on Coltsfoot drive which has cars dangerously parked on a sharp blind corner. Common sense would dictate that the current unrestricted parking closer to the entrance of Burnet Avenue is safer for both pedestrians and other road users alike.</p> <p>The current restriction free area adjacent to the entrance to Burnet Avenue does not present any danger to drivers entering or exiting the road as the parked vehicles are a considerable distance from the entrance to the road.</p>

32	<p>We support the Burpham Lane restrictions so as to reduce the dangers caused by " single lane " driving conditions often from Meadow Road to past the Church. Parked cars are always on the East side of the Lane so cars entering the dangerous right angle bend past the Marlyns junction have no idea what they are going to meet.</p> <p>Vehicles coming from Clay Lane are often stopped by parked cars as far back as the Church frontage and also have to venture out on to the wrong side of the road seeing nothing until too late. Often several vehicles are engaged in reversing for some distance during which time more arrive behind and confusion reigns.</p> <p>A 20 mph speed limit could be imposed as well but I imagine the chance of prosecutions would be slim.</p> <p>At the shops, there are a suspicious number of cars, especially on the Kingpost Parade side which never seem to move although there are few shops with staff or flats over. On Sundays these cars disappear and there is a strong suspicion that it is being used as a "Park and Ride" of some sort. Aldi staff have been strongly discouraged from parking in the parade and this situation pre-dates Aldi.</p>
36	<p>Re Burpham Lane parking.</p> <p>I feel parking should be allowed before 9am and after 6pm from Meadow Road to Clay Lane to help the less able to continue to enjoy playing Bridge in the cricket pavilion.</p>
37	<p>Re. Burpham Parade parking restrictions</p> <p>I object to the proposed parking restrictions to make the Burpham parade shops 3 hours only. Parking works well in the area as it is, and I see no need for the restrictions.</p>
38 Burpham Primary School	<p>Further to the proposed parking controls in Burpham Lane. I would like the following to be taken into consideration:</p> <p>I am concerned that whilst assisting with the flow of traffic in the mornings, putting double yellow lines instead of Resident's parking and speed bumps along Burpham Lane will increase the speed of traffic during peak times as there will be no parked cars to slow it down, thus creating even more of a "rat run". I am also concerned that the residents of Burpham Lane who do not have a driveway will be forced to park further afield (at inconvenience to them) or in Sutherland Memorial Park. This in turn will have a huge impact on capacity in the car park for those parents dropping off and picking up from Burpham Primary School as the school currently advises parents to park and stride as part of their travel plan.</p> <p>I agree that there should be double yellow lines approaching the junction of Clay Lane.</p> <p>I agree with introducing no waiting at any time double yellow lines in the turning circle outside Burpham Primary School and adjacent to Churchfields and would welcome restrictions that formalise the existing advisory markings outside the school. I would also request that Residents parking be considered for the rest of the lane outside Burpham Primary School for increased safety at pick up and</p>

	<p>drop off times and to discourage non-residents from driving down the lane.</p>
<p>Page 72 39 Barton Place Residents</p>	<p>You have said, “Clearly, if it is established that Barton Place does not form part of the public highway, then the proposals for this road will not be progressed.”</p> <p>That is reassuring but we have taken advice and have been told that for Barton Place to be included in the review it must be shown to form part of the public highway by due legal process. It is incumbent upon the Authority to show how and when this legal adoption took place. It is not our responsibility to prove that it is not public highway because it is not public highway until a legal process takes place.</p> <p>We await a response from Guildford BC on these questions and in addition, if adoption did take place, “why?” since it goes nowhere except to our garages. We have also asked what work has been carried out at public expense both pre 1974 and post 1974.</p> <p>Surrey CC stated that they assumed that Barton Place was adopted by Guildford BC prior to 1974 when they took over responsibility for maintaining the roads on a list passed over by GBC. They informed us that they had no documentation and we should ask Guildford BC for the same. Upon doing so we were informed that our drive was not adopted and referred us back to Surrey CC.</p> <p>Barton Place presumably appeared on that list because our planning permission stated that the public would have access “as and when” the Doctor’s surgery next door was developed. This development has not taken place nor is it likely to happen since the property is a grade 2 listed building.</p> <p>Both SCC and GBC have been asked how, when and why was Barton Place adopted and what maintenance work has been carried on numerous occasions, by the residents of Barton Place, and by Anne Milton MP. We are still awaiting the answers to our legitimate questions.</p> <p>To be blunt we feel conned. When our drive was resurfaced in 2011 out of the Environmental Improvements budget and not out of the Highways budget we were assured that it remained private and wasn’t a sneaky attempt to increase the parking in the area. We were also assured that parking wasn’t on the agenda by our Borough Councillor in August 2011. As late as 2015 Jo Diggins, SCC, said that she had contacted Guildford Parking Team and you confirmed that the section outside Barton Place had not been included in the review. How gullible we were!</p> <p>In the proposals for the environmental improvements we were identified along with the Kingpost Management Company as being private owners who needed to give permission for the work to be done. We note with interest and a degree of cynicism that the Kingpost area has become “private” on the restrictions plan. Why are they different from us?</p> <p>Do these consultation exercises have any meaning or is it all decided and are you just going through the motions?</p>

	<p>At the previous public consultation we spent considerable time discussing with you an acceptable way ahead should you produce proof that it was public highway.</p> <p>We explained that a no return within three hours would make life impossible for the 7 flats with stay at home mums with young children and we negotiated a settlement that allowed for residents permits if these restrictions were imposed. Without any reference back to us these proposals disappeared.</p> <p>We also suggested that the underutilised SCC land at the back of the shops could solve the parking problems at a stroke but no mention has been made of this possibility in current proposals.</p> <p>We are also upset that the Burpham ward is not represented on the Guildford Local Committee so there will be nobody to plead our case.</p> <p>We respectfully request that unless proof of legal adoption can be produced within the next 14 days that Barton Place be removed from the proposed restrictions and that the "Residents Only" markings that were, in our opinion, illegally removed by SCC be restored.</p>
45	<p>I welcome the changes that you are proposing to make to the markings on Burpham Lane (I am a resident of Paddocks Road)</p> <p>However, I have one big concern which is to do with the speed that vehicles go down Burpham Lane. People race through the traffic control measures at quite high speed. I have two school age children, both at Burpham Primary school and we cross this road on our route to school every day. My eldest child is now going to school on his own and crosses from Paddocks Road to the park.</p> <p>I am very concerned that without any further traffic control measures, cars will continue to race down this road and if anything speed up now that there are no parked cars to slow them down. I've also seen some quite large lorries going down the road - and it is unsuitable for them particularly round the bend at the end.</p> <p>Please could you build further traffic control measures into your plans to help avoid any nasty accidents as part of your proposal as it is a residential area.</p>
47	<p>I go to a bridge club, held in the cricket pavilion in Sutherland park, on Tuesday evenings. I am a 74 year old woman and I park my car in Burpham Lane. If I cant park there, then I would have to park some distance away and particularly in the winter this would not be desirable. Therefore I would not be able to go to the club if you introduced double yellow lines. I thought the powers that be wanted to encourage older people to maintain their hobbies.</p> <p>Would it not be more suitable for single yellow lines to be introduced so we could park after 6 in the evening?</p>
47	<p>I fully support the proposals for waiting and parking restrictions as shown on Drawing No. GBC/APH/BurphamProp2RevA.</p> <p>My reasons for this are:-</p> <p>Three hour limit outside shops will allow better access for shoppers and might help to stop the shops from going out of business.</p> <p>The restrictions in Burpham Lane are long overdue [ignore Aldi] and we might even be able to get Arriva to put the 36 & 37 bus</p>

	<p>service back to its original route thus providing reasonable access to those residents of Marylyns Drive, the far end of Burpham Lane and users of Burpham Village Hall</p> <p>Burpham Lane between the Village Hall and the Church is currently a death trap with parked cars everywhere and these proposals can only help.</p> <p>Parking on the junction of Burpham Lane and Marlyns Drive by users of Burpham Village Hall [especially on a Monday evening] creates a real hazard.</p> <p>Likewise the parking during the day at the junction of New Inn Lane and Burnet Avenue is dangerous to other road users and restrictions here can only help.</p>
50	<p>I was very disappointed to see the plans to restrict parking on Burpham Lane by introducing double yellow lines.</p> <p>I park there regularly on a Tuesday evening for a local club. The traffic density in the evenings once past the Aldi entrance is minimal. I would estimate about one car every 5 minutes. Consequently, there is no requirement in the evenings to restrict parking as it does not interfere with traffic flow. I would suggest 4 hr parking bays which can only be used after 6pm. I cannot comment on the need for parking restrictions during the day, but evening restrictions appear to be unnecessary.</p>
54	<p>I agree in principle to the proposed parking plans but, could you clarify if residents will have access to parking ,with permits ,and if anything will be done to reduce the speed of cars along Burpham Lane as the bollards do not work ?</p>
56	<p>Proposed parking controls of Burpham shopping parade and Burpham Lane.</p> <p>As a resident of Burpham Lane, I once again commend the changes as laid out by your office and presented to the Burpham Community last year at Sutherland Memorial Hall. To reiterate, we feel that the parking restrictions will yet further improve the overall experience of living in Burpham Lane. Specifically, we often have difficulty with accessing our property freely and have to navigate around the parked vehicles opposite our property throughout the week. Those that park there are a combination of Aldi shoppers / staff or recreational users of Sutherland Park who refuse to use the parking available in the park. We feel that extending the double yellow lines along Burpham Lane, as proposed, will be an appropriate mechanism to deal with these issues. Naturally, I would recommend adequate enforcement of these changes as I have on occasion witnessed vehicles disregarding the existing double yellow lines.</p>
57	<p>I have heard that Burpham lane is to have double yellow lines painted down its entire length. I am concerned that this will make traffic down it even faster than it is at present. My husband and I play bridge in the small cricket pavilion hut on a Tuesday evening and this new parking restriction will probably cause the club to close which would be a great pity.</p> <p>The pavilion is used for a play school during term time and this parking restriction will make it difficult for mothers to drop their children off at playschool.</p>

	<p>Would it not be possible to have the parking restrictions between 10:00am and 6:00pm thus enabling us to park when the Rd is less busy and to walk safely to the hall to play bridge for the evening and the children to be dropped off and taken into playschool safely.</p>
60	<p>Thank you for your parking proposals.</p> <p>I have one real concern of the area in front of St Luke's Church on Burpham Lane.</p> <p>Putting limited parking rather than double yellow helps us on Sundays so thank you for listening to that.</p> <p>But we now have nowhere to park wedding and funeral cars outside the church. Before there was a small area outside the entrance which has now gone to restricted. Could the restricted be at least Mon -Fri so wedding are not affected. Better still a single slot outside the church for funeral cars please.</p>
62	<p>Please note my objections to the Burpham parking plans outlined in KM/16/0004 which are as follows:</p> <p>Double-yellow lining the vast majority of Burpham Lane will have the following unintended and undesirable consequences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Speed of traffic along Burpham lane, already a serious safety concern, will increase as there will be no obstructions (parked cars), resulting in drivers increasing speed. This has already been seen in the Aldi end of the road since the yellow lines were put in place - traffic speeds are 20-30% faster on average. 2) Volume of traffic along Burpham lane, already a serious safety concern, will increase. This is because rat-running to avoid the queues on London Road past Sainsbury's will increase. The cause of the increase will be the faster and simpler travel along Burpham Lane due to the removal of parked cars which act as a "natural" road calming. This has already been seen following the Aldi white lining. 3) Aldi staff have been told to "park locally" and not in the Aldi car park. They currently park along Burpham Lane. Aldi customers park in Burpham lane when the car park is full. Your plan does not state where these people will park. It must do - this demand will not simply go away. 4) Enforcement of the existing (new) double yellow lines is inadequate and I see nothing in your plans to indicate how it may be improved. Park goers already park on the double yellow lines near Aldi in the mornings unimpeded, indicating that their deterrent factor is low. This calls into question the efficacy of your plans. Your plans give no indication of how enforcement would be improved. <p>In conclusion, your plans will make increase the speed and volume of traffic in Burpham Lane, and therefore increase the danger to residents and children in this quiet residential area. Your plans do not address the increased demand for parking in the area which is the result of the Council's decision to allow another supermarket and the high density Cloisters flat development to be built, both with</p>

	<p>inadequate parking space.</p> <p>Instead, your plans should recognise the need for more parking space, and the need to reduce traffic volume and speed in sensitive residential areas.</p> <p>My recommendation is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Reduce traffic speed and volume in Burpham Lane by using parked cars as natural traffic calming chicanes. 2) Do this by allowing parking along Burpham Lane as previously (pre Aldi) but with small sections of double yellow lines to allow for cars to pass safely and to allow residents to enter and exit side roads comfortably and safely. 3) As a suggestion, areas opposite Paddocks Road, Meadow Road and Marlyns Drive (and other side roads) could be double-yellow lined providing both the passing space required and the ease of entry and exit. Other areas could be allocated as open parking.
64	<p>Whilst I appreciate the need for some parking restrictions I feel that the proposals put forward have gone too far and will have a negative impact on some residents.</p> <p>I agree that there is a need for double yellow lines near Burpham Primary School and on the corners of junctions I do not feel there is a need for double yellow lines all along Burpham Lane. A 3 hour waiting limit would stop all day parking but still leave locals the chance to park there to use the Village Hall or Sutherland Park or for visitors to the residents of Burpham Lane to park.</p>
65	<p>I am a resident of Burpham, and have been for 20 years. I would like to object to the parking proposals as they currently stand. My reason for this is because no additional parking has been created. Burpham Primary was allowed to expand, there have been a few small housing developments, and of course recently Aldi have all contributed to more cars in the area. People do need to park somewhere when dropping their children off at school on their way to work. In an ideal world everyone would walk to school, but this is not practical for most working parents. If parking restrictions are in place, this will make matters worse not better.</p> <p>My daughter has a blue badge, and only today I was unable to park in a yellow bay in Sutherland Park because of others taking the spaces. This resulted in me being late to collect my son from school. Are the council going to check that those parking in the yellow bays have badges? Often it is the GBC vans I find that are parked in them!</p> <p>I hope the council will carefully consider the implications that imposing the restrictions will bring.</p>
67	<p>I strongly object to the idea of double yellow lines along the length of Burpham Lane.</p> <p>Evening activities would be made very difficult.</p> <p>A more feasible arrangement would be to restrict parking before 6.00pm if necessary but make it available after that.</p>

68	<p>Burpham Lane.</p> <p>The proposed parking controls in Burpham Lane, extending just a few feet into Marlyns Drive, will undoubtedly displace parking in Burpham Lane, into Marlyns Drive. Parking that currently occurs at this end of Marlyns Drive already causes road safety concerns ;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Parking congestion leading up to and either side of the first traffic calming bollard, causes difficulties in priority traffic flow around the bollard 2) Loss of clear sight lines for residents exiting their properties into the prioritised traffic flows, again causes obvious dangers. <p>The displacement of more parked cars into the Burpham Lane end of Marlyns Drive, will exacerbate these road safety concerns yet further, not only for drivers and residents, but also for pedestrians, including numerous parent/children groups making their way to and from school each week day morning.</p> <p>I understand that yet again there was another vehicle "shunt", just last week, in this part of Marlyns Drive.</p> <p>Should the proposed parking controls be implemented in Burpham Lane, then please seriously consider extending the yellow lines into Marlyns Drive, on both sides of the road, at least until the junction of Marlyns Drive and Doverfield Road.</p> <p>Additionally please also consider a 20 MPH speed restriction along the whole length of Marlyns Drive, to stop motorists speeding up in an attempt to get by the "priority bollards" when it really is not "their turn". A 20 MPH restriction in Burpham Lane itself might also be beneficial, as currently the parked cars act as a traffic slowing mechanism.</p>
69	<p>I am very concerned about the plans as I am a resident of Burpham Lane, that lives in the section between the bend and Howard Ridge. If the yellow lines are placed near my house but without resident parking, I will struggle to park anywhere near my house.</p> <p>I am a single parent with one car and will really struggle to park near enough to my house without resident restrictions being enforced. If I have heavy shopping or large items to carry in and out of my house (or even deliveries), it will be very, very difficult for me :(</p> <p>I do not have a partner or anyone who can help me with carrying large items so I urge you - please, please, please allow resident only parking for the houses along Burpham Lane without driveways. I do not think this is an unreasonable request.</p> <p>I realise that having residents parking may cost me more but in the long run, this will be in my interest.</p> <p>I really hope that you can help me with my request. My neighbours have also requested residents parking for the properties in Burpham Lane (overlooking the bowling green area of the park) and without driveways.</p> <p>If residents parking isn't instigated, people who shouldn't park there will take my space.</p>

I am not in favour of the current proposals as it will increase the danger to pedestrians in the area and creat a 'rat run' along Burpham Lane and another through the Weylea estate, along Marlyns Drive and Burpham Lane.

Since the introduction of double yellow lines along part of Burpham Lane parking along Marlyns Drive has increased noticeably. This will only become worse if the whole of Burpham Lane is made into a double yellow area.

The Burpham Lane parking has been displaced to Marlyns Drive which makes it very difficult for local residence to safely join the road from their own drives. This has resulted in a number of near misses and minor accidents that could easily resulted in personal injuries. This situation has been exacerbated by Meadow Road residence parking their vehicles on Marlyns Drive rather than their own private road!!

In the morning and afternoon 'rush hours' and corresponding congestion on London Road (A3100) and Clay Lane regular drivers are creating a 'rat run' cutting through the Weylea Estate, down Marlyns Drive and Burpham Lane at great speed at the same time as children are walking to school vastly increasing the risk to pedestrians.

The adding of double yellow lines to key parts of Burpham Lane would help reduce risks to pedestrians and road users such as the tight corner at the western end. Placing double yellow lines all the way along Burpham Lane will transfer the problem to Marlyns Drive and encourage drivers to use the clear Lane as a perfect cut through using the traffic calming as a slalom challenge.

I would prefer the current layout of part double yellow near the Aldi store and the addition of more around the tight bend as the western end of Burpham Lane.

If you do decide to implement the current proposal of parking restrictions along Burpham Lane the addition of single yellow along the Marlyns Drive up until Doverfield Road would help dissuade the displacement of parking. Failing this the implementation of residence parking along the same section of Marlyns Drive would also resolve the issue.

One final point is the enforcement of current road and parking regulations. Currently, people park opposite road junctions and within 10 metres of junctions with no action from police or other authorities. This happens all along Burpham Lane and Marlyns Drive increasing the risk to pedestrians and other road users. If there is no enforcement of current restrictions and laws what is the point of adding more that could be equally unenforced?

The risk to local residence of increased traffic in the area is only going to grow in the coming years despite the assertions of the council research as part of the proposed Clay Lane link road to the Slyfield industrial estate.

I hope the feelings of this local resident helps with your deliberations and settling on a satisfactory solution that does not just transfer the issue to another place.

80	<p>I have been playing bridge at the Cricket Pavillion in Burpham Lane for years and now the double white lines which have been newly painted are really causing a parking problem for us in the evening. The Aldi Supermarket customers are taking parking spaces outside the Burpham Shops and we are unable to park there either. Walking across the park in the dark evenings in the winter to the parking by Sainsburys is very daunting by yourself if we lose the very few parking spaces which are left.</p> <p>I have walking problems so I am very anxious to write to you about this proposal for even more lines. If we could park after 6 p.m., say, it would be a great help and I ask you to reconsider and save your money for expenditure on something else of more importance.</p>
83	<p>We strongly support the proposals that have been made regarding parking on Burpham lane and feel that the parking proposals support the local community by addressing safety and access issues along Burpham Lane.</p> <p>All of our comments below still stand especially since Aldi has opened. We continually face issues with parked cars in front of our driveway preventing us from exiting on to Burpham Lane.</p> <p>Following my voicemail yesterday evening I would like to discuss with you the impact of the Aldi development on Burpham lane and the urgent need for double yellows further down Burpham lane as well as the removal of 2 parking spaces which have been planned opposite our driveway.</p> <p>Aldi is here and we now need to work together as a community to ensure that parking restrictions work for residents and the community.</p> <p>Since Aldi opened on the 5th November, customers and staff have been parking on Burpham lane for the majority of the day when there is a community car park positioned metres away.</p> <p>This has caused continual disruption as Burpham lane is now not only blocked at the top which we are working around but also along the lane itself.</p> <p>We strongly disagree with parking on Burpham lane and especially with 2 proposed parking spaces which have in fact been planned opposite our driveway thus blocking access to Burpham Lane form our property.</p> <p>Burpham lane is very narrow which has meant we have had cars and vans driving up on curbs to get through and due to the tight turning circle we are unable to turn out of our property if cars are parked opposite.</p> <p>The 2 proposed parking spaces block visibility for parents and children crossing from Sutherland park. Due to the limited number we sensibly expect these to be occupied permanently. These are also positioned between two junctions: Marlyns drive and Meadow Road.</p> <p>This is the route to school and nursery for the majority of parents who live off Marlyns drive. We are encouraging parents to walk to school and we need to ensure it is safe for parents to do this. There is an adequate car park metres away for parking.</p> <p>The Sutherland park entrance and crossing is used by :</p> <p>A) Parents and carers taking children to Burpham primary school (age 4-12)</p>

PARKING IN THE BURPHAM LANE AREA

Further to your recent letter concerning proposed parking controls in the Burpham Lane area, we would comment as follows:

- 1 The proposal to extend the existing parking controls into only the beginning of Marlyns Drive will undoubtedly increase the volume of parking in this section of Marlyns Drive by those who would otherwise park in Burpham Lane.
- 2 The first part of Marlyns Drive is already used as an extension to/instead of the car park of Burpham Village Hall which causes both congestion and obstruction to those residents attempting to gain access and egress from their drives. There is an alternative car park in Sutherland Park which is empty most of the time.
- 3 This area is used as a 'rat run' for traffic trying to avoid traffic congestion on the London Road, which has been further increased since the opening of Aldi, to gain quick access to the A3. The speed of the traffic is of great concern as cars continually try to quickly manoeuvre the speed bollards which have only served to increase the potential for accidents. I have seen many incidents of cars shunting into each other as they try to weave in and out of parked cars, the most recent being only two weeks ago.
- 4 The parking problem is also exacerbated by parking of vehicles by residents of Meadow Road who still gain access to a disputed permanent dwelling from Marlyns Drive. There is still a dropped pavement in existence to this dwelling which I understand should have been removed but is still in place. Cars from this dwelling and people using pedestrian access to other houses in Meadow Road are parked in the first part of Marlyns Drive every day.
- 5 Residents in this area have already had their bus service discontinued because of the buses being unable to negotiate the parked cars.
- 6 This is a route used by parents and children walking to school and I would ask that suggested measures are taken to ensure their safety in this area of Burpham.
- 7 It would be preferable to extend the parking controls to **both sides** of Marlyns Drive from the junction with Burpham Lane as far as the beginning of Doverfield Road. Controls on one side of the road will undoubtedly lead to parking on the other side of the road with its attendant problems of congestion and challenge to those trying to beat the current traffic calming system, and the lack of vision for residents trying to exit their properties.

We have seen the increase of traffic to this area rise to an extent where it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident caused by the volume of cars parking and speeding in this area.

94	<p>I would like to object to the proposed double yellow lines along Burpham Lane and Marlins Drive. The parking on these streets helps to reduce car speed, which is an increasing problem along these narrow lanes. The parking also allows for short stay parking for drop offs and pick ups. Guildford has the worst parking in anywhere I have lived, and to consider these new restrictions is ridiculous.</p>
98	<p>I object to the blanket imposition of parking restrictions of double yellow lines down Burpham Lane.</p> <p>The reasons why I object is because the speed of drivers down this lane will increase dramatically and dangerously.</p> <p>There are a lot of children who use Burpham Lane daily as they walk to and from school and at the weekend when going to and from Sutherland Park.</p> <p>On many occasions I have felt it necessary to gesticulate to cars to slow down as they travel at excessive speed down this lane, inches away from the pavement. These are occasions when I am walking with my three children to Sutherland Park.</p> <p>Parked cars along the lane currently act as a natural breaking mechanism to stop cars and vans travelling at excessive speeds.</p> <p>If yellow lines are to be introduced then adding additional speed islands all the way down is also necessary.</p>
99	<p>It would appear that little consideration has been given to the points made in response to your original proposal (my email of 2 November). I reiterate these points below together with some further comments based on experiences since the original communication.</p> <p>Why are these measures necessary?</p> <p>I can find no published justification for the need to impose severe parking restrictions along the full length of Burpham Lane^[1]. Certainly concerns have been expressed in recent years as to the extent of parking in the lane (and surrounding areas) which reportedly led to the withdrawal of the bus service along Burpham Lane but the proposed solution creates new problems for local residents.</p> <p>Are the new parking regulations intended to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Create a free flow of traffic along the lane and enable the restoration of the bus service? Remove day-long and other extended parking? Prevent overflow parking from local retail areas? Enhance the environment for residents? Achieve seem other objective(s)? <p>The measures imposed to date along Burpham Lane towards the London Road roundabout have already changed the traffic patterns</p>

^[1] The documents purporting to give explanations for Town areas and Parished areas on your website (<http://www.guildford.gov.uk/parkingformaladvertisment>) appear to be in error with both linking to the Parished Area documents.

and parking. The experience of these measures is not entirely positive but there is no evidence of these lessons having been taken into account in the latest proposals.

Increased traffic speed and volume

The imposition of the current double yellow lines extending from London Road beyond the Paddock Road junction has led to an increase in both the volume and speed of traffic in Burpham Lane. Removing vehicle parking at additional places along Burpham Lane is likely to encourage further use of the lane as short-cut or rat-run for those trying to avoid queuing traffic on London Road. As this is a road leading to a school, two nurseries and a retirement home this is regrettable and potentially dangerous. It is disappointing to note that there appears to be no move to reinstate the bus service along Burpham Lane.

Extended Time Parking

The existing restrictions have undoubtedly eliminated the use of the section of Burpham Lane approaching the London Road roundabout for extended parking by the staff of local businesses, day travellers wishing to avoid central Guildford parking costs and as a stock room for the local motor business. This has made for safer driving in this area but the problem has been replaced at times by traffic queuing to enter and exiting from the Aldi carpark, causing an obstruction for those wishing to proceed from London Road into Burpham Lane. I have found myself on occasions having to queue for several minutes for the traffic to ease or perform a risky passing procedure to access Burpham Lane beyond the Aldi entrance. My latest personal example of this was only two days ago. Such queuing also leads to blockages extending around the London Road roundabout as traffic from both directions seeks to enter Burpham Lane.

The Aldi Effect

It is not unusual to see shoppers trudging from Aldi to cars parked further down Burpham Lane, presumably when the Aldi car park is full. It is also understood that Aldi has refused permission for staff to park at the store. Alternative parking for such vehicles can only add further pressures to other local streets or lead to disregard of the parking restrictions as happens from time to time at present.

Parking and safety issues for residents and visitors

The imposition of additional double yellow lines is an inconvenience to residents as there is now no on-street visitor parking within 200 yards of many of the residences. I have today been asked by a neighbour to allow his visitors to park on my driveway because of the absence of on-street parking outside our houses. There is also a problem for delivery drivers whose arrivals grow in frequency with the growth of online shopping and home deliveries. Any further restriction is likely to encourage the unauthorised use of narrow local private sideroads, such as Paddocks Road which is maintained by the residents at their expense. Would the council propose taking over responsibility for the increased maintenance arising from any general public parking?

Parking and safety issues for local facilities

The parking problem is equally true for users of the pavilion on the Burpham Lane side of the Sutherland Memorial Park. The building was originally erected and incorporated into the Burpham War Memorial Trust and operated by a local management committee. It has been used over the years by many local organisations but is now run by the council. Whilst the absence of adjacent parking may be of little consequence for cricket users on summer weekends it poses potential hazards for evening users, many of whom are senior citizens, and for parents delivering and collecting children at the local playgroup which has operated there for many years. There is no direct footpath access across the park to the main car park and winter evening users will face a muddy,

unlit trek across the football pitch to reach their cars. The nearest alternative on-street parking is in Marlyns Drive or Kingpost Parade with a 200 yards walk along and across busy roads to the pavilion. The council does not appear to have considered the safety issues involved for the elderly and parents with small children.

The alternatives
 Some improvement to the parking and traffic problems in Burpham Lane, which were clearly expected to become worse after the opening of the new supermarket, was overdue. However, the blanket No Parking approach creates as many problems as it seeks to solve.

Free passage down Burpham Lane can be achieved by removing all parking on one side of the lane whilst limiting stopping during daytime hours (7am – 7pm) to loading and unloading (including school and nursery children) on the other side. Free parking on this other side during evening and night time would also benefit social visiting and other local leisure activities for residents and users. Free and safe movement of traffic could also be helped by preventing parking on both sides of the lane at junctions. This would also ensure passing places for busses and other vehicles when parking is permitted. This would involve lifting the parking restrictions on one side of the road beyond the Aldi car park entrance.

Whatever the solution, its success can only be guaranteed by strict imposition. There still appears to no attempt to enforce speed restrictions in Burpham Lane and little evidence of parking controls which enables to existing restrictions to be flouted.

I write on behalf of the Burpham Community Association. We appreciate the efforts that have been made to provide Burpham with safe parking options. However, some concerns still remain and I would like to draw your attention to these.

Burpham Lane

This is a very complex situation as the road is narrow and carries a high volume of traffic. A group of residents were concerned enough to raise a petition which resulted in a meeting on April 25th 2016 with Councillor John Furey, Councillor Graham Ellwood, Mr Michael Green and Mr Duncan Knott from SCC, and Councillor Christian Holliday and Mr Andrew Harkin from GBC Parking. Speeding is a particular concern and the subject is to be raised at the next Local Committee in June.

The installation of double yellow lines from the A3100 junction past the right-angled bend is generally appreciated but concerns have been expressed about speeding cars. Residents have said that the double yellows already in place by Aldi have led to faster driving which is worrying, given the number of pedestrians using the lane. These include many children going to and from school and nurseries as well as the elderly residents of West Court. It would seem sensible to link the extension of the no parking area to some kind of traffic calming measures.

Residents, especially those who have children at the primary school or the Christopher Robin Day Nursery, are very concerned about the main crossing point in front of the church accessing the north side of Sutherland Memorial Park. If parking is allowed either side of this crossing, there will not be a clear view of traffic and pedestrians will have to go into the road to check, and this clearly is not acceptable, especially in the case of unaccompanied children.

Marlyns Drive

Page 84

100
Burpham
Community
Association

If the parking controls envisaged for Burpham Lane go ahead, it is likely that more parking may occur in Marlyn's Drive, which already experiences congestion leading up to the first traffic calming bollard. This causes difficulties in traffic flow. There is also a problem with loss of sight lines for residents leaving their properties. These road safety concerns will be exacerbated and this is also a concern for the many pedestrians using the road, including parents and children going to and from school and nursery groups. Would it be possible to extend the double yellow lines at least as far as the junction with Doverfield Road? And as with Burpham Lane, perhaps some consideration could be given to traffic calming measures.

Kingpost Parade

We welcome the proposal to restrict waiting times, a long overdue measure, but note that all marked parking areas are for three hour limits. Is it not possible to change some, perhaps the kerbside spaces, to a one hour limit? Many people only need to park for a short period.

The problems with Barton Place seem to be ongoing – there has been no discernible outbreak of common sense. The BCA hopes that this problem will soon be resolved and that the Residents Only spaces will be restored.

New Inn Lane and Burnet Avenue

It is noted that earlier concerns raised in our response of November 2015 have been addressed and that double yellow lines have been extended along Burnett Avenue as requested. Thank you for this.

In that last response we also raised two areas that did not come under the remit of the Parking Survey but we would like to raise them again.

London Road

It carries all the traffic from the A3 slip as well as local traffic and is regularly congested at peak times, occasionally gridlocked. Any vehicle parked along the road would only add to the chaos. There is a housing development under construction between Orchard Road and the garage with an access road onto London Road. Parking space is limited and it is possible there may be an overspill onto the main road. We would ask that double yellow lines be considered on both sides of the London Road.

Woodruff Avenue, Coltsfoot Drive, Charlock Way

There is a longstanding problem associated with George Abbot School, not just at the beginning and end of the school day but daytime parking along both sides of Woodruff Avenue and along at least part of the other two roads. Many of these cars belong to older pupils. The onus is on the school to provide additional parking space within its boundaries but we ask that consideration be given to banning parking during school hours along one side of Woodruff Avenue.

101	<p>I am writing to object the plan of putting double yellow line on Burpham Lane and Marlyns Drive these roads.</p> <p>I live in Jacobs Well and every morning I travel from Jacobs well to these roads and park my car there to take the bus 515 to Kingston. As far as I know these roads are the only place where I can park my car and walk for a reasonable distance to reach my bus stop to Kingston. Sometimes I come late evenings and I need to park my car in a reasonable safe area without exposing myself to jeopardy. If you plan to put these double yellow lines on these roads, then you should deliver us with another options to enable people to use public transports and go to their work.</p> <p>I don't see any reason for turning these roads to a double yellow-lined roads, it will put me and other people in stress to find other roads and options for parking in the morning.</p> <p>I wish that you will take my objection into consideration.</p>
102	<p>Am writing to express my concern and OBJECT to the plans to put double yellow lines along Burpham Lane and Marilyn's Drive.</p> <p>Please do consider that some of us park our car in the area in order to get the 515 bus to and back from work.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to express my concern.</p>
107	<p>Re the proposals I support the plans for Kings Post Parade and New Inn Lane. I object to the continuous double yellow lines from Marlyns Drive to the existing double yellow lines in Burpham Lane. People need access to the village hall by parking nearby because the carpark there is too small for some meetings; and people using it or the cricket club in the evening do not feel safe walking through Sunderland Park in the dark. Also the removal of some parking will speed up traffic. Goods vehicles feeding ALDI should not exit that way.</p>
108	<p>With reference to the parking control proposals, I live in Churchfields and have a parking space outside my house which I use for my car. I also have a VW caddy van which I use for business (I operate an Ovenclean franchise), which I park in Burpham Lane when not at work.</p> <p>The van is parked on the road between the entrance of Churchfields and the junction - on the left as you go out.</p> <p>I leave for work at 7.15 am most days and arrive home from 3 pm so wondered if the new proposals would affect me.</p> <p>I also park there at the weekend.</p>
109	<p>I walk in Sutherland Memorial Park and along Burpham Lane regularly and have noticed that, since the removal of the parking at the Aldi end of Burpham Lane, the speed of traffic, already using it as a rat run, has increased. Chicanes only increase the speed as cars race to beat the oncoming traffic and horns blast when aggrieved drivers are forced to brake. Residents in Trodds Lane experience this on a daily basis.</p> <p>The removal of all parking will only increase the problems. I worried about myself walking there this Wednesday when a car travelled at reckless speed. Children leaving the Sports ground exuberant after playing sport and carrying footballs etc are in danger. Burpham Lane will just become a race track and the sharp bend become more dangerous.</p>

	<p>Friends living along the A248 in Albury and Chilworth say residents there deliberately park on the road to force drivers to slow down and take care.</p> <p>Unless it is intended to put in speed humps (again these do not always work) or speed cameras a great expense, the best solution is to allow the limited parking bays that were there until recently to return and to keep those still left.</p>
110	<p>It has come to our notice that you are considering double yellow lines for the whole of Burpham Lane. We strongly object to this idea as our bridge club is held every Tuesday evening in the small pavillion adjacent to Burpham Lane and there is nowhere else to park near there. The Sutherland Memorial Car Park is not appropriate as it would entail walking across a muddy field in the dark, a health and safety issue.</p> <p>There is very little traffic along this road in the evening and surely a single yellow line and/or some marked parking bays would be sufficient.</p>
111	<p>I am in support of the addition of double yellow lines on Burpham Lane, which also progress into Marlyns Drive. In my view the new double yellow lines should extend from the junction of Burpham Lane and Marlyns Drive along Marlyns Drive to the first set of speed control islands / bollards.</p> <p>I believe this is important for the safety of road users and pedestrians. This is a key area to the community with a large number of families, with nursery / school children, walking and driving through this area. A significant amount of traffic passes down these roads and the proposed double yellow lines will move parked traffic for the football pitches to the start of Marlyns Drive. If the double yellow lines are extended further down Marlyns Drive, the parked traffic will be moved away from the junction. This will encourage the parked cars to park on a safer section of the road or use the provided car park, which has sufficient spaces, in Sutherland Park.</p> <p>In addition I have noticed Aldi staff are not allowed to use their own car park and have been parking on Burpham Lane. The proposed double yellow lines will move these cars to park at the start of Marlyns Drive next to the Burpham Lane / Marlyns Drive junction. These cars will be parked at this location all day causing significant hazards to road users and pedestrians alike, making the area extremely unsafe for families including their young children.</p>
114	<p>I live in Orchard Road, Burpham and we as residents have had some three or more years of horrendous parking problems due to the number of new development sites in and near Orchard Road. Contractors vehicles were not permitted to park on site and many arguements and police visits have occurred due to driveway access being in some cases totally restricted. Having to search out a driver just to exit your own drive and then face abuse is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>I fear that when these proposed waiting restrictions are implemented Orchard Road will become a favoured parking place and it is not suitable for mass on street parking and access drives will again be blocked on a regular basis.</p> <p>I would ask that you look closely at this location as it will surely be used as a future car park.</p>

117	<p>You are probably well aware of the traffic problems we are enduring in the Blay Lane, Sainsbury's and Burpham Lane area and hope your proposals to increase the no parking in these area will go some way to ease the situation.</p> <p>But as you point out in your proposals, this inevitably will shift the parking into other area. We live in Marlyns Drive and as the above areas clog up, traffic is now moving through Burpham Lane and Weylea Farm, and we are already experiencing ill disciplined parking in our road causing problems with the flow of traffic. We have been promised that we will get our bus service back onto its original route. It was temporarily change because of the congested parking at the top of Burpham Lane, to ensure the flow of traffic through the estate. Many of the residents would like to see the continuation of the double yellow line through Marlyns Drive, on the left hand side (from the Village Hall) i.e. the grass verge side, to deter parking on both sides of the street. We can cope with parking on the houses side, not on both sides.</p>
118	<p>We object to the double yellow lines in Burpham Lane as we play bridge in the Cricket Hut every Tuesday evening and there is nowhere else to park our cars.</p> <p>If we did park our cars in Sutherland Car Park could there be a walk way and lighting across the Green to the Cricket Hut.</p>
122	<p>I was disappointed to hear that it was being considered to add more double yellow lines to the Burpham area. I use these public roads to park to use the bus to Kingston (bus no. 515) and would find it an added strain to find parking further away. There is no parking close enough to these bus stops to park unless you live locally and this is the closest bus stop to where I live to get to work. I really hope my concerns can be heard. It would be very appreciative if I could have an update.</p>
124	<p>I would hereby like to STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposed double yellow lines on Burpham Lane, from the junction with London Road (Aldi roundabout) up to the sharp bend, and on Marlyns Drive because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These roads serve a growing school, preschools, retirement home and businesses, and people need somewhere to park! Sutherland Memorial car park is not big enough – already the school run cannot accommodate all the cars for Burpham Primary School, which is due to increase in size by another 30 pupils each year for the next few years. • The double yellow lines that have already been placed on Burpham Lane have caused significant problems for the Sunshine Nursery staff who cannot load/unload equipment safely and easily, and who now have to park in Sutherland Memorial Car Park and walk across a dark park in winter in order to set up the nursery in the mornings. • The parking restrictions have also caused problems for visitors to West Court (retirement home), who now have to walk a significant distance and who are often elderly themselves. • The speed of cars coming off the roundabout from London Road has significantly increased since the double yellow lines were introduced, and this problem will extend all along Burpham Lane. • Cars doing the school run are only there for a very short time in the morning/afternoon, they do not cause an obstruction along this section of Burpham Lane, and I have never seen a car parked directly across a driveway. • The houses on Burpham Lane and Marlyns Drive hold their value due to their proximity to a good school – one cannot buy a house to be near a school and then complain about people parking on their road in order to take their children to that school. • Some of the complainants have said that parked cars make it difficult to cross the road (I personally do not find it difficult), but

removing the parked cars would greatly increase the speed at which cars travel along the road, which would be even more dangerous.

- I hereby ask the Council to put proper pedestrian crossings outside the main entrances to Sutherland Memorial Park, which is surely a more sensible solution.
- I feel that the only section of Burpham Lane that needs parking restrictions is from the sharp bend up to the Lollipop lady's crossing (towards Clay Lane), as this is the section where the pavement is narrow and cars drive on the pavement to pass each other. This DOES NOT happen along the rest of the road.
- I would also ask the Council to place speed humps along Burpham Lane/Marlyn's Drive/Doverfield Road to make these roads safer for all.
- Finally, I would ask the Council to remove the current double yellow lines on Burpham Lane to within 10 metres of the Aldi roundabout (to stop the roundabout from becoming blocked), which would allow cars to spread out along the road as they used to, and allow access to the Sunshine preschool.

In conclusion, I would ask the Council NOT to introduce parking restrictions on Burpham Lane, from the junction with London Road up to the sharp bend, and on Marlyn's Drive, as they are unnecessary, would cause undue problems for drivers and would make the road far more dangerous due to increased speed.

With reference to the parking proposals for Burpham.

It is a strange to comment on proposals when there is no justification that is publically communicated to exactly the issue that the proposals are trying to resolve. What issue are these proposals trying to resolve?

It is also unclear as to all the knock-on effects that the proposals will have. One major advantage of having no restrictions to parking along the majority of Burpham Lane is that the traffic is naturally slowed down, which is critical given that there are over 400 children that use the local school, the vast majority of whom walk. By implementing excessive parking controls it is clear that the traffic in the area will be travelling at a higher speed so I expect within a few months there will be another review to reduce the speed in the area. Not only will we as a community end up paying for parking restrictions it will then be followed by the implementation of enforce traffic calming measures.

The other point that appears absolutely bizarre is to introduce no waiting zones along the entire length of the park in Burpham lane when it is clear the car park in the park is insufficient to cater for the activities supporting activities that occur there throughout the year at the weekend such as Cricket and Football. As a person who is involved in coaching football at the park for children this type of planning application shows that there is absolutely no comprehension of encouraging children to undertake sporting activities. All you need to do is visit the park on a Sunday morning to see there is insufficient parking available. Why does Burpham Lane along the park need no waiting at the weekend, what is the justification?

As a local resident in Howard Ridge if you insist on implementing such a scheme I would suggest that for the areas without parking restrictions that bays are clearly marked out. I see in this road there are residents who specifically park their cars outside their house in the middle of what could be 2 parking spaces to prevent others from parking there.

I will reiterate it is very difficult to comment on proposals that have no justification on the problem they are trying to resolve but as a resident of the area for many years I find it absolutely ridiculous that the restrictions are in force over the weekend and believe this will

	<p>create more problems than it could possibly resolve.</p>
<p>Page 99 127</p>	<p>I am delighted to hear that Guildford Borough Council (at the meeting held on 8 December 2015) has agreed in principle to putting double yellow lines on the rest of Burpham Lane (continuing from No.21 downwards).</p> <p>I am finding it increasingly difficult to get out of my driveway with cars parked on the opposite side of the Lane. I have parking for 3-4 cars in my driveway but my visitors are also finding it difficult to get into my driveway because of this parking. Therefore, I am in favour of double yellow lines in Burpham Lane. The sooner the better.</p> <p>As far as Kingpost Parade is concerned (another area where parking is becoming increasingly difficult – partly because Aldi customers and residents of the flats opposite Kingpost Parade are parking there. I suppose some sort of charging to park in Kingpost Parade is inevitable – perhaps the first two and a half hours free to allow customers at the Indian Restaurant time to eat. Will the staff at the shops get any preferential treatment? Otherwise parking for staff will become another big issue. Aldi staff are not allowed to use the Aldi car park – hence the long term parking in Burpham Lane.</p> <p>I am not against the Aldi stores in general but I think Aldi should not have been given permission to build on that particular site – the traffic queues on the London Road to turn left into Burpham Lane have made jams and blockages that affect the whole of the London Road back to the roundabout at Stoke Park at certain times of the day. The Aldi car park on occasions is not large enough for their customers and Aldi make no provision for their staff cars which is appalling in this day and age.</p> <p>Of course, we knew all this before Aldi was given permission to build but no-one listened. Will Guildford Borough Council / Surrey County Council be listening now when we ask for double yellow lines in Burpham Lane – bearing in mind this is a Lane, not a Road? The Lane is not wide enough to sustain this constant parking – even at weekends the children’s football on a Saturday morning and now the cricket on Saturdays and Sundays (where no-one seems to use the car park on Sutherland Memorial Playing Field) – makes it so difficult for residents to access their own properties. Maybe some thought should be given to marking that car park larger to accommodate everyone who uses the playing field at weekends.</p>
<p>128</p>	<p>Following your ‘exhibition’ in Sutherland Memorial Hall last year and the subsequent published proposals I am writing as requested regarding the parking proposals for Burpham Lane – I in the section close to Howard Ridge.</p> <p>Firstly I will say that overall the parking proposals are welcome, and will help parking in the area generally. However, I do have a couple of concerns which I will try to summarise here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · You are currently proposing that there will be double yellow lines directly outside our house. <u>This is very welcome.</u> We are lucky enough to have a driveway for our car. Current parking rules however mean there are normally cars parked outside which make it almost impossible to get in and out of the driveway when required (we have been unable to get out of our driveway on occasions!). This is exacerbated because I am disabled and need access to the driveway/parking at all times and

the double yellow lines will help this. As explained, it seems crazy to have to request a disabled parking bay simply so that my driveway is not blocked, or to use when it is.

- The majority of Burpham Lane near our house will be single yellow lines with parking not allowed during the day. I do know that a number of our neighbours do not have access to a driveway, and therefore will have to park some distance away from their house. For anyone with heavy goods (e.g. shopping) or limited mobility the parking proposals will be totally unfeasible. Would it not be possible to have Residents only parking (which may be chargeable annually)? This would allow parking to be improved without penalising the residents, as well as being a source of funding for the council. Similarly with three drivers in our house, parking on our driveway may be impossible, and being disabled resident's parking would ensure a space was normally available.
- With parking restrictions in place traffic will obviously move more freely on Burpham Lane. However, this will lead to additional traffic – our street is currently used by many as a “shortcut” to the A3 and this will be used even more as parking improves. The lack of parked cars blocking the Lane will mean an increase in the number of people who can exceed the speed limits on this road. I live close to the local primary school, and even now the speed and volume of traffic is a danger to the school children. The school is doubling in size over the next few years, meaning even more pedestrian (and car) traffic, and it is only a matter of time before someone is seriously injured. Would some sort of traffic calming measure be possible in our part of the lane – there was a few years ago but this was removed?

The point we feel particularly strongly about is that we would prefer not to have double yellow lines in front of our driveway at Green View, No 62 Burpham Lane. This house has been newly built and is not shown on your map.

If possible, it would be good if there were no yellow lines in front of no 60 either as we also own that house. This is because there will not be much parking left on the street after the proposals are implemented and we would like our visitors to be able to park in front of our driveway if there is no space elsewhere.

