

ANNEXE 4 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|--|--|
| <p>Dorking Road, Chilworth (introduce sections of double yellow line around various points of access)</p> | |
| 6 | <p style="text-align: right;">(10 representations)</p> <p>I live in Dorking Road near the school and would be very pleased with the proposed parking restrictions especially at the weekends when the Percy pubs car park is full and Dorking road takes the excess. Trying to exit our little road opposite the school has become very dangerous as drivers park right on the corners at either end of our road, so trying to enter the main road I have to cross my fingers and edge my way out as the cars have blocked my view in both directions.</p> <p>I have often wondered if I was hit would the pub be liable for the damage caused by their customers inconsiderate parking (that would be too much to hope for)so I wish you luck with the proposed action.</p> |
| 14 | <p>I live at Haywards Corner, Dorking Road, Chilworth, GU4 8BG; one of the flats built in 2012. My property has three bedrooms and one allocated parking space, in a private car park behind the flats. I was very concerned to receive the letter today as myself and partner are reliant on on-street parking as all of my neighbours are.</p> <p>I am hoping you will be able to clarify some points regarding the proposal?</p> <p>As I understand it the proposal is for restrictions along the length of the Percy Arms Car Park.....only on that side of the road. So parking will still be possible outside the houses opposite the car park. There will be no restrictions outside the houses.....Can you confirm this is correct?</p> <p>Also the double yellow lines outside my property will carry on across (our) small car park entrance and onto the corner just before the first house. Is that correct?</p> <p>Can you also explain why this is being proposed? I have never experience parked cars blocking this entrance and (because of the existing lines) when leaving the car park it is possible to see clearly any oncoming traffic. I don't really understand why these would be needed.....</p> <p>When I brought my property in 2012 there were no parking restrictions. Were thoughts not put into on street parking 'issues' before planning permission was given??</p> <p>To my mind on-street parking is only ever busy on Sunday (lunchtime) when the pub is busy.....actually in the winter/autumn it's not that bad. The other end of the Dorking Road, by Tillingbourne school is a total nightmare every morning, afternoon and evening...yet I couldn't see any proposals for that end.</p> <p>I'd really appreciate it if you could clarify these points.....especially confirming where the restrictions might be.....as I'm sure you can tell we are very concerned about possible restrictions. And the damaging effect further restrictions could have on our daily live's.</p> |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| | <p>-----</p> <p>Following our phone conversation this afternoon I wanted to email firstly to thank you for clarifying the proposals on the Dorking Road, and second log my thoughts on the proposal.</p> <p>As detailed in my earlier email I live at Haywards Corner and my property is reliant on the limited on-street parking; therefore possible restrictions are a concern.</p> <p>I would not object to the proposal for restrictions at the entrance to the Percy Arms car park; (as discussed) 5 metres to the right and just before the 'layby' (walk way) on the left as you drive out of the car park should not affect residents. As I mentioned during our conversation cars only (so rarely) park on that side when the pub is very busy e.g some Sunday lunchtimes in the summertime.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions at the first entrance into Haywards Corner car park (closer to Albury) are more of a concern. I do not believe these lines are required. The existing lines allow drivers leaving the entrance to see oncoming traffic clearly. I would question a driver's ability to drive if they struggle to safely drive out (or in) of this car park entrance.</p> <p>If this part of the proposal does go ahead I would hope that the length of the lines are kept to a minimum. You suggested 5 metres, I do not believe any more than 2 metres would be needed to prevent cars parking up to the corner.</p> <p>As mentioned above my property is reliant on on-street parking, as are the other residents in Haywards Corner....well most of the Dorking Road seem to use on-street parking. Further restrictions are a real concern and I hope residents (and our need/reliance for on-street parking) are kept in mind when these restrictions are discussed.</p> <p>As mentioned below I would suggest the other end of Dorking Road (Shalford end) near Tillbourne School is much more of a safety issue with parking than the Haywards Corner end. Finally when I bought my property in 2012 there were no parking restrictions. I've already had lines painted outside my property and further restrictions are a worry.I do wonder why planning permission was approved for these properties without (seemingly) considering parking requirements and possible issues.</p> |
| <p>24</p> | <p>We, the occupiers of Haywards Corner, Dorking Road, Chilworth object to any changes to the existing parking arrangements.</p> <p>The existing arrangements (lack of restrictions) work well and all users seem to be using the space sensibly.</p> <p>Any restrictions in front of the Haywards Corner development will mean that we will not have any parking space for second cars near our houses.</p> |
| <p>48</p> | <p>Dorking Road, Chilworth.</p> <p>My partner has already been in contact with you and it seems that there's interest in putting double yellow lines outside our home, on Dorking Road, Chilworth (outside the Percy Arms pub).</p> <p>The parking in the week is just about sufficient enough that people that live in the properties can park after work etc.</p> |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | <p>My partner has an allocated space behind the flat/house. Unfortunately i do not and rely on spaces outside of the property and around the pub!!</p> <p>The Percy Arms pub causes alot of parking issues during nice weather - especially weekends & bank holiday!</p> <p>Try putting yourself in our shoes, try living somewhere where there is more than 1 car per property trying to park outside an already busy road without the need for double yellow parking!!</p> <p>We have to live here, if you put up double yellow parking its going to make it very difficult for anyone to park</p> <p>Why can't the Percy Arms have alternative parking. Can they not expand on their parking? Make it bigger.</p> <p>You should try coming over on a Sunday when it's really warm and then understand where i'm coming from....</p> <p>If the weather is really warm and i'm parked on the road, i CANT go out on a sunday at all because if i do, i WONT get parked again! It's ridiculous. We can't have people over either because of lack of parking!</p> |
| <p>51</p> | <p>In relation to the proposed parking restrictions in Dorking Road Chilworth I would wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals. I can see no benefit to the proposal but much aggravation and inconvenience to local residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>Whilst the Chilworth Infant school does generate cars parking this is only for a very limited time at the beginning and end of school, but in the twenty years we have lived in Dorking Road this has never been an issue. Similarly with the Percy Arms where a nice day in the summer will generate cars parking in the afternoon all along Dorking Road past our drive, but this is quickly gone and never an issue.</p> <p>Rather than spend money on the introduction of unnecessary and unwanted parking controls may I suggest that the money be used to repair the road surface between Chilworth and Albury. This stretch of road is in a terrible state and only a matter of time before it leads to an accident.</p> |
| <p>72</p> | <p>I am very please we may get yellow lines in the Dorking Road as it is very dangerous pulling out of our drive as people park almost in front of our drive entrance. My wall has been knocked down several times by people turning in our entrance. We find it very hard to see pulling out of our drive as we cannot see past the parked cars. It is an accident waiting to happen. It is worse at weekends with walkers parking and the Percy Arms customers. Also when the school children are coming and going. So we would be delighted if yellow lines are pursued.</p> |
| <p>75</p> | <p>I am writing as a resident of Dorking Road that lives opposite the school.</p> <p>I have examined the proposed parking restrictions for this part of the Dorking Road (A148) and would advise you that I and my parents completely endorse what the Council is proposing.</p> <p>I appreciate that these restrictions may not be popular with some fellow residents of this area and perhaps with some parents who drop off/collect their children from the Church of England First School but the restrictions are certainly needed to avoid a serious</p> |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| | <p>accident occurring.</p> <p>People have an unfortunate habit of parking directly next to the driveway opposite the school, which is our main means of access to and regress from the house. For example, yesterday was a fine day and this brought many ramblers out to the area. Some of them chose to park on the road outside our house and they parked hard up on both sides of the entrance to the driveway. This made things so dangerous that I elected to reverse all the way down to the other entrance to the driveway because I did not have a clear field of vision to drive out of our entrance with all the vehicles parked there. It is for this reason that the doctors, nurses and carers who visit my parents on a regular basis decline to drive into the forecourt of our house since many of them have had a bad experience when trying to gain access to the road from the driveway. It is a miracle that there have not been any serious accidents to date.</p> <p>I think the parking restrictions the Council are proposing are fair and still leave scope for parking on the road but not so as to encroach on the entrance to our driveway. Hence, my neighbours who regularly leave their cars parked outside their houses will still be able to do so.</p> <p>I therefore hope that the proposed parking restrictions will be approved.</p> |
| Page 98 77 | <p>We have lived in Dorking Road for over forty years, which is opposite the school and Percy Arms pub. I agree the pub is busy, but this is only at weekends and school is only for a few minutes each day. The pub has not always been busy in the past years and if it were to change hands in the future it may not be busy; however we feel it is good for the pub to be busy and a local business to be profitable. Having no parking in the area available will possibly damage this busy business and it will also just move the problem somewhere else. A lot of families with young children also visit the village to go on walks and down to visit the powder works, people using the railway also park in the area.</p> <p>The problem could be helped if people with off road parking were to use it, Haywards Close etc - as conditions of the planning, off road parking was provided for these residents. The railway have ground which could be used for parking for those using the trains. Possibly the pub may be able to extend their parking to rear of the pub or possibly on the field behind.</p> <p>Yellow, no parking enforcement would affect people in properties adjoining us as we have no off road parking available, neighbouring residents include the elderly and families with young children - who require close easy access from parking to property for safety; this is also true for those parents dropping/picking up kids from school.</p> |
| 95 | <p>We live in the service road within Dorking Road opposite the school and would like to make the following comments;</p> <p>The road is often extremely busy; cars park on both sides of the road; the speed limit is not adhered to most of the time and the road is used by a considerable number of cyclists and motor-cyclists. As such, we do not believe the proposed yellow lines extend far enough as, with the current proposal, it would still be difficult to see safely up and down the road, particularly when larger cars are parked, which considerably restrict vision.</p> <p>Obviously this is a significant safety issue. Some of the other local residents are elderly or disabled. The slip-road is used by many people as a convenient turn around (even though it is private) and so we believe the parking controls should be extended to improve the overall safety of the road layout.</p> <p>It would be prudent to restrict access to the slip road to residents only and so reduce the number of people using the exits.</p> |

115

The outlined proposal of additional yellow lines on Dorking Road, Chilworth, though not ideal, will go some way to alleviate the problems of: visibility on exiting Sample Oak Lane; sight lines from parking areas and/or residential premises and facilitate traffic flow, but will inevitably cause issues and concerns for those residents affected by this proposal and, as stated in your letter, may displace the current parking problems further along the Dorking Road with the same visibility problems resulting.

During this consultation period could consideration be given to protecting the residents of Percy Cottages who have no option but to park on the highway - eg broken line parking spaces for Percy Cottages Residents Only?

ANNEXE 4 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|----------|--|
| | Friars Gate, Guildford (convert part of parking bay to single yellow line adjacent to recently created vehicle crossover at No.4) (0 representations) |
| | |

ANNEXE 4 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|---|--|
| Greville Close, Guildford (formalise second disabled only parking bay) | (2 representations) |
| 22 | <p>I would like to thank all those involved for taking the time to listen to my previous objections to the plans for formalising disabled parking in Greville Close. My personal opinion of the revised plans is that they are much more suitable. I hope this will be true for everyone.</p> |
| 44 | <p>I have recently become aware of the new parking restrictions proposed by the council at the top of southway near the hospital.</p> <p>Whilst I can appreciate the need for these regulations, as a resident of Greville close I feel the council has overlooked what this will do for myself and other residents. Currently, there is a substantial issue of parking during the weekday, and there is a clear contrast in the amount of vehicles on the close when compared to the weekend.</p> <p>The majority of people who park here during the week are not residents, and by not implementing any kind of parking scheme for Greville close with the new proposals, the council are only making our problems worse. (In case there is any form of doubt/confusion from that statement, it can quite clearly be seen that this is one of the closest roads near the proposed changes without any restrictions) Whilst this is not a formal rejection, unless a counter proposal is offered that takes residents needs into consideration myself and other will be forwarding a formal rejection in the near future.</p> |

ANNEXE 4: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|---|---|
| High Street, Ripley (increase no return period within limited waiting parking bays from 1 hour to 4 hours) | (10 representations) |
| 4 | <p>I strongly object to the proposed parking changes as they would have a real impact on the residents of Ripley.</p> <p>I believe that the current parking arrangements offer the best option for both residents and people visiting the businesses and residents in the area</p> |
| 5 | <p>I live in Newark Lane near the High Street, the dangerous end, where cars, lorries and cyclists regularly drive along the pavement outside my front door, putting the life of myself and my dog in peril.</p> <p>Apart from that, I have nowhere to park my small car. I am retired and do not use my car on a daily basis. I have given up driving for Ripley Good Neighbours, since it is impossible to park on my return.</p> <p>Why can we not have Residents' Permits, thereby giving GBC more revenue?</p> <p>If not, can you suggest where I park.</p> <p>I await your response, without much hope.</p> |
| 16 | <p>I have reviewed your proposals for placing return period restrictions on parking in Ripley. Although I support them, I suggest that their effectiveness is contingent on the degree to which they are enforced. In my 9 months as a Ripley resident I have never seen a parking officer or traffic warden. That may well explain why parking regulations are routinely flouted including parking on double-yellow lines. It seems to me that you can modify restrictions however you wish but until and unless you enforce them the existence of parking restrictions means nothing.</p> |
| 41 | <p>Proposed changes to the parking controls in High Street, Ripley.</p> <p>I understand your concerns raised for the misuse of the limited waiting bays by those wishing to park for longer periods, however no consideration has been taken for the lack of parking available to those visiting Ripley. The free car parking is always full, and I can see nothing in your proposal to address this concern.</p> |

81

On-street parking arrangements in Ripley High Street.

I am a director of a small company which employs 10 people in Ripley, all of whom commute from between 5 and 30 miles to get to work here.

As you are no doubt aware, since the Rose Lane development, which saw the closure of a large un-made car-park, and its replacement with a much smaller paved car-park, there has been an acute shortage of parking in the Ripley area – a planning blunder!

These proposals will do nothing to address this fundamental planning error. They will not magically cause there to be less cars, and so the exercise is a futile waste of public money – money which would be better spent creating more paved parking for those who commute to bring economic activity to the village.

Perhaps you believe that everyone should be using public transport? Think again. The total absence of any sensible public-transport-planning at the county (or any other) level means that getting to Ripley by public transport is a huge task not to be undertaken lightly – and certainly not something anyone should be subjected to on a daily basis – I think it would probably be challengeable under Article 3 of the ECHR!

The Ripley Village Hall (over which I doubt you have any jurisdiction, but perhaps you do have some influence) sits with a large car-park empty most days, whilst hard-working commuters struggle with the already feeble parking. They could (perhaps encouraged by yourselves) offer (say) a pay-and-display parking on most days to no detriment to its current usage, and make some money towards the hall's upkeep to boot – a win-win!

This rearrangement of the deck-chairs on the metaphorical Titanic of Ripley parking, is a pointless, wasteful assault on already hard-pressed commuters and workers in Ripley.

85

The parking and traffic situation in Ripley requires much attention and improvement.

There needs to be a specified parking area for vehicles which now park along the roadside or on grass verges or seemingly wherever there may be a space.

In front of Pinnock Café there is usually solide parking making it virtually impossible to turn out of the Courtyard into the main road. Large vehicles park there along with vans and long vehicles making the area hazardous even for pedestrians, think of a blind or disabled person, children and dogs. It is my opinion that parking should not be allowed in that area.

Attention needs to be given to the speed of traffic that goes through the High Street. WHY are there no traffic calmers, WHY is there ONLY one pedestrian crossing?

One must hope that you will give full and urgent attention to these matters resolutions to which seem much overdue.

| | |
|--|---|
| 86 co-signed by 12 businesses | <p>We understand there is a problem with a few cars blocking the central parking bays all day & can see why you wish to extend the no return within one hour to no return within 4 hours. However, you may also catch genuine visitors to the village, who see something in a local shop, then go off to get their partner & being them back to see it too. This could also catch house hunters viewing local properties then calling in on the local estate agents. Perhaps a compromise of no return within 2 hours (or 3 hours), might reduce the risk of catching the genuine shoppers / visitors.</p> <p>The longer term visitors need somewhere to go & we would suggest creating parking bays at both ends of the High Street. Some double yellow lines are historical from the days of the A3 running through Ripley. We feel they could be lifted to create a new 3 car bay outside the wall of Ripley House. The wall stops residents having to view the parked cars. At the other end of the High Street, just before the village "gate", where the Portsmouth Rd joins the High St, a new 5 car parking bay could be created. These could allow parking for 4 hours, thus shifting some of the longer stayers to the edge of the village. Ripley's parking problems will not be solved by 8 extra spaces, but it would remove some of the pressure & also act as traffic calming to reduce the speed of vehicles entering the High Street.</p> |
| 121 | <p>The parking outside Pinnocks cafe and adjacent cottage is solid parking all day long often entailing large vans and 4x4 vehicles with the tail end invariably protruding into the cycle lane. The vehicles are driven in front ways which means on leaving they are reversing into the main road. This solid block of parking means that the residents of The Courtyard have no clear sight line when exiting into the High Street and are often forced to nudge out into the main road before being able to ascertain if it is safe to proceed. Surely the danger to all concerned is blatantly obvious and should have been addressed before planning permission was granted for 11 properties in The Courtyard. I have asked this question on several occasions but have not as yet received an answer.</p> |
| 129 | <p>As a Ripley resident of some years I hope you will consider including my comments in consultation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The proposals are good and will discourage 'commuter parkers', but they will look for alternatives, i.e. the free parking areas in Rose Lane. 2) The proposals do not offer options for residents who live on the High Street who have no-where else to park. 3) Residents in the Portsmouth Road and Newark Lane park on verges as they have no-where else to park. Can this be formalised to provide resident parking? 4) You have not included the White Hart Meadows car park in your map, a free car park of 60 spaces, although people complain that few are ever available. Are any changes proposed there there? 5) People drive to work as the very poor bus service is not an alternative. Do GBC have any sites, perhaps at the edge of the village, which could be considered for village workers parking? To avoid 'commuter parking' perhaps a permit system could be set up? Taking up the free parking areas shown in the proposals reduces resident/resident visitor parking areas and I doubt these areas will be enough to take up the workers need. 6) A local business owner recently suggested more parking should be allowed at the London edge of the village. 7) What can be done about pavement parking blocking the pavement? It is a regular occurrence. Often, families with children |

and pushchairs have to walk into the road to pass vehicles. If pavement parking is allowed, can white lines white lines be drawn to ensure the pavement is kept clear.

Overall, Ripley has a severe parking problem for residents without parking space, plus workers who need longer parking. The short term parking proposals are good to encourage shoppers but this will create new issues for those not catered for, as above.

Overall, we are supportive of the changes. As a small business located in Ripley for over ten years now there are two major issues with parking:

1. Lack of day parking for colleagues based in the office. (The car park and access to it off Rose Lane is badly lit and fills up quickly in the morning)
2. Inadequate parking for visitors as much of the short term parking seems to be occupied by residents and commuters sometimes leaving cars and vans parked for days on end.

We believe the proposals will help ameliorate the shortage of short term parking enabling better facilities for visitors to the village. However, we also believe more efforts need to be made to provide more parking throughout the village. We have suggested before better use could be made of the Village Hall car park for example, which lies empty for most of the day and even opening it at day time would create so much more capacity in the village. Recently, large flower pots have appeared throughout the village which have reduced parking further.

So parking is an issue for a variety of users in the village and we support these plans to create better turnover in key areas.

ANNEXE 4: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|---|---|
| <p>Lower Road, Effingham (introduce various double yellow lines between Howard of Effingham School and Vineries Garden Centre)</p> | <p>(9 representations)</p> |
| <p>Page 106 7</p> | <p>With reference to the suggested parking restrictions proposed for Lower Road, Effingham I think the proposals are excellent. Having used that road many times and knowing the many delays I have experienced due to too many cars down ones side and no passing places + the problems I have seen with busses trying to get through and the bus lay by being full with parked cars.. In addition your proposal will eliminate the blind spot for oncoming vehicles where cars are parked almost up to the Vineries Garden centre. I presume the bus lay by will also be designated no parking as this is a valuable passing spot in non peak hours.</p> <p>Have you noticed the verges outside the Catholic Church which is slightly down the road from the School - they are filled with car tyre ruts, without grass and become very muddy when it rains. They are a real eyesore. Is it possible to include adding bollards to these verges like the ones installed further up to prevent them being used for parking. Cars are also often blocking the pavements when services are being held.</p> <p>Unlike me most of the people who park in these areas do not live locally.</p> <p>Many Thanks for the fact that the whole parking situation is being studied and that positive proposals are being considered.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Further to my previous Email on the subject where I agreed wholeheartedly with your proposals, can I suggest you also apply no waiting double yellow lines along one side of Lower Road from the school to The Street/Effingham Common Road round about and in the Bus Lay by just along from the Church. This is the area where all the cars will migrate to. The School has plenty of spare ground that can be used for parking.</p> |
| <p>49</p> | <p>I have reviewed the proposed extension of parking restrictions in Lower Road, Effingham, and would say the following.</p> <p>It is reasonable to extend parking controls as marked on the plan during weekdays, though to prohibit parking in the area at weekends is unnecessary. Therefore single yellow lines could be applied, saving the Council approximately 50% of the paint cost.</p> <p>Guildford Borough Council should require the Howard of Effingham School to prepare a sustainable transport plan and to reduce the numbers of cars parked near to the school grounds. Otherwise, no doubt, the same number of cars will arrive at the school and be parked in the vicinity. The introduction of parking controls will merely move the issue of parked cars to other parts of the village, where traffic problems are already acute during the school day.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| 53 | <p>parking problems caused by Howard of Effingham students along Lower Road in Effingham.</p> <p>While the proposed additions will help some of the problems caused by daytime parking, if my understanding is correct they fail to address the considerable problem caused by parents parking along Lower Road during late afternoon and early evening, when there's an event involving them at the Howard. The proposals will still allow evening parking along the lane heading towards the Vineries, between the turning to the left and most of the way towards where the road bends to the left.</p> <p>Although the evening parking problem is infrequent, when it happens it is particularly acute and especially dangerous. Because parents park along the eastbound carriage-way towards Bookham, this can cause long lines of stalled traffic to build up from both directions. I have seen a situation where a bus from Bookham was pushing forward recklessly and forcing a long line of drivers to reverse back towards Effingham. When this happens over the winter, with reduced light and poorer weather, it creates even more dangerous conditions for people trying to cross the road, and necessarily has a knock-on effect on other roads. For drivers trying to escape the melee, they use the school car park to turn round, further complicating the situation. People can be held up in this situation for a long time, and the school has never seen any need to forewarn village organizations to publicise avoiding the area on these nights.</p> <p>My suggestion would be that if parking is still allowed on the Bookham bound side of the road then this must be limited to daylight hours. Lower Road should be allowed to have free-flowing traffic in both directions once the students have finished their school day.</p> |
| 73 Effingham Residents' Association | <p>The proposal was discussed by the Committee on 28th April and I have been instructed to write to you expressing grave concern on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would be disastrous simply to install yellow lines without making sensible arrangements for car to be parked elsewhere. The status quo is better than just leaving motorists (sixth formers) to find other parking places. That would lead to chaos in Effingham streets, probably mainly in Church Street and Brown's Lane, but possibly in Orestan Lane also. 2. It may be possible for KGV car park, Brown's Lane, to be used since it is generally not much occupied during school time house. The Committee's suggestion is that, if agreeable to KGV management, the School should pay KGV to provide a specific number of slots, and re-coup the fees from the students if necessary. The School has to be involved in finding a solution since it is their pupils causing the problem. It is not acceptable for the School simply to stand back. 3. It is understood that the British Legion does allow parking by pupils in the sizeable car park at the rear of the Legion Hall. This should also be pursued as a possibility by the School on similar lines to 2. above. 4. An alternative suggestion was to widen Lower Road by paving over the grass verge area to allow parking parallel to the road. This would clearly be a much more costly solution and would destroy the current character of the road. <p>I trust that the above objection and constructive comments will be actively pursued, in conjunction with the School, to ensure that a viable solution to the parking issue will be resolved before any further yellow lines are put in place in Lower Road.</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| 76 | <p>Parking in Lower Road, Effingham.</p> <p>We agree with your proposals for parking between the school and The Vineries. However, we would like these restrictions to also be in place between the British Legion Hall and the entrance to Century Court to allow easy access to Effingham Place.</p> <p>At present, large cars and vans find it difficult to access Lower Road without mounting the pavement. Large delivery vans certainly have to mount the pavement as the turning circle is too small due to the cars parked directly opposite the entrance to Effingham Place.</p> <p>We would consider it to be the responsibility of the school to provide car parking facilities and not cause problems for transport using Lower Road.</p> |
| 82 | <p>I write as a Resident of Effingham Place regarding the proposed on street parking controls for Lower Road, Effingham.</p> <p>Whilst we in Effingham Place welcome the proposed changes to include double yellow lines for much of the stretch of Lower Road either side of the Howard of Effingham School, we are disappointed and concerned that the proposal does not go far enough.</p> <p>The entrance to Effingham Place comes off Lower Road beside the school and for much of the time there are parked cars opposite our entrance. The result is that traffic travelling west to east is forced to drive around the line of parked cars in the middle of the road, whilst traffic is coming towards it on the Effingham Place side of the road. Two enclosed example photos are typical of the sort of congestion that takes place every day and is exacerbated at school drop off and pick up times, with a huge increase in the number of vehicles using the road.</p> <p>It is difficult and dangerous for drivers turning into and out of Effingham Place due to the parked cars immediately opposite. When driving into Effingham Place from the west, it is necessary to signal right around the parked cars and immediately right again into Effingham Place. Drivers following seem unaware that the indication is not just to pass the parked cars and so often follow far too closely, not expecting the right hand turn, thus causing a potential hazard. Also, those leaving Effingham Place turning left (west), turn into traffic travelling eastwards in the middle of the road, around the stationery vehicles, leaving little room to manoeuvre.</p> <p>For these safety reasons, we would urge you to consider extending the double yellow lines to include the area directly opposite Effingham Place.</p> |
| 97 | <p>I write as a resident of Effingham Place regarding the proposed on street parking controls for Lower Road Effingham.</p> <p>Whilst we in Effingham Place welcome the proposed changes to include double yellow lines for much of the stretch of Lower Road either side of the Howard School, we are disappointed and concerned that the proposal does not go far enough.</p> <p>The entrance to Effingham Place comes off Lower Road beside the school and for much of the time there are parked cars opposite our entrance. The result is that traffic travelling west to east is forced to drive around the line of parked cars in the middle of the road, whilst traffic is coming towards it on the Effingham Place side of the road. This is exacerbated at school drop off and pick up times, with a huge increase in the number of vehicles using the road.</p> <p>It is difficult and dangerous for drivers turning into and out of Effingham Place due the to parked cars immediately opposite. When</p> |

driving in to Effingham Place from the west, it is necessary to signal right around the parked cars and immediately right again into Effingham Place. Drivers following seen unaware that the indication is not just to pass the parked cars, and so often follow far too closely, not expecting the right hand turn, thus causing a potential hazard. Also those leaving Effingham Place turning left (west) turn into traffic travelling eastwards in the middle of the road, around the stationery vehicles, leaving little room to manoeuvre.

For these safety reasons, we would urge you to consider extending the double yellow lines to include the area directly opposite Effingham Place.

Your review of the traffic congestion in Lower Road during the Howard of Effingham term times is greatly welcomed.

When I arrived in Effingham Place in 2004 the congestion on Lower Road was not so much a problem. Although I always feel for Effingham Place residents it will always remain a problem as there are no double yellow lines on the opposite side of the road from the entrance to Effingham Place, to restrict parking. This means that the cars of sixth formers which park there during term time force the two way flow of traffic on to one side of the road only and trying to drive out of the driveway is very difficult from 9am to 4pm. With seven separate houses and families in Effingham Place there is a lot of coming and going with very restricted sight lines. It is difficult and dangerous for driver turning into Effingham Place too, due to the cars parked immediately opposite. When driving into Effingham Place from the village, it is necessary to signal right around the parked cars and immediately right once more into Effingham Place. Drivers following seem all the time to be unaware that the indication is not just to pass the parked cars and so often follow far too closely, not expecting the right hand turn, thus causing a potential hazard.

For all the public using Lower Road it has now got to a dangerous pitch. Over the last number of years the Howard of Effingham School has increased its Catchment Area and the number of pupils in the sixth form. Slowly, slowly the line of cars has increased along Lower Road so that we now have to run the gauntlet to get passed this huge line of parked cars which is almost impossible to do without meeting a vehicle coming in the opposite direction. There was absolute mayhem on that road a week ago people trying to reverse as a bus was stuck in the traffic jam. This is only one incident observed. I don't know how often this happens but it needs close monitoring. As sixth formers are coming from further afield and parking their car on Effingham's roads it should be the schools responsibility to either dissuade them from travelling in cars or arrange buses to pick them up. The school seems to have made this problem by increasing their Catchment Area as they must cooperate to find a solution.

Yes, it would be enormously beneficial and would reduce the Safety Risk to have double yellow lines all the way along that side of the road. I am surprised there has not been a serious accident already. The sixth formers used to use the Garden Centre to park and the Royal British Legion but they have put a stop to this free parking by the school children. Maybe it would be a good idea for the school to negotiate parking at the King George V building. They already rent the football / rugby pitches and tennis courts from them so may KGV could make a concession on some parking bays. They have over fifty of these. I think the Headmistress has to work with the Council as she must know what a burden of risk she is putting on the whole community.

Please look into this as a matter of urgency. It is essential you visit this site within the next month to make a Risk Assessment before the sixth formers leave for exams.

116

The pedestrian crossing points are not shown on the plan.

- 1) Parking is currently permitted and reduces the width of the road to a single car / vehicle.
- 2) Through traffic (Effingham to/from Bookham) has to wait for oncoming traffic.

No parking between the entrances of the British Legion and The Vineries on Lower Road should be enforced.

ITEM 10

ANNEXE 4: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|----------|---|
| | <p data-bbox="116 308 309 379">Millmead Terrace, Guildford (convert single yellow line to double yellow line opposite garages)</p> <p data-bbox="1541 323 1854 363">(14 representations)</p> <p data-bbox="320 387 2056 515">I live in Millmead Terrace, although not opposite the garages, and rely on on-street parking. Parking in this area is problematic, especially overnight and on Sundays when restrictions do not apply. The stretch of road you refer to is full most nights not because people choose to park there rather than another available spaces in this part of zone B, but because there are no other parking spaces.</p> <p data-bbox="320 555 2056 651">Due to the geography of the area there is no "overflow" when the on-street spaces are full. This means that residents are often forced to park anywhere they physically can. If I can't find a legitimate space, I will park on a single yellow. If there is no space on single yellows I will park on double yellows. Parking on double yellows overnight in particular is not uncommon.</p> <p data-bbox="320 691 2056 786">For this reason I suspect that the users of the garages will still not wish to use them as the introduction of double yellow lines opposite will not guarantee free access at all times. They will risk being trapped should a neighbour be forced to park on the double yellows overnight or on Sundays.</p> <p data-bbox="320 826 2056 986">The worst case scenario for other residents who rely on on-street parking is that the council proceed with this change but fail to retract/terminate the on-street permits given to those who have garages. If on-street permits are not retracted, then those permit-holders will likely (and understandably) choose to park on the street because (i) there is no risk of being boxed in; (ii) the garages are very tight for all but the smallest of cars (this information is from neighbours who have a garage); and (iii) many who have use of garages live some way from them.</p> <p data-bbox="320 1026 2056 1121">The impact on other residents of this eventuality is that the number of permit-holders competing for spaces will remain the same but the available on-street space during the most pressurised times (Sundays and overnight). We will be forced to park on the double yellows and so will, no doubt, be fined periodically.</p> <p data-bbox="320 1161 2056 1289">By way of evidence I'm attaching photos taken just now as I walked home (8pm). I'm responding to your email straight away so haven't had the opportunity to select a particularly bad evening- this is the norm. One photo shows that the spaces on Millmead terrace are full. One shows that there is only space for another 1 or 2 more cars on the single yellow line opposite the garages. The third shows two cars parked dangerously on double yellow lines by the bend in Millmead Terrace.</p> |
| 3 | <p data-bbox="320 1313 2056 1409">As an owner of one of the garages I do support the proposal but I do not see how it can be enforced as the parking enforcement officers do not work 24 hours a day or on a Sunday. At the moment people park on the double yellow lines outside my front door on the bend of Millmead Terrace in the evenings and on a Sunday because they know that there is no penalty for doing so.</p> <p data-bbox="320 1449 2056 1503">I know that some of the residents in Millmead Terrace assume that putting double yellow lines opposite the garages will take 11 cars off the street but because of the lack of enforcement I do not believe this is the case because if we can't get our cars in and out of our</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>garages 24/7 then we can't use them. We need our cars to get to work in the morning before the Enforcement Officers are on duty. Also the garages are on the small side and not built for the size of some modern e.g 4x4 cars.</p> <p>I think you need to take these issues into account before you remove any parking permits from the Residents of The Bellairs apartments plus any other owners of the block of garages.</p> |
| 10 | <p>Thank you for the letter advising of the proposed parking changes on Millmead Terrace. As a resident of Condor Court, which is above the garages I agree that cars parked opposite the garages mean it is extremely difficult for them to be used with ease. This may well prevent owners from regular use and ultimately add to the on street parking demand.</p> <p>Therefore whilst I support the proposed change I think it should only be completed if we can ensure that the current timings of the 8.30 - 6pm residents parking bays are maintained and not extended. This will continue to provide a generally workable parking balance between local residents and their visitors.</p> <p>In addition, I note that the four '60's style' properties on Millmead Terrace have front gardens that could all easily accommodate the parking of a vehicle, is there anything the council can do to encourage this - or suggest it to the owners - properties would surely be more desirable/ rentable with additional off road parking and if the 'no parking ever' zone is in place in front of the homes it will not eat into on street parking spaces. I suggest this as this would remove demand for on road spaces and therefore benefit everyone in the local area.</p> |
| 20 | <p>I am writing in support of the proposed changes to the current restrictions on Millmead Terrace being made into permanent restrictions. This is however with the caveat that owners of the garages are encouraged to use them properly and therefore have restricted access to zone b parking permits - one per household.</p> |
| 34 | <p>I should like to formally oppose the proposals to convert the current single yellow line on Millmead Terrace to a double yellow line. There is currently very little free parking available in the town centre and this would further reduce access for visitors and local residents.</p> <p>I am a resident of Condor Court, which has very strict parking restrictions - 1 permit per flat - and aggressive ticketing in place for any unlicensed vehicles. We rely on the single yellow line on Millmead Terrace for guests at the weekend, including numerous family members who come to visit us from abroad and therefore like to stay the weekend. The nearest alternative single yellow line is a 20 - 30 minute walk away which is difficult with luggage. I'm sure many other Condor Court residents make the same use of Millmead a Terrace and benefit in this way, and with 34 flats that is approximately 70 people, versus the few who own the garages who are in support of the proposals.</p> <p>I hope you will consider our objections at the committee hearing.</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| 46 | <p>I wish to object to these proposals on the following grounds:</p> <p>1) People already park on the double yellow lines overnight, that already exist in Millmead Terrace. They will continue to do this therefore continuing to block access to the garages.</p> <p>2) The absence of patrols on Sundays and evenings means that the introduction of double yellows will be ineffective.</p> |
| 58 | <p>At present I support the need to improve the very poor on street parking situation in Millmead Terrace. Over the past eight years since moving here the situation has deteriorated considerably.</p> <p>I do not , however, support the planned proposal (KM/16/0004-6) as at least nine cars on average park here every evening. The introduction of double yellow lines might mean nine owners of the garages might use them instead of on street parking.</p> <p>I do, however, have grave doubts that this will be the case and as a consequence the situation could be made even worse.</p> <p>Far better would be a proposals to remove all 2 hour parking in Millmead Terrace in order to provide more much needed residents parking. To extend B permit hours to Sundays and to 9pm daily.</p> <p>Lastly the 28 new apartments due to open in Buryfields should, in my view and that of many residents, be restricted to off street parking which the development provides.</p> <p>To provide off street parking in addition, means long term residents (who only have off street parking) will once more be penalised and struggle to park when returning home from work!</p> <p>Sadly I do not see your proposal improving the situation or addressing the concerns of residents.</p> |
| 66 | <p>I own one of the garages on Millmead Terrace, underneath Condor Court.</p> <p>I keep my car in the garage, however if there is a car parked opposite, it's almost impossible to get my car out – This has caused abject misery over the last 2 years.</p> <p>I've missed flights, family birthdays, meetings and days out... I cannot tell you how happy I am about the new parking restrictions on that stretch of the road!</p> <p>Thank you so much for making this very welcome consideration</p> |
| 70 | <p>I am a resident of Millmead terrace and parking permit holder for zone B. I am writing to you to strongly object towards the proposed idea of converting the existing single yellow lines into double yellow lines. If this were to go ahead it would put even more pressure on an area which already has limited parking options for the local residents and permit holders.</p> <p>I usually return from work around 6:30pm and the only option remaining to me is to park on the single yellow lines as all of the permit holder parking spaces are already taken. By installing double yellow lines in this area I have no idea where I am supposed to park. I only have the one car and have held a valid parking permit for the past two years I've resided in Millmead terrace.</p> |

I also understand that new flats are being constructed in the area, which will inevitably increase the pressure on what is already becoming a desperate situation.

As I am writing this email, I have just watched one of the garage owners park his Porsche 911 in his garage on a Sunday afternoon, with at least 7 cars parked along this stretch of road, without any problem. I've also noticed that not all of the garages are actually used for parking cars and mainly used for storage. I was also recently informed that the underground car park under Condor Court is actually condemned, so should not be in use.

If the council insists on going ahead with this proposal, then I think the very least it could do is provide some more parking options for the permit holders in zone B, rather than restricting them further. Surely there are other options, such as allowing permit holders to park in the local car parks overnight.

Parking in this area is becoming an increasing concern and on Sundays it is often the case that no parking is available for permit holders due to the free parking policies.

I hope you can understand my, and the other local permit holders, concerns and try to find a better and fairer solution to this problem which improves parking for everyone.

Access to the Condor Court garages.

I support your intention to convert the existing *No Waiting Monday to Saturday 8:30am-6pm single yellow line* to a *No Waiting double yellow line*. These residents should not have to struggle to gain access to their garages.

However, I would urge you to consider how you might ease the repercussions of approx. 9 cars every evening and all day Sunday which will no longer be able to park there.

If you look at the cars currently parking on this single yellow line in the evenings, you will see many actually have a Resident's Parking Permit displayed in their windscreen: They are parking on the single yellow line because there are not enough parking spaces in Residents Parking Zone B (from Lawn Road, along Millmead Terrace and down to Bury Street).

Currently parking is controlled during the hours 8.30am to 6pm, Monday to Saturday. As a resident myself, I frequently return home after 7:30pm and am unable to find a parking space in this zone.

Sundays are equally problematic. If I go out on a Sunday morning, I can't usually park my car in a resident's bay if I return before 5pm: they're all taken.

GBC aren't making any money out of allowing non-residents to park in this Zone B area (there are no pay-and-display bays) so I wondered if you would consider instigating the change you made to Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens, where the controlled hours are 8.30am to 9pm seven days a week?

Lawn Road, Millmead Terrace and Bury Street are just a few minutes' walk from the Yvonne Arnaud Theatre, Electric Theatre,

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p>numerous pubs and restaurants, Guildford station, Debenhams and a High Street of shops and facilities.</p> <p>I gather GBC aims to encourage fewer vehicles to enter the town centre – and yet it offers free town centre parking in a residential area which is closer to the town centre than many of your public car parks: visitors to Guildford (for work or leisure) are obviously going to take advantage of this!</p> <p>Furthermore, some of your parking bays in this area are large enough for two and a half cars! Others could be extended, without blocking access, to accommodate another vehicle - which would also alleviate the issue.</p> |
| 105 | <p>We would like to put forward our OBJECTION to the proposal to change the current parking controls in Millmead Terrace.</p> <p>Reasons for our objection are as noted ;</p> <p>As residents of Millmead Terrace for the past 13 years we have become very reliant on the availability of parking in the evenings and on the weekend in the proposed area of change - the single yellow line outside of the garages. Removing access to park in this area at these times would leave us and many other residents in a position of having to park our vehicles some distance (i.e. streets) away from our homes, which can be very difficult and a huge inconvenience, especially with young children, as we do.</p> <p>Historically these garages have been leased to individuals including residents within Millmead Terrace for the specific use of storage only. This is due to the fact that the size of the garages are not fit to house a standard modern size car, unless you specifically purchase a 'Smart' sized car to fit within the space, which simply means they are not a solution for off street parking for the residents of the apartments to which they are currently leased/owned by, unless these residents purposefully purchase a car with these below average size specifications.</p> <p>For the past 13 years whilst we have resided in Millmead Terrace and during the time that these garages have been leased to others and used for purposes of storage etc, there has never been an issue to gain access or request a change to the current parking controls, so it seems now inappropriate to request this change to please a minority of residents on the street.</p> <p>It was generally known that the use of these garages for a parking solution was a late resolve by the developers of the flats , and one that should never have been given approval as a solution when converting this building to residential as per the reasons above.</p> <p>Should you wish to contact me directly my details can be found below.</p> <p>I do hope that you will take time to consider the points of this Objection within your decision.</p> |
| 113 | <p>We are homeowners on Millmead Terrace, who own one car, with a parking permit for on road parking. We have recently signed a community petition requesting the council review the parking allocation on Millmead Terrace as we strongly believe that it is insufficient to meet the needs of residents in the area.</p> <p>We thus object strongly to the proposal to create a double yellow line on Millmead Terrace opposite the garages below Condor Court.</p> <p>Over the last few years we have found it increasingly difficult to park anywhere remotely close to our own home on Millmead Terrace. More often than not we are forced to drive around the block at least twice before parking, usually as far away as Lawn Road. This</p> |

occurs on weekday evenings as well as weekends, especially on Sundays. We attribute this to functions at the churches in our area, general congestion in the Guildford central area, creation of the Bellairs Apartments and other renovations of properties into apartments in the area.

We question where you would expect those that currently park opposite the garages to park? We estimate that more than seven cars park opposite the garages on a daily basis (after 6pm). More than ten cars park there during church service times (approximately 09.50-12.00pm) on Sundays. Creating access to the garages results in a false economy where for every off-street parking created one on-street parking space is lost. We believe this will merely add to the congestion and queue for parking on the rest of Millmead Terrace.

We also question how many people in fact keep a car in the said garages? Having seen some of the garages open, the majority of cars on the road these days would not fit in one of the narrow garages without significant problems getting in or out of the car once parked. We therefore argue that the majority of garages we have seen occupied are in fact occupied by bicycles, motorbikes or general storage rather than cars. We thus argue whether the strain on what is potentially a very small percentage of people who indeed have a car in one of the garages warrants the strain on the rest of the residents on Millmead Terrace who struggle to park near their homes on a daily basis?

We are also concerned about the long term strategy of the Guildford area which includes potentially turning the George Abbott car park into green space. Although as residents we wholly support green space creation, we are concerned that this is a high turnover/high occupancy parking lot and could further exacerbate the parking issue in the Millmead area.

We urge the council to rethink this initiative and in fact request that they take the community survey recently completed to heart and review the parking issue we as residents have on Millmead Terrace, with the aim to creating a better situation for the whole street regarding our ability to park in our own street.

Millmead Terrace - Convert existing No waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm single yellow line to a No waiting at any time double yellow line.

With regards to the proposed change, as local resident of 8 years and a user, on occasions, of the evening parking in Millmead Terrace, I believe that this provides valuable and much needed spaces for local residents.

It is typical for the parking spaces to be full most evenings and on Sundays. Even to the extent that I regularly see cars parked on double yellow lines (see attached photo IMG_3568 copy) in the area in the evenings. I suspect that they think that there is little chance of traffic wardens after 6pm.

As per your statement...

"We recognise that the introduction of parking restrictions may reduce parking availability and displace it to nearby areas, **so we will extend controls** far enough to take this into account, without being too restrictive for residents and other road users."

Could you please let me know your plans and where you will be extending parking to accommodate the displaced vehicles from Millmead Terrace?

I understand the difficulty that some owners of the garages opposite may have in manoeuvring their cars, but feel that without any additional local spaces available this is a shame to remove the on road spaces.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Also with the possible regeneration of Guildford Plaza a space which is alongside the site is currently used for parking by 6-7 cars from Wycliffe House there will be 15+ cars per evening and Sundays looking for local parking.</p> <p>I feel that the parking space in Bury Street (the lower section behind the Keystone pub) should be made residents only (as it is regularly used by out of town shoppers for free 2 hr parking) and that the time should be extended to 24hrs 7 days a week. There is little point in having residents parking only between 8.30am – 6pm as most residents are needing the spaces when they are home in the evenings and at the weekends.</p> |
| | <p>I am directly affected by the proposed change to double yellow lines opposite the garages in Millmead Terrace and strongly oppose any change at this time.</p> <p>I ask that before any change is considered you read the petition re parking which has been prepared and take into account the views of the people who signed it. The 2 hour visitor bays in Millmead Terrace must be removed before you can consider imposing double yellow lines.</p> <p>Every night the single yellow lines outside my house are used by residents with permits as there are no bays for us to park in. Where do you propose we park if you remove these spaces? As an example (one of many) I returned home at 8 pm last Monday. There was a function at the United Reform Church. There were absolutely NO bays for me to park my car. The single yellow line was also full. I counted the number of cars parked which were not displaying residents permits - 19.</p> <p>As you must be aware, theatre goers, shoppers, people attending functions at the 3 churches very close to Millmead Terrace and people going for a meal in town use the 2 hour bays, our residents' bays after 6 p.m. and on Sundays and the single yellow line. On Sundays the situation is impossible. If I go out in the morning I cannot find a single bay (or space on the single yellow line outside my house) in which to park until after church goers and shoppers finally return. The same situation then repeats itself in time for evening church services.</p> <p>Another matter which I simply cannot understand is that residents permits seem to be issued with absolutely no regard to the number of available spaces. A gallon will NOT go in to a pint pot.</p> <p>Please let logic prevail before you remove the single yellow line.</p> |

ANNEXE 4 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|----------|---|
| | <p>New Cross Road, Guildford (convert single yellow line to double yellow line outside No.49a and various other 'Technical' changes) (2 representations)</p> |
| 2 | <p>Just a quick one to say I 100% support the changes to parking restrictions on new cross road, Guildford. I live at 49a and the single yellow line between 49a and new cross road has been a constant issue for years, mainly due to the area being too small for any car over the size of a smart car!</p> <p>I'm very grateful something is being done about it.</p> |
| 119 | <p>In principal I am in agreement with the proposed changes to New Cross Road, however I am concerned about the one nearest Worplesdon Road and very near Sainsbury's :</p> <p>Convert part of existing No waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm single yellow line to a Free unrestricted parking place (TECHNICALITY)</p> <p>This is because Sainsbury's customers are very likely to choose to park in New Cross Road then drive off in the South Road/Baden Road loop rather than go into the car park. This will increase the dangers and difficulties to those of us who live in the road.</p> |

ANNEXE 4: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|-----------------------|---|
| | <p>Raymond Crescent, Guildford (convert part of parking bay to double yellow line adjacent to recently created vehicle crossover at No.62) (13 representations)</p> |
| <p>Prev1 & 52</p> | <p>I am writing in support of the proposed change to the parking arrangements at 62, Raymond Crescent GU2 7SZ. There is already a ramp outside this property which has been approved by the council and so it would make no sense to then deny the residents of no 62 access to their own driveway.</p> |
| <p>Prev2 & 90</p> | <p>I have previously tried to explain the dilemma we (the residents of Raymond Crescent, Downing avenue, Pentreath and St Johns) are facing. The lack of bays compared with the amount of permits seemingly issued, with, on top of this the amount of day tickets also purchased. We have not only many families but older residents that cannot walk hundreds of yards to get to their car in another road. Young mothers with babies and toddlers, shopping to carry etc, the list goes on. The parking is a real issue here and it is causing bad feeling with residents and neighbours as no one can park their cars. Obviously some houses have several cars now, being an expensive area the grown up offspring and staying at home longer and they too are car owners. Would you please take the time to come up here once again and see if it is possible to re evaluate the amount of bays? It seems so unfair that we had our parking taken away, then have to pay to do so and now more permits are issued than the amount of bays. We also have students who park in the visitor only bays and bayhop, it really is a stressful nightmare here. It is beginning to cause bad feeling between neighbours, this is sad but understandable.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I wish to state I object strongly to the above proposed change in Raymond Crescent.</p> <p>There are not enough bays in our road and it is presenting huge issues with residents that are unable to park.</p> <p>Elderly needing visitors/carers, young mothers with children and shopping.</p> <p>Please rethink this removal of a valued bay</p> |

| | |
|------------|--|
| Prev3 & 59 | <p>I object to you removing the 2 bays we as residents argued for when you first put the parking scheme in place and want 2 more to replace it so the cars that share the spaces on the road are not more inconvenienced by a total absence of parking spaces, we frequently suffer from all the spaces being full and not enough spaces, there are more cars with permits and now you want to remove 2 spaces – No that is not OK.</p> <p>Just because a resident develops off street parking it does not constitute a valid reason or balance for removing a bay, because many people use the bays and only one can use the off street parking, the overall ratio of cars needing off street spaces to the number of spaces needs to be maintained. If you take a bay away it must be replaced by and another created in the J area.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I hereby give notice again that I still object to you removing the parking bay in Raymond crescent. Your reference KM/16/0006. The fact you have opened this up again is offensive.</p> |
| Prev4 | <p>I'm writing today to express our concern at the proposed removal of the parking bay outside number 62 Raymond Crescent. There's already high demand within the close for parking and we feel that we would benefit, if anything, from additional provision for our neighbours and guests. We should like to encourage you to review the proposed changes.</p> |
| 74 | <p>I would like to object to the removal of the parking space by no 62 Raymond Crescent. This space does not impede the houseowner of no 62 from getting into their drive and it is hard enough to park in the street as it is without losing another space. The amount of students that are told to park in this area combined with the number of student houses makes parking a nightmare , please don't add to it.</p> |
| 87 | <p>We live in Raymond Crescent.</p> <p>We are OBJECTING to the proposal of removing the parking bay in Raymond Crescent.</p> <p>WE NEED PARKING BAYS IN THE AREA AS WE HAVE NO SPACE TO PARK OUR CARS. WITHOUT PARKING BAYS, IT WILL CAUSE SAFETY ISSUE TO THE CHILDREN IN THE AREA AS WELL.</p> <p>IMPORTANT ISSUES, WE SAY 3 TIMES:</p> <p>WE NEED PARKING BAYS ! WE NEED PARKING BAYS! WE NEED PARKING BAYS!</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| 88 | <p>We live in Raymond Crescent.</p> <p>We are OBJECTING to the proposal of removing the parking bay in Raymond Crescent.</p> <p>WE NEED PARKING BAYS IN THE AREA AS WE HAVE NO SPACE TO PARK OUR CARS. WITHOUT PARKING BAYS, IT WILL CAUSE SAFETY ISSUE TO THE CHILDREN IN THE AREA AS WELL.</p> <p>IMPORTANT ISSUES, WE SAY 3 TIMES:</p> <p>WE NEED PARKING BAYS ! WE NEED PARKING BAYS! WE NEED PARKING BAYS!</p> <p>-----</p> <p>We are also writing to let you know that we have NOT received any letter from the council informing us and consulting us about proposal which the council has NOT COMPLY WITH the regulations.</p> <p>WE ARE OBJECTING THE PROPOSAL of removing the parking bays.</p> <p>NO WAY!~</p> |
| 89 | <p>We live in Raymond Crescent.</p> <p>We are OBJECTING to the proposal of removing the parking bay in Raymond Crescent.</p> <p>WE NEED PARKING BAYS IN THE AREA AS WE HAVE NO SPACE TO PARK OUR CARS. WITHOUT PARKING BAYS, IT WILL CAUSE SAFETY ISSUE TO THE CHILDREN IN THE AREA AS WELL.</p> <p>Previous we had no awareness of your proposal and you have not sent any letter for the consultation.</p> <p>We REJECT the removal of bays in the quoted proposal~!!!</p> <p>NO WAY !</p> |
| 91 | <p>My family and I are extremely unhappy about your proposed parking bay removal from Raymond Crescent.</p> <p>There are not enough bays to cope with residents parking at this time, so to remove even one of them will only will only compound the problem. We can't understand the reasoning behind this idea, as it will only cause more difficulty for us!</p> <p>Please reconsider this proposal, as the current amount of parking bays in Raymond Crescent are already insufficient for our needs!</p> |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 92 | <p>I am a resident of Raymond Crescent in Guildford and whilst I have no objection to the proposed removal of one parking bay outside No 62 I do object that given the close proximity of the University (who operate an alternate day on site parking restriction scheme) more of the Raymond Crescent bays have not been reclassified as Permit J holders only M-S 8.30am – 6.00pm</p> <p>All of our current bays (except two adjacent to No 64 oddly) allow students to freely park in Raymond Crescent whilst attending the University where they would have to pay to park to the detriment of the Raymond Crescent residents.</p> |
| 96 | <p>This email is my confirmation to reject the removal of bays in the quoted proposal.</p> <p>I live in Raymond Crescent, Guildford, GU2 7SU.</p> |
| 106 | <p>I would like to formally register my objections to the parking controls proposed for Raymond Crescent.</p> |
| 112 | <p>I note the proposal to remove a parking space in Raymond Crescent.</p> <p>As someone born and raised in Dennisville, with family still living there, I have enough trouble finding suitable parking when visiting, the removal of just one space would make things worse.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate visitors may not be a prime consideration, I believe due consideration should also be given to the needs of visitors.</p> |

ANNEXE 4: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|--|---|
| <p>School Lane / Dawneys Road, Pirbright (introduce various double yellow lines and formalise existing school keep clear markings) (14 representations)</p> | |
| | <p>It came as a welcome surprise as I was unaware that the council were looking into this issue. As a resident on Dawney's Road, it fills me with great relief knowing that there are proposals being put forward to improve what is a huge issue for residents currently affected by the parking situation.</p> <p>I have looked at drawing GBC/APH/SchoolLanPropRevA and believe that this would be a welcome change and therefore strongly support this proposal. It is clear that these changes are intended to increase the flow of traffic and increase a greater element of safety to pedestrians during 'school run' periods, both of which are clearly high priority. I do however have my concerns, as raised by yourself in your letter, with regards to the potential for the parking issue to be displaced to nearby areas.</p> <p>Acknowledging that I will have some form of bias in this situation as a resident of Dawney's Road, but I can inevitably see an increase in parking along Dawney's Road, thus increasing the already present security risk and nuisance that we experience. As I am sure you are already aware, Dawney's Road consists entirely of Service Families Accommodation (SFA) and all residents are therefore serving members of the Armed Forces. The road is clearly marked with a 'No Motor Vehicles: Except for Access' sign, but this is routinely ignored and abused by visitors to the local school. The daily nuisance that this causes is huge and although I appreciate that the signs are present, it is not enforced and therefore ignored. Although less likely but nonetheless a real threat, many areas of SFA across the UK are routinely subject to suspect activity related to the current terrorist threat. Although I appreciate that the vast majority of vehicles accessing Dawney's Road (In breach of the Road Traffic Offenders Act) have no malicious intent, the sheer volume of traffic makes any form of identification of confirmed/potential suspect activity impossible. There have also been occasions where Security Patrols have been disrupted due to illegal parking along Dawney's Road as a result of parents/family picking up their child whilst on the school run.</p> <p>Considering the above, at the very minimum, I would like to suggest that the current rules with regards to the No Motor Vehicles sign on Dawney's Road are enforced in addition to the proposals made. I would urge this to occur at the same time that the changes are made as per your drawing in order to 'stamp out' any increase of illegal parking as a result of an increase in parking restrictions along School Lane. Should this be unsuccessful, then I would strongly suggest that greater controls are implemented to further formalise existing measures, such as the introduction of parking permits; either way, enforcement is vital in improving road conditions within this area.</p> |
| 13 | <p>I have already objected to these proposals to the local council and parish. Their view appeared to be that a lot of effort had been put into formulating these parking restrictions so they were expected to go ahead regardless of local opinion. Consequently, I do not have great expectations about the likelihood of my objections making any difference. I understand that you have to be seen to consult. However, I need to be able to say that I tried.</p> <p>I believe these proposed restrictions will not solve the problem of school-related parking and will actually make the situation worse. At</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| | <p>the moment, there are only issues at school drop off and collection. In total, this is about one hour per weekday. We already have people parking in our driveways, on pavements, across the entrance to our road and blocking access. If the space to park is restricted even more people will park on our road, which is already privately owned by the Ministry of Defence and supposedly access only. There is already a sign at the end of the road, which is ignored. We will go from having a few cars occasionally disrupting us to lots of cars always in our way at school times. People will still need to park to drop off and collect from the school. They will not suddenly start to walk, cycle or take non-existent public transport. They just won't have as much space directly outside the school to do so. Consequently, you are just going to make the situation much worse for residents. Where do you think people will now park if they are pushed away from the immediate environs of the school? Logically, they will move, in greater numbers, into our relatively quiet cul-de-sac.</p> <p>The school-related parking situation is not so bad to justify the imposition of these new measures. Please don't spend limited taxpayers money to make life worse for parents and residents. Either build a suitably sized car park for the school or take the Police to patrol outside to discourage dangerous and inconsiderate parking. The status quo is maintainable. Please don't ruin our lovely street.</p> <p>Finally, have you consulted with the Ministry of Defence as they own and manage our road? All residents are Service Personnel.</p> |
| <p>Page 124 19</p> | <p>I would like to request for the length of School Lane between Pirbright Common and West Heath that at least one side of the road has restricted parking at all times using "No Waiting at Any Time – Double Yellow Lines".</p> <p>The road can take 3 car widths. So with one car parked, it's still possible for traffic to flow in both directions. Parking on both sides at any point creates a significant problem as it allows moving traffic to flow in just one direction which leads to frequent traffic jams with cars piling up in both directions.</p> <p>Parking for residents should be a priority outside their homes. "No Waiting at Any Time – Double Yellow Lines" opposite would again prevent traffic jams.</p> <p>I hope this is helpful. I appreciate your consideration. Your proposed restrictions should make a significant difference to traffic flow especially at school drop off and pick up times but throughout the day when vehicles park on both sides of the road.</p> |
| <p>25</p> | <p>We wish to express our concern on the proposed parking restrictions for School Lane. We reside at Cooks Green Cottages, School Lane.</p> <p>It seems to us there is a high risk that should the proposal go-ahead that we will be adversely affected. With no off street parking we are reliant on the layby opposite our property for parking. This is already impacted by the school in that parents park their cars now to pick up their children. Surely, if restrictions are in place this will simply exacerbate the situation? The risk is that parents are simply forced to find alternatives which will include outside our house.</p> <p>An option might be to introduce permits for use of residents in the layby.</p> <p>We would therefore like to formally object to this proposal.</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| 29 | <p>Regards School lane, Pirbright, I support the proposals however I would ask that consideration is given to extending the car park at Avenue De Cagny to compensate for the loss of spaces that will result from the proposals.</p> |
| 30 | <p>I am wholly in favour of the proposed parking restrictions in School Lane.</p> <p>The current situation is not sustainable. The volume of school run traffic, coupled with the inconsiderate parking that takes place, is currently a genuine hazard to both pedestrians (with children) trying to get to the school and to other road users, particularly the emergency services should they need to drive along School Lane at school run time.</p> <p>I feel the proposed restrictions would limit the hazardous parking with vehicles making ill judged manoeuvres that are a danger to pedestrians, and thus create a better free flow of traffic along the Lane.</p> |
| 33 | <p>I am writing with regards to the proposed parking controls on School Lane, Pirbright. Whilst I am inclined to agree with the proposals, I do have some concerns. The main concern is the potential increase in congestion that may occur on residential roads. For example, Dawneys Road already becomes congested during the 'school run' hours and I predict that this would be exasperated, thus causing more issues than those solved. I also predict that W Heath nearby would be adversely affected by the proposed plans. However, I do see some unused ground near W Heath that could be gravelled for alternative parking, perhaps with a small annual charge for the procurement and maintenance of the area.</p> <p>Unless alternative parking areas are designated, I would not support the proposed plans in entirety; however, regardless of alternatives, junctions should be no waiting at any time.</p> |
| 35 | <p>We are the owners/residents of 'Burrow Hill Cottage', School Lane, GU24 0JW, and we do feel that the proposals would be restrictive to us, as our property would have double yellow lines painted on the road in front of our property including our drive entrance. It also seems that under your proposal, no other residential property will have double yellow lines in front of it except ours. Therefore it feels unfair for us to be the only property on School Lane to not have any direct parking outside our property.</p> <p>Whilst we do accept that there is a need for some sort of parking control on our road, the main problems (jams) only occur twice a day during the school runs, Monday through to Friday. At the weekends the road is fairly quiet and has an easy traffic flow, parking or no parking.</p> <p>There really is no need for parking restrictions at weekends. Also, the double yellow lines would also just displace the available parking further down School Lane towards the traffic lights.</p> <p>Under your proposal, we, any visitors, or delivery vehicles etc, would be unable to park outside our house at any time of the week, so as a preference we would suggest single yellow lines with controlled times i.e. 8 -10.am and 2.30-4.30 pm on Monday to Friday only (during the school runs).</p> <p>I note on your proposal that the double yellow lines would also cross the entrance to 'Sandpits', a County Council owned unmade track, and I do think that double yellow lines would also encourage people to park in the Sandpits area during school drop off/ pick up</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>times, just as they use the tennis courts car park at present.</p> <p>May I ask who would police the proposed parking restrictions ?</p> <p>Finally, as you are aware this is a conservation area and I am not sure that any yellow lines painted down our roads really reflect well on the overall scene!</p> |
| 43 | <p>I live on Vapery Lane and don't walk my children to school as that end of School Lane is too dangerous. The cars enter the village doing way over 30 miles an hour and although they have raised the pavement there are still tyre marks on it occasionally. Also there have been numerous crashes with cars coming off the road at corner by West Heath and where the brook goes under the road the road is very narrow and cars are often hitting side mirrors etc.</p> <p>If you reduce parking on School lane are you going to provide alternative parking?</p> |
| 61 | <p>As a parent of Child attending Pirbright School, I would like to highlight the following points and ask that they be considered and noted in the meeting;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - as there are two schools on school lane, the safety of 100's of children should be considered above that of a number of residents. If parking is overlapping dropped curb drives and in doing so causing access issues for residents the consideration should be given to single yellow linked being marked ONLY along any dropped curb section. There are already standard parking restrictions by the schools. - Pirbright village primary has children from the age of 4, who simply cannot be dropped to make their own way into the school and their classrooms. Therefore, parking a reasonable distance from the school is a necessity. - there is no suitable parking a reasonable distance from the 2 schools. The car park at the parish green is always completely full (with over spill to the grass verges) at school drop off and pick up. - I would suggest that the parents parking on school lane are also an overspill consequence of a lack of adequate alternative parking. - We are confused as to the rationale of seeking a single yellow line along school lane and are concerned regarding the lack of alternatives for parents of young children and ultimately the safety of our local children. - any inconvenience to residents who have knowingly purchased properties on a road with 2 schools sites (school lane) can only be at weekday school drop off (8.15 to 9am) and pick up (2.50 to 3.30pm). Nothing has materially changed and the introduction of a single yellow line along the length of school lane is excessive and lacking in consideration of the wider community impact. <p>Please can you update me as to the outcome of the discussion. I believe many parents will wish to contribute their input, should this be pursued with the borough council.</p> |

63

I have lived on School Lane for near 6 years in the house which is opposite the bollard / chicane.

I do agree that measures do need to be put in place to restrict the parking. Parking in School Lane has without doubt become an issue. However, every day outside my house I hear at least one car halting to an emergency stop or on a number of occasion, two cars have been involved in an accident outside my house due to having to stop suddenly when they see the chicane.

I realise that the chicane was put in to slow traffic down but due to the fact that young children twice a day walk or cycle past my house on School Lane towards their parked cars or towards Vapery Lane and West Heath, the chicane should have been placed further along the road to stop traffic speeding before reaching the area that lots of children congregate in.

The chicane has been placed in an area that has a high footfall of children and as the chicane is on a corner and not in clear sight of speeding traffic coming off the ranges, it creates the potential for a car accident in a place with a high volume of children.

I have on a number of occasion suggested speed bumps before reaching the chicane and I can categorically state that the cars do not observe the speed limit prior to reaching the chicane. The road without further safety measures is frankly dangerous and sadly before time I can envisage an awful accident occurring.

The only suggestion to date to have been made to me for solving the problem, is community speed checks, but realistically I don't hold out for this having much effect. School Lane is now one of the main route from Farnbrough through to Woking/Guildford and as a result, I firmly believe that more permanent measures need to be put in place.

So with parked cars along the road it at least slows the traffic down. Thus with regret, as parking is an issue, I would prefer the parking issue rather than an unfortunate accident happening to an innocent bystander, which is likely to be a child.

I have copied in the Parish Clerk, Lindsay Graham, as I do think this needs to be placed on the Parish Council agenda for future consideration. I would be grateful if you could forward this email onto the relevant persons in charge of speeding and traffic control within the council. Thank you.

Finally the parking issue needs to go hand in hand with the traffic and speeding issue.

71

We live in School lane and appreciate your trying to do something about the congestion. Really, the school needs its own car parking and there are plenty of nearby if funds allow you to build one.

My comments are:

- Unless you have a traffic warden about noone will take any notice of double yellow lines and a lot of taxis collect from the Knowle School lurk with engines running – so could scoot off if a warden appears.
- People park in front of our house and it worries us that they will now block our drive as there will be a lot less parking.
- They will also clog up Dawneys Road which has young children living there.
- The area opposite Cooks Green Cottages should be kept for the occupants of Cooks Green Cottages – could there be Residents parking only there and in front of our house?
- The traffic lights at the junction of School Lane only allow 4/5 cars out on one green light phase which does not help the bottle-

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>neck</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People park all over the zigzag lines by the zebra crossing • People park wherever it suits them as they are selfish. • Please could we have some bollards? • The footpath running alongside our garden carries much foot traffic, mothers and buggies – is there a way of preventing car from blocking the entrance? • To sum up, if you do all these measures, please could you provide a traffic warden and lollipop lady? <p>Good luck!</p> |
| 103 MOD Land Management Services | <p>KM/16/0005 - School Lane and Dawneys Road, Pirbright</p> <p>We have no objections to the proposal set out in the letter under the above reference.</p> |
| Page 120 120 | <p>I am writing in relation to the parking proposals on School Lane in Pirbright (reference KM/16/005). I am a resident of the village, a parent at the school as well as a teacher at the school so have insight and a vested interest.</p> <p>In the most part, I am in agreement with the proposal and in fact attended the meeting at the Parish Council to voice my experiences, knowledge and opinion. However, there is one control which I am against and feel it is unnecessary and that is the 'no waiting at any time double yellow lines' on the other side of the road facing Knowl Hill school. This side of the road has a wide pavement/grassy verge and cars who park on this pavement can't block the pavement as the verge is so wide and do not affect the traffic flow especially . With 2 schools and a nursery on this road, the controls need to be realistic and this control serves no purpose as there is plenty of room and it is not a safety issue.</p> |

ANNEXE 4: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|----------|--|
| | Ward Street, Guildford (convert short sections of parking bays to double yellow line adjacent to the access to the Friends Meeting House) (0 representations) |
| | |

ANNEXE 4: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER

| Ref. No. | Representation Comments |
|----------|---|
| | Woking Road, Guildford (introduced double yellow lines adjacent to Bus Stop) (0 representations) |
| | |

This page is intentionally left blank