

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
<p>Bunch Lane</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A petition signed by 45 residents in support of the proposals was sent in by the Bunch Lane Residents Group. • 7 specific objections were made against proposals in Bunch Lane. • Some of these were on the grounds that there could be displacement further along Bunch Lane. • There were other more general objections to the proposals as a whole, including Bunch Lane on the grounds that displacement could be a problem and a larger station car park was needed before anything should be done. • A comment was made about the position of the parking bay opposite Hawthorn Cottage and whether it should be reduced in length to provide better access to Hawthorns. • Several responses felt commuters shouldn't be penalised. 	<p>The mainly unrestricted parking in Bunch Lane can be obstructive for through traffic and residents have complained about access problems to their driveways. The proposals in Bunch Lane are intended to retain unrestricted parking but in safer locations whilst improving visibility around the bends in the road. In addition four 2 hour spaces are being provided for visitors to local amenities such as St Christopher's Church.</p> <p>There will be 11 spaces retained for long term parking in the lower end of Bunch Lane. If these proposals were introduced it is possible that some drivers may choose to park in other roads or further along Bunch Lane, although the increased distance makes this less desirable. Any problems that may result from this can be reviewed post implementation</p> <p>Minor adjustments will be made to the unrestricted parking area near Hawthorns to ensure access to this property.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed to proceed as advertised (adjusting for Hawthorns access) in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce obstruction • Improve access to adjacent properties • Provide better access to local amenities 	<p>Proceed as advertised and adjust for Hawthorne Cottage access</p>

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
<p>St. Christophers Green</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the immediate area of St Christopher’s Green where residents parking is proposed: <p>4 properties are supportive but would also like longer operational hours until 7pm.</p> <p>1 resident objects but may support longer hours</p> <p>A resident of St Christopher’s Road and a nearby business objected that it was unnecessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> St Christopher’s Church has also commented that they do not agree with residents parking as it will reduce the available space for their visitors. They would like also additional short term spaces on the north side of St Christopher’s Green. There were other more general objections to the proposals as a whole, including St Christopher’s Green on the grounds that displacement could be a problem and a larger station car park was needed before anything should be done. 	<p>The proposals in St Christopher’s Green are to introduce residents parking on the west side between 0830 and 1730, Mon – Sat. Extending the operational hours until 7 or 8 pm creates an enforcement expectation that would be difficult and potentially expensive to meet. The proposed operational hours should be adequate to prevent commuter and shopper parking.</p> <p>A length of double yellow line is being removed on the north east side to create 2 more unrestricted spaces. Consequently any potential commuter displacement is likely to be 1 or 2 vehicles as a result of these proposals.</p> <p>The business that objected has parking for 20 or more vehicles on its site. The four 2 hour bays in Bunch Lane would help visitors to the area find a space, which is currently very difficult.</p> <p>The operation days for residents’ bays run Mon-Sat so they could be used by church on Sunday.</p> <p>Limited waiting bays have not been included as part of these proposals on the north side of St Christopher’s Green, as there are four 2 hour bays in Bunch Lane on the church boundary, which are conveniently placed for the church and its visitors.</p> <p>Vehicles that are necessary for funerals and wedding can park on waiting restrictions whilst these are in progress.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised.</p> <p>Investigate limited waiting bay on the north side of St Christopher’s Green in Phase 2.</p>

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
<p>Lion Green, Lion Mead and Junction Place</p>	<p>There were objections, including shops, to the loss of unrestricted parking outside the Methodist Church on the B2131 and in Junction Place.</p> <p>A resident living in a flat above a shop objected to loss of parking near his property on the grounds that it would be more difficult to transfer a disabled relative.</p> <p>Haslemere Methodist Church objected on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some Church users have mobility problems and need to park outside. • The church car park is not large enough. • The one hour restriction in the proposed bays in Lion Mead is not long enough for funerals. • Short term parking is needed for the shops. • A shorter, Mon-Sat restriction would have a lesser impact on church users. 	<p>The proposals on the B2131 in Junction Place are intended to prevent obstructive parking near the two junctions, the approach to the zebra crossing and the exit of the petrol station.</p> <p>In front of the Haslemere Methodist Church west bound traffic has to wait for a gap in the opposing eastbound traffic flow to pull around parked cars outside the church. Some vehicles also park obstructively on the footway.</p> <p>The church car park also has two access points on this stretch limiting the available parking space to about 2 vehicles. Using a lesser restriction (single yellow line) might give the impression that it was acceptable to park for a short period of time in this location.</p> <p>The Church has objected to the loss of these spaces however it does have approx. 20 parking spaces in its car park. In addition a number of unrestricted spaces will remain in Lion Mead for church users if necessary.</p> <p>Vehicles that are necessary for funerals and wedding can park on waiting restrictions whilst these are in progress.</p> <p>The loss of unrestricted parking on the B2131 is compensated by the creation of six, 1 hour (Mon-Sat, 0830-1830) parking bays in Lion Mead. These are intended primarily for shop and business customers, however they are also available to church visitors. Increasing the time limit in these bays would disadvantage local businesses.</p> <p>Residents living nearby or visitors to the church can stop</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised.</p>

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
		<p>on double or single yellow lines to drop off passengers and blue badge holders can park for up to 3 hours on a waiting restriction and an unlimited time in a parking bay.</p> <p>The extent of double yellow lines in Lion Mead has been checked and reduced to the minimum considered necessary to provide visibility and access at junctions and accesses.</p> <p>Ample unrestricted parking remains in both Lion Mead and Meadway.</p>	
Lion Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 objections were received specifically about the difficulties for parents finding parking spaces on the school run. 	<p>The proposals in Lion Lane are to introduce double yellow lines opposite the entrance to Shottermill Infant School and to create a passing space in the line of parked vehicles further south in Lion Lane to ease traffic congestion.</p> <p>Traffic calming has been introduced around the school entrance. These restrictions are proposed to ease congestion and help school safety by preventing parking near crossing points.</p>	Proceed as advertised.
Hill Road and College Hill area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents in Hill Road generally supported the safety related proposals in this location. • An objection was made that additional restrictions in Hill Road would reduce parking for town centre workers who could not afford charges in the town centre car parks. 	<p>It is proposed to place ‘no waiting at any time’ parking restrictions around the junctions in Hill Road and parts of College Hill to improve safety at junctions.</p> <p>The extent of the restrictions has been minimised to retain parking in this road with the exception of the junctions.</p>	Proceed as advertised.

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
<p>Kings Road, Longdene Rd</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter of support was received from the majority of residents of Longdene Road. Residents pointed out that there were often spaces available in the station car park and that ‘lack of parking capacity in Haslemere’ should not be used as an excuse to do nothing. • There were no specific objections to Longdene Rd, only general ones to the proposals as a whole. • The Kings Road residents association sent a letter of support signed by 78 residents (74 in favour, 4 against) • An objection was made by the dental practice in Kings Road that the proposals would reduce parking for staff and patients on nearby roads. The practice has approximately 30 staff and only 6 off street parking spaces. • Objections were received from a resident of Foundry Lane, that they and their visitors would have difficulty parking. • Objection to permit holders bay outside 119-147 Kings Road as there are driveways in this location. • One objection felt there were not enough 	<p>Residents in Longdene Rd have made many detailed comments about residents parking provision during recent consultations and the proposals maximise the amount of parking space that can be provided. In some locations where spaces are proposed vehicles currently park with 2 wheels on the verge. The verge will need hardening in these locations.</p> <p>The proposals in Kings Rd provide residents parking Mon-Fri 0830-1730 using all practicable road space. This road is one of the closest to the station and used by commuters. Some properties have driveways that limit the road space available for parking.</p> <p>The dental practice is situated in a difficult location for customers with cars and parking in this area is not easy, the nearest car park is Weydown Road. It is planned to convert some 1 hour limited waiting bays in Kings Road to resident bays, however to assist local businesses it is proposed that two of these be retained.</p> <p>Properties in Foundry Lane have off street parking. There will continue to be unrestricted parking in Kings Road to the west of Foundry Lane. This could be used by visitors during the operational hours.</p> <p>In Kings Rd a balance has been sought between station users and residents with unrestricted parking retained where possible west of Foundry Lane. The proportion of resident bays/limited waiting bays and unrestricted spaces can be reviewed post implementation.</p> <p>Outside 119-147 Kings Road, there will not be any</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised in Longdene Rd and Kings Rd except retain two 1 hour limited waiting bays outside no. 2 Kings Rd.</p>

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
	<p>residents permit holder spaces and that there should be no unrestricted spaces in Kings Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Haslemere Town Council supported residents parking in Kings Road but objected to some of the proposals at the western end on the grounds that it could cause displacement. 	<p>marked bays but only permit holders will be allowed to park, which means that it is highly unlikely that anyone will park across driveways, while still allowing residents the option to park over their own drive if they wish.</p> <p>The additional double yellow lines are proposed on safety grounds. Vehicles are forced onto the wrong side of the road approaching the bend (going east) near the footbridge over railway.</p>	
<p>Courts Hill Road (CHR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A letter of support, signed by 29 residents was received. One resident felt there should be no unrestricted parking in CHR and commuters should use the car park. Some properties on the north side of CHR (west) have driveways sloping steeply down to their properties and cannot use them in icy weather. They felt they should be eligible for permits or continue to be allowed to park across their drives in icy weather. Other residents and their visitors park in front of their drives and would not be able to do this with proposed DYL. They would also not be eligible for permits. Objections were also made on the grounds that vehicles could displace to Hill Road. 	<p>The proposals in Courts Hill Road were to provide a mix of 17 free unrestricted spaces and 18 resident permit holder spaces, operational between 0830-1730 with no waiting at any time elsewhere.</p> <p>The proposals here were devised to regulate parking (a mix of commuters and residents) and to counter possible displacement from Longdene and Kings Roads.</p> <p>All the properties have adequate off street parking except Haughton House which only has 6 spaces.</p> <p>Overall, amongst residents in the road, support is mixed. 29 residents, mainly at the western end support the proposals and approximately 25 residents, including those from Haughton House are opposed.</p> <p>There are also objections from residents of Hill Rd, concerned about displacement as well as Shepherds Hill and Lower Street, opposed to the loss of on street parking in this area.</p> <p>The introduction of residents parking in Kings Road and</p>	<p>Do not proceed with proposals in Courts Hill Road except the provision of double yellow lines at the junctions of Courts Mount Road and Shepherds Hill and the entrance to Hedgehog Lane.</p>

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 objections were received from residents of Haughton House. They did not support the proposals and felt that paying £2 for visitor permits would make a significant impact on their annual budget. • Some residents felt the proposed parking bays outside Haughton House would restrict access to driveways. • There were many ‘general ‘objections from non CHR residents, some on the grounds of displacement. Lower Street and Shepherds Hill residents also felt the restrictions would reduce their ability to park in the road. 	<p>Longdene Road could lead to some displacement in CHR, however it is already heavily parked at the western end.</p> <p>There is a need for parking regulation in CHR, particularly to maintain access, reduce obstruction and improve access for visitors, however based on the response the current proposals do not have a consensus amongst residents or the wider community.</p> <p>The double yellow lines at the junctions of Courts Mount Road and Shepherds Hill should be retained to reduce obstructive parking in these locations, as should the short length in Hedgehog Lane. However the rest of this road should be reviewed again as part of Phase 2.</p>	
Courts Mount Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two objections were received stating that the proposed ‘no waiting at any time’ restrictions should be extended on both sides of the road along the whole length. 	<p>These comments suggest extending the proposed restriction; however that is not possible without further advertisement and statutory consultation. The double yellow line alongside the footway in this location is intended to prevent parking on the footway to keep it clear for pedestrians. Any potential extension can be considered in a post implementation review (Phase 2)</p>	Proceed as advertised

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
<p>Sandrock</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A letter signed by 12 residents of Sandrock supporting residents parking but objecting to the proposed hours and requesting 24/7 restrictions. • An individual letter was also received from one of the residents above requesting the same. • Objections from some Lower Street residents included claims that they were entitled to park in Sandrock to access their properties in Lower Street. • General objections were made to Sandrock on the grounds that there could be displacement or that it needed to be considered as part of a wider plan for the town and a larger station car park. 	<p>Sandrock residents would like a 24/7 scheme but this would be very unusual. If the council were to agree 24/7 operational hours, the residents could well expect some level of enforcement at night and on Sundays. This could place an unreasonable burden on the council and raise expectations beyond what is realistic in enforcement terms. In addition, residents would need to purchase visitor permits for weekends and nights, which could prove inconvenient.</p> <p>The proposed operational hours of 0830-1730 Mon-Sat should be adequate to prevent commuter and shopper parking.</p> <p>There is an existing prohibition of motor vehicles order on Sandrock dating from 1981. It says that <i>"no person shall except under the direction or with the permission of a constable in uniform cause any motor vehicle to proceed in the length of Sandrock south of Courts Mount Road except for access to premises and land adjacent thereto"</i>.</p> <p>Some Lower Street residents claim they have a right to park in Sandrock and the order mentioned above possibly allows this to access their properties.</p> <p>However the exact number of residents that might be eligible would need detailed investigation, as would potential surplus capacity available for them to park in Sandrock. This should be investigated as part of Phase 2. It is therefore recommended to proceed with proposals in Sandrock as advertised, and following implementation review the capacity and eligibility of other nearby residents to apply for a parking permit.</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised, but following implementation review the capacity and eligibility of other nearby residents to apply for a parking permit as part of Phase 2.</p>

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
<p>Popes Mead, Chestnut Avenue, West Street and Bridge Road (and access road to telephone exchange)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents in Popes Mead and Chestnut Avenue and part of West Street have previously supported/petitioned for residents parking. A letter signed by Chestnut Avenue residents from all properties north of the car park access was received supporting the proposals, but requesting that the operation hours be extended to 08.30-20.00, Mon-Sun, as originally advertised, due to the risk of bay blocking by those not wishing to pay in the WBC car parks. There were objections that it was unfair to exclude properties 1-11 Bridge Rd and these residents would not be able to park in adjacent roads close to their houses where they had done previously. The cost of a season ticket for the Waverley car park was mentioned by many as being too expensive and much higher than the resident permits available in the Waverley car parks. Bridge Road residents association objected on the grounds that some residents currently park in Chestnut Avenue and Popes Mead and would not be able to do so. This could lead to displacement elsewhere in Bridge Road and Fieldway. 	<p>The proposals in this area are to provide residents parking between 0830-1730, Mon – Sat. in spaces that are currently used for parking.</p> <p>Resident permits were proposed to be street specific, which would have meant that means permits issued to Chestnut Avenue residents could only be used in Chestnut Avenue, and likewise in Popes Mead.</p> <p>In previous consultations, Bridge Road residents have not wanted residents parking and so this road was not included, and the residents are not eligible for permits.</p> <p>Odd numbers 1 to 11 Bridge Road are situated between Chestnut Avenue and Popes Mead. Residents in this part of Bridge Road are likely to park in these two roads.</p> <p>Many objections considered the exclusion of these properties to be unfair. It is therefore recommended to include residents of 1-11 Bridge Rd (odd nos.) in the permit scheme, and in order to accommodate this, it is recommended to create one permit scheme from the two previous schemes proposed separately for Chestnut Avenue and Popes Mead. This scheme will be for the residents of Chestnut Avenue, Popes Mead and 1-11 Bridge Road.</p> <p>Support was confirmed from Chestnut Rd residents, but they requested longer restriction hours – including Sundays and up to 8pm. This could place an unreasonable burden on the council and raise expectations beyond what is realistic in enforcement terms. In addition, residents would need to purchase</p>	<p>Proceed as advertised except allow properties 1-11 Bridge Rd (odd nos) to purchase permits for one scheme encompassing the two previous schemes proposed for Chestnut Avenue Popes Mead</p> <p>Review the operational hours of the residents parking schemes as part of Phase 2</p> <p>Proceed as advertised in West Street</p>

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Bridge Road residents objected because it could be more difficult to park outside their houses and were concerned about their driveways being blocked. Some requested that Bridge Road should also have residents parking. • Haslemere Hall objected to the proposals on the grounds that (mainly) elderly visitors would not be able to park in nearby Chestnut Avenue or Popes Mead. <p>40 more general objections were also made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These were general objections citing the current proposals as not being holistic or the need for a bigger station car park also that there should have more thorough consultation. • Lower St residents typically objected to all the proposals but many mentioned this area because they would not be able to park in these roads during the restrictive hours as they have done. • There were a few comments that it would be more difficult to access the Hall and some echoed the point that it was unfair on Bridge Rd not to give them permits. 	<p>visitor permits for weekends and evenings, which could prove inconvenient.</p> <p>The proposed operational hours of 0830-1730 Mon-Sat should be adequate to prevent commuter and shopper parking. However, it is recognised that WBC charge up to 19.00hrs in both the nearby Chestnut Rd and Central car parks, which may encourage vehicles to park in Chestnut Avenue and Popes Mead after 17.30 hrs, rather than use the car parks. This situation should be monitored and any changes considered as part of Phase 2.</p> <p>In the immediate vicinity of where the proposals are planned there appears to be more support (from Popes Mead, Chestnut Av and West St) than opposition. The residents of 1-11 (odd nos) may also be more supportive if they were allowed permits for the scheme.</p>	

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were no objections to the proposed loading restrictions in West Street. 		
<p>Tanners Lane (north), Church Lane, High Lane and Derby Road (east)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St Bartholomew's school supported the proposals in Derby Rd, but were concerned about the extent of the proposed restrictions in Tanners Lane and Church Lane (in relation to parents parking) St Bartholomew's church felt an additional single yellow line should be provided in Church Lane. They agreed the time 4.30-5.30 was the best compromise but said there were sometimes events that meant there would be visitors during these hours. Some local residents objected because there could be displacement onto surrounding roads, the majority of these from High Lane. 3 residents felt that the 2 permit bays in Derby Road should be moved nearer to High Lane. Objections were made by parents on the grounds that it would be more difficult to pick up children from after school clubs and that it would generally be harder to 	<p>The proposals in this area include residents parking provision and, double yellow lines where it is not safe to park and 'no waiting 16.30-17.30, Mon-Fri', intended to improve access to the school and church.</p> <p>To the west of Church Road commuters park along most of the northern side of Derby Road and between Church Road and High Lane, on the south side. Parts of Tanners Lane are also used for parking as is Church Road.</p> <p>There are a number of properties in Tanners Lane with no off road parking and resident spaces have been proposed in these areas.</p> <p>The proposals in Derby Road were developed in consultation with St Bartholomews Church, residents and the school. The no waiting '16.30-17.30 was considered the least disruptive to all, allowing visitors, parents and staff to park during the day but also preventing the majority of commuters from using these locations. Many have cited possible problems with restricting parking between 1630 and 1730.</p> <p>There were 74 objections to this location overall and although there is some support from the church and school, both have reservations. Given the number of objections it is recommended not to proceed with any proposals in Derby Road, Church Road or the upper part</p>	<p>Do not proceed with proposals in Derby Road East, High Lane, Church Lane, Church Green and Tanners Lane (approximately north east of the boundary between Crane Cottage and Rosemary Court)</p> <p>Provide residents parking opposite Railway Cottages and double yellow lines east of Crane Cottage.</p>

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
	<p>find a space in Tanners Lane/Church Green on the school run.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 41 more general objections were made that it would be harder to access the church, there could be displacement problems, it was not holistic and a bigger station car park was needed. Many acknowledged the need to do something in Tanners Lane as the road was not suitable for unrestrained parking. Some Lower Street residents claimed they parked in Tanners Lane. • Several commuters/local workers objected that there was a long waiting list for car park season tickets and they could not afford the car parks and needed to park in Derby Rd. • The proposed residents parking bays opposite Railway Cottages were considered obstructive to passing traffic. • Objections were made that it would be difficult to park in the area between 16.30-and 17.30 when picking up children from after school activities. 	<p>of Tanners Lane at the present time. This area can be reviewed again in Phase 2 if necessary.</p> <p>Residents parking should however be provided in Tanners Lane opposite Railway Cottages along with double yellow lines to ease traffic flows (generally southwest of Crane Cottage)</p>	

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
<p>Beech Road, Grayswood Road, Church Lane</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were numerous objections to the proposals in Beech Road. These were made on the grounds that Beech Road acts as an overflow parking facility for Haslemere Hospital and Health Centre. Respondents claim that the proposed operational hours between 11.30 and 14.00 would reduce parking for the hospital and cause difficulties for visitors and patients. • It was also stated that Beech Rd residents had off street parking and did not need a residents parking scheme. • The League of Friends of Haslemere Hospital were supportive of the proposals but with reduced operational hours of 12.30-13.30 or similar. • The Haslemere Health Centre expressed concerns that the proposals would reduce the ability of patients to park nearby, many of whom were elderly or very young. The car park has been extended within the site but is often full. Beech Rd provides additional capacity for the hospital and health centre. A restriction between 1300 and 1400 was suggested as likely to have less impact on patients. • There were many objections from 	<p>The proposals in Beech Road are to provide resident permit holder parking between 11.30 and 2pm, Mon-Fri. with some permit holder only bays between 0830-1730, Mon-Fri.</p> <p>The proposals were requested by residents in Beech Road who have complained about obstructive parking in the road and difficulties accessing their properties.</p> <p>When the hospital and health centre are busy (for example on days when there are blood tests) Beech Road is heavily parked by visitors and patients. Vehicles are continuously looking for spaces in the hospital car parks as well as Beech Road. Busy days can mean the hospital car parks are full and there can be up to 35 vehicles parked in Beech Road.</p> <p>This is not always the case however as on quieter days there are spaces in the car park and only a handful of cars parked in Beech Road.</p> <p>Recent monitoring of the parking in Beech Road indicates that on busy day between 5 and 10 vehicles park in Beech Road all day. These could be hospital staff, residents or town centre workers.</p> <p>The proposals were planned to allow parking in Beech Road before 11.30 and after 14.00, however many objectors felt this was too restrictive and have either called for the restriction to be dropped or reduced to 1 hour in the middle of the day, say 12.30-13.30 or 13.00-14.00.</p> <p>Given the number of objections and lack of support from</p>	<p>Do not proceed with proposals in Beech Road and Grayswood Road. Proceed as advertised in Church Lane opposite the hospital access.</p>

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
	<p>patients and visitors to the hospital.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visitors and workers in the town also said that unrestricted parking in Beech Road should be retained because the car parks were too expensive. 	<p>many respondents it is recommended not to proceed with any of the proposals in Beech Road. As a consequence it is not necessary to implement waiting restrictions on Grayswood Road. The proposed double yellow lines in Church Lane opposite the access to the hospital should be introduced as this is opposite a bus stop and the area is unsuitable for parking (and is rarely used)</p>	
<p>Three Gates Lane</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were objections from residents of Three Gates Lane on the grounds that the proposals would cause displacement further along the road. Some felt the restrictions were not needed in the evenings or weekends. There were more widespread objections that the proposed restrictions would also remove free all day parking for town centre workers (and residents visitors) There was some support for the proposals from residents and other respondents who felt the parking was obstructive and that restrictions should be extended further. Haslemere Town Council felt this proposal should be postponed until alternative parking for town centre users was available. 	<p>The proposals in Three Gates Lane are to extend the double yellow lines in Three Gates Lane to prevent parking on a bend.</p> <p>The road is mostly too narrow to allow parking, particularly outside East Saddlers. Larger vehicles need to drive on the verge to get past parked cars.</p> <p>The proposals in this location should be retained however it is recommended that double yellow lines should not be placed in front of Fairfield where the road is wider. This will allow parking for about 4 vehicles and still allow traffic to pass.</p>	<p>Proceed, but allow unrestricted parking for four vehicles, in front of Fairfield.</p>

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
High Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many objections were made against the proposals to enforce current restrictions that prohibit echelon parking in parts of the High Street and Shepherd Hill. These were on the grounds that the overall number of spaces available to shoppers would be reduced, having an adverse economic impact on local businesses. There were no objections to the proposed loading restrictions in the lay-by to the north of the junction with West Street. 	<p>The practice of parking at 45 degrees (echelon) to the kerb has developed in the on street parking spaces outside Costa Coffee and at the bottom of Shepherds Hill.</p> <p>Echelon parking is considered dangerous in many locations with passing traffic, as vehicles have to reverse out into oncoming traffic, often with obscured visibility from adjacent cars and vans. Both locations where this takes place in Haslemere are on an A road and close to junctions.</p> <p>The current traffic regulation order (TRO) states that vehicles should park parallel to the kerb in these locations. It is planned to enforce this existing restriction and was highlighted on the drawing as such.</p>	<p>Proceed with loading restrictions in lay-by to the north of West Street as advertised.</p>
Lower Street/Shepherds Hill	<p>Although there are no proposals to change parking arrangements in Lower Street, there were objections to the proposals from Lower Street Residents on the grounds that they would be excluded from residents parking schemes and would have fewer places to park around the town centre.</p>	<p>The Committee report of September 2012 set out in very general terms how a long term strategy to manage parking in Haslemere might be achieved with a phased approach. The proposals in this report are termed Phase 1.</p> <p>An objective of Phase 1 has been to minimise displacement. The provision of parking spaces for Lower Street and Shepherds Hill is likely to cause more significant displacement of commuters and therefore it is linked to Phase 2 which will also look at additional parking capacity near the station.</p> <p>In the interim, as a number of the proposals are not now going ahead, any impact on the residents of Lower Street will be greatly reduced.</p>	

Location	Summary of comments and objections	Response	Recommendation
<p>General objections</p>	<p>Many objections were made to ‘all the proposals’ or to a great many of them, sometimes without stating why.</p> <p>Recurring themes were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • concern about displacement • the need for a larger station car park • failure to consult with stakeholders and take into account the needs of the community. • the need for affordable (or free) parking by town centre workers and residents. 	<p>The popularity of the station with commuters means parking space is at a premium in Haslemere during the ‘working week’. Displacement was a major concern for many respondents. The advertised proposals (and the amended recommendations listed above) take account of this where possible, but in some cases displacement is the inevitable consequence of providing more convenient parking for residents and visitors. It is not always possible to accommodate everyone, however the council will review the current proposals that are going to be implemented, adjust as necessary and take account of residents views in future phases.</p> <p>A larger station car park is considered by most as a desirable objective, including SCC and, Waverley BC. It is not a simple task however and both authorities are committed to working with Southwest Trains as part of an ongoing commitment and a phased approach.</p> <p>The proposals in this report have been initially developed following discussion and consultation with residents and stakeholders in the community and amended where appropriate to take account of objections.</p>	