



LOCAL COMMITTEE (WAVERLEY)

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND
RESPONSES**

24 JANUARY 2013

1. Mr Robert Serman

The comprehensive parking proposals make several references to Phase 2. What precisely will Phase 2 comprise and when is it intended to bring it forward ?

Response

The response to this question is provided in section 7.2 of the report as follows:

Phase 2 of the review of on-street parking in Haslemere will take place alongside the 2013 Waverley parking review. This will include an assessment of the impact of any schemes that are introduced as part of phase 1, consultation, as appropriate, both with residents within Phase 1 permit schemes and those who may be interested in also having schemes as part of Phase 2. A report on the outcome of the assessment and review will be presented to a future meeting of the Local Committee.

Supplementary question

Mr Serman asked how long the review would take and what the associated costs would be.

The response provided subsequent to the meeting is that the review will take place in the autumn of 2013 and that the Local Committee has allocated the sum of £15,000 in its provisional budget for 2013-14.

2. From Mr Jeremy and Mrs Victoria Leake

Question 1 - Displacement

What is the estimated car displacement of the proposed resident-only parking

schemes (ROPs) and other road controls, and why has Surrey County Council (SCC) not presented this analysis to Waverley Local Committee (WLC) members in its report, despite receiving 507 objections that included many concerns about displacement and 137 additional objections purely on the basis of displacement?

Question 2- safety impact of SCC proposals

What does SCC conclude from its risk and safety assessment of the resulting aggregate displacement of cars from Phase 1 ? For example, would the displacement of cars to other parts of Haslemere result in increased safety risks ?

Question 3 - Equality of Impact Assessment

What does the Equality of Impact Assessment that SCC carried out, and reviewed by WLC members, conclude on how the proposals affect different residents living in Haslemere town centre ? Some Lower Street and Shepherds Hill residents park in Popes Mead, West Street and Chestnut Avenue and have done so for many years.

Question 4 - Alternatives considered by WLC

What alternatives to ROPs have WLC members considered in Haslemere Town centre and why are ROPs considered the best option ? For example, a 1 hour curfew which allowed local residents to park in the centre of town would create space by excluding commuters while allowing maximum flexibility in the use of scarce parking space for residents, shoppers and visitors, and would be an improvement for all residents and businesses in the centre of Haslemere.

Question 5 - Cost/benefit of SCC long-term plans for parking in Haslemere

What cost/benefit analysis has been done by SCC officers and reviewed by WLC members, that ensures that SCC's plans for phasing of ROPs is the most appropriate long-term on-road parking arrangement in Haslemere?

Question 6 - Discrimination and predetermination

We would like to understand the nature of SCC's discrimination against Lower Street and Shepherds Hill (LS&SH) and WLC members views on it. Paragraphs 2.14 and 2.15 of Richard Bolton's report state:

2.14 Following implementation of Phase 1, Phase 2 will follow, which will, amongst other objectives mentioned in this report, look at parking provision for residents of Lower Street and Shepherds Hill.

2.15 The highway authority does not have a duty to provide resident parking, and residents of these roads must have moved to their properties in the knowledge that they did not have off street parking.

The second part of paragraph 2.15 is clearly intended to imply that LS&SH residents are less deserving of on-street parking because they must have known that they had no off-street parking when they moved into their homes. SCC has finally revealed its true reason for denying LS&SH equality in their parking process and plans. SCC initially claimed that LS&SH did not want parking in his report presented to the WLC in September having misrepresented the position of

LS&SH to the WLC, drawing on a flawed survey in August (which we told WLC members about previously). But this claim has now proved to be false because LS&SH presented a petition in December from 52 of its residents asking to be included in any Phase 1 parking scheme.

Question 6a

If residents of Longdene and Kings Road moved into their homes knowing that they moved next to a station, and that residents of Popes Mead and Chestnut Avenue moved into their homes knowing that they moved into the centre of a town with shoppers, and residents from neighbouring roads (LS&SH and Bridge Road) sharing parking in their road, doesn't Mr Bolton's logic in paragraph 2.15 also apply to them (and indeed all roads included in Phase 1)?

Question 6b

What do you have to say to residents who have lived in Lower Street or Shepherds Hill for more than 40 years, before the council reduced the capacity of the parking area at the top of Shepherds Hill, resulting in those residents being displaced to adjacent roads ?

Question 6c

Could WLC also please explain to LS&SH why, given Mr Bolton's logic in paragraph 2.15, it is not discriminatory for SCC to allocate parking to Bridge Road residents who also do not have off-street or on-street parking outside their houses in Chestnut Avenue, and to Popes Mead residents in the part of West Street outside the fire station which has no houses fronting it ?

Question 6d

We do not understand SCC's desire to accelerate parking for some roads in the town centre ahead of others. Either Popes Mead and Chestnut Avenue are so blighted by parking problems that they need an urgent parking solution. In which case, so do their neighbours, including Lower Street and Shepherds Hill residents. Alternatively, if parking is not an urgent problem for neighbouring roads such as Lower Street and Shepherds Hill, then it is not an urgent problem for Popes Mead and Chestnut Avenue. Could WLC please explain why it has given preferential treatment to some roads over their neighbouring roads ?

Question 6e

Do Committee Members agree with Lower Street and Shepherds Hill being treated as less deserving of being included in Phase 1 due to their location, as implied by Mr Bolton's remarks in paragraphs 2.14 and 2.15 of his report please ? We request that this answer be signed off by Committee Members rather than written by an SCC officer as is usually the case. If members disagree with Mr Bolton, what conclusion do they draw about the equality of Phase 1 ?

Question 6f

How will SCC address the issues of having discriminated against Lower Street and Shepherds Hill residents in Phase 1 if in the public consultation in Phase 2 reveals that residents in neighbouring roads do not want Lower Street and

Shepherds Hill residents parking in roads that they have frontages on ?

Question 6g

Why did the Deputy Chairman of the WLC (Councillor Renshaw), and SCC Cabinet Member (Councillor Furey), copying the Chairman of WLC (Councillor Frost), tell residents in LS&SH in July 2012, prior to SCC's consultation, analysis by SCC Officers and review by WLC in September 2012, that Lower Street and Shepherds Hill would not be included in SCC's Phase 1 parking proposals ? Is it usual for WLC to determine outcomes of their meetings prior to committee members considering the facts and consulting residents?

Response

The proposals in this report are intended to make it easier for residents in some roads to park nearer their homes by creating permit parking areas. The creation of residents' parking schemes will inevitably lead to some displacement. The recommendations in the report have taken concerns about displacement into account and minimised this where possible. It is often difficult to predict where people might choose to park and there are many variables involved for each individual, but it is the responsibility of the motorist to park safely and not present a hazard to other road users. As such 'additional safety risks' are not anticipated and the recommended proposals should help improve safety and reduce obstructive parking

The proposals may displace a small number of vehicles in a number of locations across the town; however, there is adequate capacity in the existing car parks and on street in nearby roads.

A post-implementation review of the proposals is planned in Phase 2 and any actual displacement that materialises can be considered at this time.

In developing the recommendations in the report consideration has been given to consultation responses and their potential impact on highway users. Parking restrictions are primarily introduced for safety reasons or to maintain access and traffic flow.

Alternative solutions such as a blanket 1 hour waiting restriction can help reduce long-term parking in residential roads and is often used for this purpose. It is not effective unless all residents have off street parking because those without would have nowhere to leave their vehicle during the operational hour. A 1 or 2 hour restriction is not appropriate near shopping areas where non-residents (shoppers) park for shorter periods throughout the day.

The proposed operational hours of the residents' parking schemes in Haslemere are 0830-1730, Mon.-Fri. or Sat. These are the hours when non-residents are most likely to park in residential roads.

It is not possible to provide parking for residents (or anyone else) in Lower Street due to the potential disruption to traffic flow. If Lower Street and Shepherds Hill residents are to be provided with residents' parking it needs to be elsewhere. This will cause displacement and as such is being considered in Phase 2.

It is possible (and recommended) to formalise the existing parking arrangements in Popes Mead and Chestnut Avenue to provide residents' parking, but the

available road space for this is limited. If all the residents of Lower Street were allowed to purchase a permit for the Popes Mead/Chestnut Avenue area it is very unlikely there would be enough space for all the residents to park.

Numbers 1-11 Bridge Road are situated in the middle of, and a few metres away from, two residents' parking bays. It is considered reasonable to allow them to park in these roads and the impact of their additional vehicles is small. Geographically Lower Street is no closer to Popes Mead than many other roads.

The Council does not have a duty to provide on street parking for any residents in Haslemere, but it does have the powers to allocate on street parking space to certain groups of highway user, including residents. Following a lengthy consultation process it is considered appropriate to provide parking for residents of Longdene and Kings Roads in these respective roads.

The residents of Shepherds Hill and Lower Street who choose to own a vehicle are responsible for finding a suitable parking space. The Council does not have a duty to provide a parking space for them, but has agreed to look at their issues in Phase 2.

Shepherds Hill is the A286 and a principal road. The volume of traffic using the road and its proximity to the town centre mean it is not considered suitable for on-street parking. Highways are for movement and access; parking is regulated or formalised where it is safe, but it is not the primary concern when balancing the needs of all highway users. The introduction of the waiting restrictions in Shepherds Hill would have undergone a consultation process at the time they were introduced.

There is and has been no discrimination against Lower Street and Shepherds Hill residents. It is simply more difficult to provide dedicated parking for these residents on the highway network in the town centre area taking into account all the other functions of the highway. Inclusion in Phase 1 would cause larger scale displacement of commuters (one of the biggest causes of concern from consultation respondents) or lead to over-supply of permits for the schemes that are proposed.

As with all modern organisations many e-mails are sent and received as part of normal Council business. As you are aware, Councillors Fury and Renshaw were involved in e-mail communications which discussed various parking issues and options within Haslemere.

The anticipated cost of introducing the proposed residents' parking schemes and other parking restrictions is given in the report. The full scope of Phases 2 and 3 have not been fully agreed. A cost/benefit analysis is not realistic in these circumstances.

3. From Mr Roderick More

I live at The Coppice which is one of the three "new" houses opposite the back entrance to Haslemere hospital. Well before any of the current proposals for parking restrictions in Haslemere were made, I complained to Steve Renshaw about the hazards my wife and I face in getting out of our drive. On every weekday, cars park immediately outside our house (sometimes partly obstructing our driveway) and give us no sightline along the road, particularly to our left. We can only inch out, trying to look both left and right and also keep an eye on traffic

coming out of the hospital on the opposite side of the road. By the time we can see if anything is coming, the bonnet of the car is well into the road and, as the road is effectively single lane, with cars parked, a collision is always a possibility.

During the consultation period last year, one of your safety officers visited Beech Road and, as a result, your autumn plans included double yellow lines outside the three houses opposite the entrance to the hospital. I felt that was a good decision and was most surprised and disappointed to see that this has now been dropped.

I should be most grateful if you would let me know the following:

1. Why do you now consider that we face no threat to our safety ?
2. Did your safety officer consider there to be a safety problem ?
3. Why it is that you consider double yellow lines outside the front entrance to the hospital in Church Lane to be warranted but not outside the back entrance in Beech Road (it is the back entrance that is used by the many lorries going to the hospital and Beech Lane is a bus route).
4. What recourse will we have if we have a collision having asked the Council to give us proper protection ?

Response

The Council has recently carried out a statutory consultation about changes to on street parking restrictions in Haslemere. There was strong opposition to the planned changes in Beech Road and it is recommended to the Local Committee that we do not go ahead with the advertised proposals at the present time.

Parking problems here are typical of many roads where cars park between residential driveways. In our experience the number of parked vehicles in Beech Road fluctuates and traffic speeds reduce when the road is more heavily parked.

Residents have in the past made representations for more parking controls. It is likely that we will consider the parking arrangements again as part of another future review and your comments about access from your driveway will be taken into account.

4. From Ms Clare Loosley and Ms Tamara Lake on behalf of Longdene Road residents

The residents in Longdene Road are very happy to see that the proposals for a residential permit scheme have now been recommended by officers to the Committee for implementation and we really hope that the Committee can agree with their recommendation this afternoon.

Were this to be the case, given the time that this exercise has taken due to the interventions and objections raised by various local pressure groups and bearing in mind the difficulties that residents are continuing to experience in parking on our road, can the Council please implement the scheme as soon as possible and can they advise a date when this will actually be effected ?

Response

If agreed it is planned to implement residents' parking schemes as soon as possible. This is likely to be by the summer.

5. From Mr Paul Megson

This is a general question, prompted by the series of proposals, notices and consultations published by Surrey County Council over the last year or so on the subject of car parking in Haslemere. Please note however that my question could equally apply to many other processes which might in the past have required, or might in future require, formal or informal consultation with residents. Examples might include (but not be confined to) temporary road closures, permanent road closures eg no further admittance to motor vehicles, creating or re-routing public footpaths or bridle paths etc.

Consultation responses may be invited from specific groups of residents, from residents generally – or indeed the public at large, whether residents or not – or from both.

Please explain the processes whereby Councillors and their officers evaluate and take decisions on all representations they receive on a particular subject, whether those representations are made by individuals who can be seen to be directly affected, or indirectly affected, or not really affected at all; whether those representations are canvassed (responses to direct questions addressed to that respondent) or unsolicited; whether they are from individuals speaking for themselves, from individuals claiming to speak for others or for associations, or from individuals who can evidence the fact that they speak for others, eg by delivering a petition or a bundle of individual letters.

Please describe the relative weightings given to such representations across the spectra of interest I outline above.

Response

The Council has set out its approach to public engagement, which includes consultation, in its "Commitment to public involvement" document. This makes it clear that the Council will listen to ideas, involve residents in decision-making, provide opportunities to influence the design and delivery of services and explain how participation has made a difference.

As part of this is a recognition that the Council needs to meet its legal obligations. Some consultations that the Council carry out are required by law- and the way in which we do these and evaluate the responses and enable them to be taken account of is regulated by legislation.

In other situations, our "public involvement" document makes it clear that we will involve people in a timely and meaningful way, co-ordinating activity across the Council and with partners. Opportunities for involvement will be genuine and we indicate that we will feedback results. The approach builds on the "Best Practice Principles" described in the Consultation Institute Charter. It also recognises the principles established by case law, taking account of the Government's recently updated guidance on Consultation. When engaging in a consultation exercise there is an expectation on Council officers that they will consider advising consultees how the responses to the consultation will inform any decisions that are to be taken.

As regards the weighting of any particular representations, this may be something that is required in accordance with a specific statutory process. Otherwise, Council officers will collate, summarise and present the outcomes from consultations, and other representations they have received where they are to be taken account of by a decision maker (eg a committee). Whilst the categories and sources of particular types of responses may be drawn up and summarised, the weight to be given to any of them is a matter for the particular decision maker or decision making body whilst taking account of all relevant considerations in coming to its conclusions.

Supplementary question

Mr Megson requested further information about objections to the proposals: the amount of correspondence which contained more than one objection or expression of support; the number of objectors and supporters for each proposal; the number of people who objected to a single proposal and the number who objected to more than 50% of the proposals; more detail on the nature of support and opposition relating to the proposals for Beech Road and Courts Hill Road (West).

The Local Highway Services Group Manager confirmed that some multiple objections had been received, but no analysis of this had been carried out. He would investigate the feasibility of this and respond in writing to Mr Megson.

6. From Mr David Round

Has not the Council considered the simple approach to controlling (prohibiting) commuter parking in residential roads ? Namely, to prohibit any parking in such roads for just one hour a day. It works. This has been put before but seems not to have been followed up. Other councils do this. It is much simpler, far less bureaucratic, fairer, and doesn't require anyone to pay anything - unless they transgress the prohibition.

Response

A 1 hour waiting restriction can help reduce long term parking in residential roads and is often used for this purpose. It is, however, not effective unless all residents have off street parking because those without would have nowhere to leave their vehicle during the operational hour.

This type of restriction is not appropriate near shopping areas where non-residents park for shorter periods throughout the day making it more difficult for residents to park near their homes.

The proposed operational hours of the residents' parking schemes in Haslemere are 0830-1730, Mon.-Fri. or Sat. These are the hours when non-residents are most likely to park in residential roads.

Supplementary question

Mr Round felt that a number of the roads where all-day parking takes place do have off-street parking and maintained that a curfew would be a simple and effective solution.

7. From Mr John Cox

The residents of Sandrock, Haslemere, welcomed the 21 September 2012 decision of the Local Committee (Waverley) to proceed to statutory notification of their intention to introduce a resident only parking scheme which included Sandrock. We also now welcome the recommendation of Officers in the 24 January 2013 report to the Committee, following such statutory notification, that implementation of the scheme should proceed (including the agreed provision of much needed yellow lines to prevent obstruction in Sandrock). The "Summary of Objections" provided in Annex 2, Page 42 of the report does not, however, adequately reflect the views submitted by Sandrock residents in our petition and the report therefore presents a distorted view.

Given the recent extension of the Waverley Borough Council car parking charging period to 19:00 Monday to Saturday, which we believe will add to the parking pressure in our road due to Sandrock's close proximity to Haslemere Town Centre and Hall (as well as to the Station), Sandrock residents, in an overwhelming majority, petitioned the Committee (sent on 9 November 2012) to extend the restricted period beyond the hour advertised. If we could not be allowed a 24 x 7 restriction, which was our overall preference, (as the Committee and officers should be well aware from previous submissions from Sandrock), we petitioned for the restriction to run on to 19:00 Monday to Saturday (rather than just up to 17:30 as advertised). We are disappointed that this key issue in the Sandrock petition has not been mentioned in the report.

We therefore ask the Committee Chairman:

1. Why our views with regards to the extension of the restrictions until at least 19:00 have not been conveyed to the Committee ?
2. To support the Sandrock residents by providing an increase in restricted hours and, if not to 24 x 7, then at least from 08:30 to 19:00 Monday to Saturday as set out in our petition as this would at very least deter non-permit holders from evening parking in Sandrock.
3. To give an assurance that reconsideration of the timing of restrictions in Sandrock will, if necessary, take place in 6 months and not be delayed further as a consideration of Phase 2 and that residents will be fully involved in that reconsideration process.

Response

The proposals in Sandrock are to introduce residents' parking on the west side between 0830 and 1730, Mon. – Sat. Extending the operational hours until 7pm 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.

The operational times of the proposed residents' parking schemes will be reviewed in Phase 2.

8. From Mr Alan Blinder

Madam Chairman and Officers of the Committee, I would like to thank you all for your support and encouragement over the last 18 months, it has been greatly

appreciated. I am very pleased to see that St Christopher's Green has been recommended for Phase 1 of the residents' permits implementation, and that the controlled time has been extended to include Saturdays. However, I am extremely disappointed that enforcement times have not been extended to 19.00. As previously mentioned in our responses to the consultations, St Christopher's Green is in a unique location as it is directly opposite a very popular restaurant with other restaurants "around the corner". We experience, on a regular basis, restaurant customers parking their cars on our road rather than in nearby car parks.

Will the Committee agree to monitor the situation and, based on objective evidence gathered, look to review the enforcement hours to 19.00 at Phase 2 and when the fairground car park becomes pay to park ?

Response

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 7pm 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. There are free on street spaces in Weyhill for restaurant goers in the evening and spaces nearby in car parks and on street become available as commuters return to their vehicles. The operational times of the proposed residents parking schemes will be reviewed in Phase 2.

9. From Mr Graeme Spratley on behalf of residents of Popes Mead/West Street

We thank the officers and the Committee for their resilience over the last 18 months and welcome the recommendation to introduce the scheme, which is the culmination of several years' efforts.

We accept the inclusion of the residents of 1 -11 Bridge Road in the interests of fairness and inclusivity, as well as the banding of Chestnut Avenue/Popes Mead/West St (opposite the Fire Station) and Bridge Road. The situation in Popes Mead/West Street is worsening due to the overflow from Proven Car Company and since Waverley Borough Council have increased their charges and extended their hours. However, we are disappointed about the hours of restriction, specifically the 17.30 expiry. We request that the scheme as recommended is introduced, but that there should be an immediate advertisement to extend the hours to 19.00hrs for all the roads that are affected. If there is a reason why this can't happen then our suggestion is an early review in 3 – 6 months, rather than be delayed for 12 months, or worse, be moved into Phase 2.

Can the officers and Committee please advise:

1. Why our observations in respect of the hours have been ignored ?
2. Why have similar objections from St. Christopher's Green, Sandrocks and Chestnut Avenue also been ignored ?
3. Why we can't have the evening expiry period extended to 19.00 at the time of implementation to be in line with nearby Waverley Borough

Council car parks, which would seem to be utterly logical ?

Response

The proposals in Popes Mead and elsewhere are to introduce residents' parking between 0830 and 1730, Mon.– Sat. Popes Mead requests for longer operational hours (received prior to the latest official consultation period) have not been ignored, but operational hours until 7pm would create 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 for the majority of the day. The operational times of the proposed residents parking schemes will be reviewed in Phase 2.

Supplementary question

Mr Spratley asked when the parking review (to include Phase 2 in Haslemere) would take place.

The Local Highway Services Group Manager responded that the review will take place in the autumn of 2013.

10. From Mr Paul Gardner

I refer to the papers published last week in connection with Surrey's plans for residents' parking on Chestnut Avenue here in Haslemere. I have been asked by my neighbours to address the concerns which we have about the current scheme.

Underpinning the Council's proposals is the principle that we should be able to park on our own road. When a residents' parking scheme was first proposed it was on the footing that it would end at 8.00 p.m. This would have enabled us to return from work in the evenings with a reasonable chance of getting parked near own home. When the scheme was reconsidered the plan was for the period to end at 5.30 p.m. Our residents queried the merits of that proposal, which had come from nowhere, and would result in our cars being displaced elsewhere. In consequence we re-stated our support for the original proposals on filing our petition in response to that scheme.

Please will you explain the following:

1. The rationale for having the period end at 5.30 p.m.
2. The logic of having a period of at least 1.5 hours where people can move their cars from paid spaces in the Chestnut Avenue car park to (effectively) free spaces on our road, probably overnight.
3. Why the wishes of your residents have been ignored.

We also note that permits will only be available to residents whose cars are registered to an address on this road. I must not be the only resident with the equivalent of a company car, which is registered to my office address. Is it the Council's intention to debar me from having a permit to park on my own road ?

Response

The proposals in Chestnut Avenue and elsewhere are to introduce residents' parking between 0830 and 1730, Mon.– Sat. Extending the operational hours until 7pm 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 for the majority of the day. The operational times of the proposed residents parking schemes will be reviewed in Phase 2. Company car drivers are permitted to have a resident permit if they are the primary user of that vehicle and a letter from the company (or lease company) confirming this is needed.

Supplementary question

Mr Gardner remained troubled by the possibility that residents' vehicles would be displaced for short periods and that point 3 of his question had been ignored.

11. From Mr Peter Jones

Regarding the proposed bus stop and crossing in Petworth Road, have you considered the speed of cars driving around the corner from the High Street into Petworth Road ? Putting in a crossing is very dangerous and will only lead to a serious accident. People currently cross safely on the corner where drivers can clearly see them.

Losing three parking spaces at the bus stop is another huge negative for shopping in Haslemere. With the bus route being reduced in recent years and very few buses on this route why should our public money be wasted when this is just not necessary ?

There is no history of either the current bus stop or three valuable parking spaces causing a problem, so why do these ridiculous changes need to be made ?

Response

The introduction of a new pedestrian crossing in Petworth Road was recommended by the Haslemere Healthcheck Review of 2008. This review was produced by the Haslemere Initiative, whose aim is to improve the vitality and viability of Haslemere and the surrounding area. The crossing was prioritised for construction in 2012/13 by SCC's Haslemere and Western Villages Task Group, and funding has been allocated by SCC's Local Committee for Waverley. Haslemere Town Council supports the new crossing. SCC officers recently visited nearby shopkeepers and report general support, tempered by disappointment at the resultant loss of limited waiting parking spaces. The layout has been adjusted so that one parking space will be preserved (currently there are three).

The crossing has been reviewed by SCC Road Safety and Passenger Transport officers, as well as the Police Road Safety officer for Surrey, in particular with respect to traffic turning from the High Street. In order to mitigate risk an advance warning sign will be installed in the High Street, and buff coloured high friction surfacing will be applied on the corner to highlight the presence of the crossing and assist vehicle braking.

Supplementary question

Mr Jones was not aware of any support amongst local businesses and asked for details of the consultation by officers and of how local businesses would arrange deliveries and collections when the necessary zig-zag lines have been installed.

The Area Highways Manager would check the details and report back.

12. From Mr Robert Monteath

I would like to know what assessment you have made on businesses due to the proposed loss of parking spaces on Shepherds Hill. I am Chief Executive of the Bordon Liphook Haslemere Charity which runs a charity shop in Shepherds Hill. We rely on donations from the public. When the bays were reduced last year to accommodate the Gas Board's work our donation level dropped by 40%. All our profits go directly back into the community, supporting those individuals in desperate financial need: this will penalise the most vulnerable in our community. Reducing the number of bays to 4 from 8 will cause a great deal of concern.

Response

There has been no formal assessment on the effect that these changes will have on businesses. The echelon parking has developed over time in contravention of the formal manner of parking, which is for vehicles to be parallel to the kerb. Echelon parking can be dangerous, particularly for cyclists as vehicles reverse out into the path of oncoming traffic with restricted visibility.

Both sets of echelon parking are on the A286 which is a principal road with heavy traffic flows (approx 10,000 vehicles per day). The depth of the "bays" is limited, resulting in some parked vehicles protruding into the traffic flow and causing an obstruction. In addition, frequent reversing movements are not something the highway authority would condone on this category of road.

Supplementary question

Mr Monteath requested that a formal economic assessment be carried out.

13. From Mr Martin Nield on behalf of the Courts Hill Road (West) Co-ordination Team

From the safety point of view I am pleased with the proposals to put double yellow lines at the junctions with the A286, Courts Mount Road, and Hedgehog Lane. As to the response to the parking controls themselves, I obviously do not have all the detail, but we all know that a heavy majority of the residents of the western end of Courts Hill Road strongly support parking controls in the western end. Admittedly, their concerns are primarily more about traffic management per se, than permit parking, but if residents at this end of the road cannot have permits, then the available spaces will be taken, as now, by commuter parking. Currently, whilst many properties on the south side have off street parking, they cannot exit their drives, due to vehicles being parked opposite. Those of us on the north side often cannot exit our driveways due to parked vehicles and restricted sight lines.

The road is on a bus route which has difficulty passing the currently uninterrupted line of cars, as does the dust cart, where safety issues are exacerbated by the absence of any passing space. When we held our initial discussions we had no idea that Courts Hill Road could become an overflow parking area for many parts

ITEM 5

of Haslemere and, if the officers' recommendations are accepted, the whole road will become clogged with parked vehicles.

1. We believe that latest proposals, as advertised, force a degree of spaced parking and address this problem. If the officers' recommendations are accepted, the whole of Courts Hill Road will become clogged with parked vehicles. Therefore, will the Committee please vote against the recommendation of their officers and the block protesters, and support the residents of Courts Hill Road (West) who have to tolerate this unacceptable intrusion into their daily lives, five days a week ?
2. Does the Committee agree that it is completely indefensible for officers to recommend extending double yellow lines at the junctions between Courts Hill Road and Shepherd's Hill and Courts Mount Road but not at the corner with Longdene Road, apart from a small stretch in Hedgehog Lane ? The same safety considerations apply at all three points.

Response

Whilst there is support for the advertised proposals amongst Courts Hill Road (West) residents, there is also significant disagreement from residents in this part of the road and elsewhere in Haslemere.

It is accepted that current arrangement of unrestricted parking is not a sustainable long term solution for Courts Hill Road and some form of parking management is needed, but the advertised scheme does not appear to be the solution. An alternative layout will be sought as part of Phase 2 and the effect of residents' schemes in Longdene and Kings Roads monitored.

Supplementary question

On behalf of Mr Nield, Mr D Pope asked why more weight had been given to the views of objectors than to those of Courts Hill Road residents.