

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
	<b>Alresford Road, Guildford (convert part of existing limited waiting shared-use parking place outside No.15 to a disabled only parking place) 0 Representations</b>	
	Implement as advertised.	

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p>19</p>	<p><b>Artillery Terrace, Guildford (convert part of existing single yellow line outside No.1 to a limited waiting shared-use parking place) 1 Representation</b></p> <p>I have only just been informed (by a local group) about the planned changes to the parking in Artillery Terrace as outlined at <a href="https://www.guildford.gov.uk/parkingformaladvertisment">https://www.guildford.gov.uk/parkingformaladvertisment</a></p> <p>Firstly, I am extremely concerned and distraught that I have not been personally notified or consulted about this plan as it directly and primarily affects my property, its value and its accessibility. The proposed plan is to put parking spaces directly in front of my garage blocking the option to use that building for the purpose it was originally intended for.</p> <p>Whilst it is not currently in use as a garage, I do not believe it's right to block the right of way to use it as such in the future. The same applies to the garage adjacent to it. Both garages had been divided some years ago together with the two off street parking spaces further towards Church Road.</p> <p>I would propose that there is a greater reward in reviewing the huge, often empty, range of parking spaces available just round the corner on Artillery Terrace where the council has a series of garages that aren't used much for cars and a large space that could be used by residents for 10+ cars. Has that been considered as an alternative?</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals are noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of parking prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>Various planning consents allowed the property-owners at 1 Artillery Terrace and 28 Church Road to convert the premises adjacent to the proposed parking bay from parking facilities to living space / offices. These removed the need to maintain vehicular access, albeit that the Highway Authority did not insist that the kerbs adjacent to them were amended to reflect this change.</p> <p>What the representee is suggesting is that we should maintain, in perpetuity, their ability to possibly convert the building back into parking facilities, without the need to amend the parking controls. Of course, the same principle could be applied to any property with a frontage onto the public highway. Should this therefore prevent the introduction of parking bays in all circumstances?</p> <p>Clearly, if there was a desire by the property-owners to convert the buildings back into parking facilities, any changes necessary to the parking controls to accommodate this could be included within a s.278 agreement associated with the planning consent.</p> <p>There is a great demand for on-street parking in this particular locality. The opportunity to increase parking provision is extremely limited. The proposed area is one of the few areas that remain available to improve the on-street parking situation for fellow residents.</p> <p>The off-street area referred to is a contract parking / garage area owned and managed by Guildford Borough Council. The spaces</p>

		<p>and garages are well utilised and indeed, there is a waiting list for those wishing to acquire a garage/space. It is also the site of a Car Club space. Although it does not fall within the remit within the on-street parking review, the comments and suggestions have been forwarded on to my colleagues.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
--	--	--

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Brodie Road, Guildford (convert existing single yellow line outside Nos.20&amp;21 to a double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction) 1 Representation</b></p>	<p>I note your proposed parking changes and wanted to send feedback about Sydenham Road.</p> <p>I am a resident of Brodie Road and therefore I know the parking situation very well.</p> <p>On a Sunday when there are no restrictions, Sydenham Rd becomes dangerously congested. In front of numbers 54 and 64, cars park on both sides of the road and on the pavement. Often they leave the narrowest gap for traffic. On a occasions, vans and lorries can't get through.</p> <p>You don't need me to tell you it's on the town centre one way system and very important.</p> <p>While I'm here, have you considered how to improve the situation around Castle Car Park when cars queue to enter often blocking Sydenham Road back to Bright Hill in one direction and Tunsgate in the other. Surely that needs looked at??</p>	<p>Comments about other parking and highway issues in the area noted.</p> <p>The proposal intends to improve access and traffic movement in Brodie Road.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review. The situation in Sydenham Road had not been raised as an issue. Therefore, it was not included within the review's scope.</p> <p>Considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review, which we still plan to complete within 18 months. Depending on the number of additional items considered, I estimate that it would extend the review by 9-12 months. It would also probably delay the implementation of the measures aimed at resolving the issues already being considered.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it may be possible to consider the representee's concerns during a future review. The next one is due to commence in early to mid-2018.</p> <p>Although it does not fall within the remit within the on-street parking review, the concerns about the impact of queuing to access Guildford Borough Council's Castle Car Park have been forwarded on to colleagues and Surrey County Council Highways.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Chantry View Road, Guildford</b>  <b>(convert existing limited waiting shared-use parking place on the west side of road near Chantry Quarry to a double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction)</b>  <b>4 representations</b></p>		
<p>15</p>	<p>I am writing to share my view that these parking bays pose a serious risk of a traffic incident as they are located on a blind corner and requires traffic coming down the hill to move into the opposite lane. The complication of the site is the proximity of the A281 junction which means that traffic peels off the main road and do not expect cars in the opposite direction to be in their lane. Cars coming down the road wait for a gap to pass the parking bays but they cannot know if there are cars about to come off the A281. The exit of Chantry Quarry only complicates quick judgement of the traffic situation.</p> <p>These parking bays should be replaced with yellow lines</p> <p>There are plenty of other parking places in the street</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>26</p>	<p>We write to advise that we are <b>FOR</b> the proposed removal of the parking bay on the vicinity of Chantry Quarry.</p> <p>As an CQ resident, it is very hard to see if cars are coming down CVR as one exits CQ (turning left) and vice versa as one comes down the road, basically the parked cars in the bay, make this into a blind corner. It's incredibly dangerous and we fear that it just an "accident waiting to happen".</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>64</p>	<p>I am writing in reference to the proposed parking alterations on Chantry View Road. The proposal is to remove the parking bays.</p> <p>I live at at the corner of Chantry View Road and Chantry Quarry.</p> <p>In theory I agree that removing the bays is a good idea as there are sitting on a bend too close to Shalford Road.</p> <p>My concern is that removing them will encourage cars to park on Chantry Quarry. Chantry Quarry is a private road but there have</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>Chantry Quarry is a private road / gated development. The area between the rear of the footway and the gate is also private. Therefore, the control of parking and prevention of u-turns in this area would be an issue for those responsible for its management to address.</p>

	<p>been issues with people parking there in the past. The area of concern is circled on the attached map. People parking in the circled area block my legal right of way. If the parking bay removal goes ahead I would like some sort of action taken to ensure that cars will be prevented from parking on Chantry Quarry.</p> <p>My other area of concern is with people doing U-turns in Chantry Quarry. The route to Millmead Car Park is not well signposted on the one-way system so people do not realise they need to turn left by Debenhams and go over the hill. Instead they go straight, realise they can't turn right into the car park, keep going and find that Chantry Quarry is the first safe place to turn around (the less safety conscious people do U-turns at Great Quarry). I do not exaggerate when I say that on weekends cars quite literally queue up to do U-turns at the end of Chantry Quarry, making it difficult for me to get in and out of my driveway and also causing a nuisance. Putting up big signs along the one-way system that direct people to the Millmead Car Park would do wonders for the overall flow of traffic on Shalford Road.</p>	<p>Although it does not fall within the remit within the on-street parking review, the concerns about the signing for Millbrook Car Park have been forwarded on to colleagues and Surrey County Council Highways.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
	<p>We recognise that the current arrangement of 3 limited-waiting bays on the immediate uphill side of the entrance to Chantry Quarry does impact on the visibility and general safety at the bend and we support the removal of the same.</p> <p>Our Observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Parking is extremely limited in Chantry Quarry and much to our concern, our previous applications for Residents' Parking in Chantry View Road were denied.</li> <li>2 The subject 3 bays have since served for us as the most accessible overflow parking locations and their removal would have a significant negative impact. We are loath to lose this facility.</li> <li>3 We have watched the usage of the Residents' Parking Spaces at our end of Chantry View Road and it is noticeable that very few cars display permits. Users appear to be mainly casual visitors seeking access to local facilities such as Shalford Park, the Rowing Club, the Weyside Pub and the Town Centre.</li> <li>4 We deduce that most residents of Chantry View Road have sufficient space on their property not to need the Permits to</li> </ol>	<p>Comments both in support and opposed to the removal of the bay are noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>Although the permit eligibility of those living within Chantry Quarry, a private, gated development was also raised as an issue at around the same time as the ones about the parking bay earmarked for removal, local borough and county councillors chose not to include it within the review.</p> <p>The inclusion of Chantry Quarry and numerous other private developments situated within the controlled parking zone could have significant implications on the permit scheme. It would also require fundamental changes to the way the scheme and its catchment areas operate. Instead, the Local Committee expressed a preference to undertake a review of more limited scope in order to resolve more localised issues. The exception to this were situations where residents within an area had expressed significant support for major changes.</p>

	<p>5 which they are entitled and we have been denied. We are particularly concerned that a consequence of the closure of the 3 places will be that these casual visitors will park in the space immediately outside the gates to Chantry Quarry. This will be detrimental to general safety on the bend in much the same ways as the 3 subject spaces are now.</p> <p>6 A further safety issue is that of the numerous vehicles, southbound on the A281, who use the entrance to Chantry Quarry to accomplish a reversal back towards Millbrook Car Park. This problem also exists at the entrance to Great Quarry, where it also obstructs the flow of traffic along the A281.</p> <p>Our Proposals:</p> <p>1 The Residents ask that they may be provided with appropriate Residents Parking Permits in Chantry View Road to provide much needed additional parking, as enjoyed but apparently seldom used, by our neighbours.</p> <p>2 Secondly, that a minimum of three additional parking spots are provided further up Chantry View Road to replace the 3 that will be removed.</p>	<p>One of the reasons given for why Chantry Quarry residents should perhaps be eligible for residents' permits was that demand for on-street parking nearby was low. This would suggest that there is not a need to provide compensatory parking elsewhere within Chantry View Road.</p> <p>Chantry Quarry is a private road / gated development. The area between the rear of the footway and the gate is also private. Therefore, the control of parking and prevention of u-turns in this area would be an issue for those responsible for its management to address.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
--	--	--

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Chapel Street, Guildford</b>  <b>(TECHNICAL CHANGE – change TRO to more match controls in-situ, and also remove the need to mark the double yellow lines within the pedestrian zone)</b>  <b>2 representations</b></p>	<p>We are 'new' residents of Quarry Street, we have lived here for sixteen months. Our house fronts on to Quarry Street and has gated vehicular access from Chapel Street. Two properties currently share this access and a third is on the market.</p> <p>The problem we have is that our Chapel Street vehicular access is constantly blocked; usually by delivery vehicles serving businesses in the street. We have put a notice on the gates requesting drivers not to block access and there are already double yellow lines. The proposals will add 'no waiting' signs which is welcome but we are concerned that this will not be enforced and therefore ignored. If access is blocked when we return home we are forced to block traffic coming up Castle Street while we look for drivers and ask them to move. My husband is disabled and is not able to leave the car and I find it very difficult and embarrassing having to search for drivers and cause a traffic jam.</p> <p>I know that our neighbours at number 55 are also concerned about this matter and when the additional property is sold, things can only get worse.</p> <p>We are happy living in Quarry Street but we do feel it is reasonable to expect to be able to leave and return to our home without constant worry and inconvenience.</p> <p>I would be so grateful for any help you can offer.</p>	<p>The redevelopment of the premises where the representee now lives was considered in planning and highway terms at the time the application was determined. It was concluded that the development would not generate significant additional traffic and that the present arrangements upon the highway were appropriate.</p> <p>The TECHNICAL amendment merely alters the traffic regulation order (TRO) so that it matches the restrictions on the ground. It involves the double yellow lines, which have been introduced to highlight the presence of the access. Even so, the existing markings are already enforceable.</p> <p>In any location, quick stops are harder to deter by enforcement as drivers tend to be close to their vehicles and can drive away if they see an enforcement officer nearby. Given the nature of the parking activity, more restrictive controls are unlikely to deter motorists from stopping to allow passengers to board and alight, and load or unload, any more than the existing double yellow lines. Nevertheless, we will increase enforcement and look at other ways to try to improve the situation.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

45

I fully concur with the views of my neighbours, if there is anything you can do to help enforce something it would be great appreciated as its extremely frustrating and causing traffic issues in Castle Street/Chapel Street area.

The main culprits are delivery drivers for the restaurants in Chapel Street who leave their cars blocking our driveway on a continuous basis after being informed on a daily basis that this is unacceptable.

The redevelopment of the premises where the representee now lives was considered in planning and highway terms at the time the application was determined. It was concluded that the development would not generate significant additional traffic and that the present arrangements upon the highway were appropriate.

The TECHNICAL amendment merely alters the traffic regulation order (TRO) so that it matches the restrictions on the ground. It involves the double yellow lines, which have been introduced to highlight the presence of the access. Even so, the existing markings are already enforceable.

In any location, quick stops are harder to deter by enforcement as drivers tend to be close to their vehicles and can drive away if they see an enforcement officer nearby. Given the nature of the parking activity, more restrictive controls are unlikely to deter motorists from stopping to allow passengers to board and alight, and load or unload, any more than the existing double yellow lines. Nevertheless, we will increase enforcement and look at other ways to try to improve the situation.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Cline Road, Guildford (convert part of existing permit only parking place outside No.78 to a disabled only parking place) 1 Representation</b></p>		
56	<p>I am happy with the proposal of a new disabled bay outside number 73 Cline Road.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.  Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Cross Lanes, Guildford (convert existing single yellow line outside Mathon Lodge and Mathon Court to double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction) 4 representations</b></p>		
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 91</p> <p>27</p>	<p>Concerning the proposed changes to parking controls in Cross Lanes.</p> <p>I wholeheartedly support the proposal to convert the existing single yellow line that protects access to Mathon Lodge and Mathon Court into a double yellow line. I wrote to you on the 7th January 2015 raising concerns about the safety and access to these properties for the reasons outlined below, all of which are still relevant.</p> <p>1) On a regular basis cars and vans are parked immediately adjacent to the entrance way of Mathon Lodge/Mathon Court on the single yellow lines. Parking immediately adjacent to the entrance of Mathon Lodge/Court results in almost zero visibility for drivers exiting the housing complex and turning either left or right. The dangers of this are compounded by the fact that the stretch of Cross Lanes encompassing the marked parking bays is only sufficiently wide enough for traffic travelling in one direction. There are often cars queuing and waiting for traffic travelling in the oncoming direction to pass before they can proceed. This results in incoming drivers tending to drive with increased speed so as to avoid inconveniencing waiting drivers. This increased speed coupled with the decreased visibility of drivers exiting Mathon Court/Lodge increases the likelihood of collisions between drivers. I have witnessed more than one near accident for this very reason.</p> <p>2) Immediately opposite the access to Mathon Lodge/Court is a pedestrian alleyway running alongside the London Square business complex. This is a very frequently used cut through for Mathon Lodge/Court residents and other pedestrians heading towards the London Road train station and the town centre. Pedestrians cross the road in between</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>the parked cars on the single yellow line. The reduced visibility that occurs as a result of cars parking right alongside the entrance way, in conjunction with the traffic speed could result in a vehicle collision with a pedestrian.</p> <p>3) Parents dropping their children off at the Busy Bees nursery, immediately opposite the access to Mathon Lodge/Court, will often park on the single yellow lines in the mornings at busy times when the nursery car park is full. This increases the pedestrian traffic crossing the road between parked cars and there is the added danger of parents opening car doors onto the road side, both to exit the car themselves and to assist their children to exit the car.</p> <p>4) Cross Lanes is a very busy road in the mornings, particularly between 8am and 9am. There are a large number of schools in the immediate vicinity and there is a high volume of traffic due to parents using the road to reach Tormead School, Lanesborough School, Guildford High and the Busy Bees nursery. In addition to this, the increased occupancy of the London Square business complex has made a marked difference to the number of cars using the road, compounding the dangers caused by the reduced visibility with cars parking adjacent to the access of Mathon Lodge/Court.</p> <p>I believe that the proposed changes are sensible, required and will not significantly reduce the amount of parking available to local residents given there are two long parking bays further up and down the road. I hope that these changes will go ahead as they will greatly improve safety and accessibility for all Mathon Lodge/Court residents.</p>	
<p>32</p>	<p>I write with reference to the proposed parking changes in Cross Lanes.</p> <p>A number of residents use the single yellow outside Mathon Court as overflow parking as the resident parking in the area is insufficient. By changing this to double yellow cars will just be moved to surrounding roads displacing residents on those roads.</p> <p>As such I do not think the current road markings should change.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposal noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were about the parking situation adjacent to the access to Mathon Court. The proposals are intended to improve visibility for those wishing to access and egress Mathon Court at times when the present single yellow line controls do not operate.</p>

		<p>Other parking bays and lengths of single yellow line in the area may not be situated as conveniently as those that currently protect the access to Mathon Court. Nevertheless, significant opportunities to park are available, which do not impact access and egress to Mathon Court.</p> <p>The availability of parking in Cross Lanes, and need for greater prioritisation, has not previously been raised as an issue. Indeed, we have issued very few permits to residents of Cross Lanes, and there is currently only 1 permit-holder.</p> <p>Considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review. Nevertheless, if the number of permit-holders were to increase, it may be possible to consider the representee's concerns during a future review.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
47	<p>I received your letter about the proposed changes to parking controls in Cross Lanes (your ref. APH/8501). I've looked at the proposals online and I agree with them. I live in Mathon Court and anything that can improve visibility for cars exiting Mathon Court would be very helpful and would improve safety. At present when you come out of Mathon Court the visibility is very poor. Many times I've got half way out to be surprised by a car travelling way too fast down Cross Lanes. Increasing visibility by having fewer cars parked near to the entrance to Mathon Court would certainly help. A parabolic mirror opposite the entrance to Mathon Court would also make it much safer to exit Mathon Court - but I don't know if this would be a possibility?</p> <p>As mentioned above, part of the problem is the speed with which some vehicles travel down Cross Lanes, particularly during the rush hour. It's often concerned me how fast they come past the nursery on Cross Lanes, as there are often small children around. Vehicles on Cross Lanes can't really see the entrance to Mathon Court very well, partly because of the parked cars, and they tend to pick up speed because it is a long straight road. I don't know if there's anything you can do to encourage vehicles to reduce their speed</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Whilst there are still examples where parabolic mirrors have been used on the public highway, I understand that new installations are not permitted. Nevertheless, I have forwarded the matter onto Surrey County Council Highways, along with the concerns about traffic speed.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>along Cross Lanes?</p>	
	<p>I would like to object to the proposed changes to the parking controls in Cross Lanes. This is because parking is already limited in the area and the single yellow lines currently allow residents some extra space after 6.30pm. From my experience any cars parked on these lines overnight are removed before regulations come back in to play in the morning and therefore are not a problem. In addition to this, any deliveries and/or contractors are currently able to park on the road when working in the local area.</p> <p>In my opinion a change which would make a more significant improvement would be to switch the free on street parking bays to permit bays for resident use only. This is because the use of these bays by office personnel, rail commuters from London Road station and shoppers at the weekends, limits resident use of the bays. It is this which forces locals to park on the single yellow lines, not the lack of double yellows.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposal noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were about the parking situation adjacent to the access to Mathon Court. The proposals are intended to improve visibility for those wishing to access and egress Mathon Court at times when the present single yellow line controls do not operate.</p> <p>Other parking bays and lengths of single yellow line in the area may not be situated as conveniently as those that currently protect the access to Mathon Court. Nevertheless, significant opportunities to park are available, which do not impact access and egress to Mathon Court.</p> <p>The availability of parking in Cross Lanes, and need for greater prioritisation, has not previously been raised as an issue. Indeed, we have issued very few permits to residents of Cross Lanes, and there is currently only 1 permit-holder.</p> <p>Considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review. Nevertheless, if the number of permit-holders were to increase, it may be possible to consider the representee's concerns during a future review.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Downside Road / One Tree Hill Road / Warren Road, Guildford (introduce double yellow line, no waiting at any time restrictions around junction and bend) 13 representations</b></p>		
2	Support warren/Downside/One Tree Hill proposal.	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
11	<p>I live in Warren Road. The allowed parking spaces are too near to my drive and other driveways and make it very dangerous to come out of my drive as I cannot see what is coming down the hill. Some times there are big lorries, vans or 4 by 4s parked there. I think there should also be a 24 hour restriction on these spaces. All houses in the road have plenty of off street parking available.</p>	<p>Concerns about various other aspects of the present parking arrangements noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were primarily about the parking situation in Warren Road close to the junction and bend. The proposals are intended to improve safety near of these features and militate against the potential for the parking that takes place there to displace to other undesirable locations.</p> <p>Having been raised and considered previously, the continuing concerns about the setback distances of various existing parking bays, and the desire for the bays to be subject to greater restriction elsewhere within Warren Road, are noted.</p> <p>The setback distances in Warren Road are in keeping with those used elsewhere. They reflect the number of properties each access serves, the residential nature, width and geometry of the road and the fact that it has a 30mph speed limit.</p> <p>The present combination of 4-hour limited waiting shared-use bays and unrestricted bays offer residents, their visitors and other users flexibility. Presently, there is very little demand for permits and for space to be prioritised for particular user-groups. Indeed, there are currently only 2 permit-holders in the section of Warren Road within</p>

		<p>Area I. Furthermore, it is seldom the case that these spaces are fully occupied, suggesting that the availability of space for short and medium stay visitors is not an issue. Additionally, the present 5-tonnes restriction on the bays and their restricted width prohibit larger vehicles from using them.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>Page 86 12</p>	<p>Proposed changes Downside, Road, One Tree Hill Road, Warren Road".</p> <p>We note that no change is proposed to the bays marked on the drawing. We ask that a time limit of Four Hours is introduced for these bays. The reason for this request is that there have been periods over the last few months when large horse lorries or vans have parked for many days in these bays. They do not fit within the white lines parallel with the kerb and obstruct views from driveways. Neither GBC or the police have been able or willing to take any action. The main users of these bays are dog walkers who visit Merrow Common, and a four hour limit will not inconvenience them. The houses adjacent or opposite the bays, such a mine, have ample driveway parking.</p> <p>I have no objection to the proposed changes in markings at the junction of Downside, Road, One Tree Hill Road and Warren Road</p>	<p>Concerns about various other aspects of the present parking arrangements noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were primarily about the parking situation in Warren Road close to the junction and bend. The proposals are intended to improve safety near of these features and militate against the potential for the parking that takes place there to displace to other undesirable locations.</p> <p>Having been raised and considered previously, the continuing concerns about the setback distances of various existing parking bays, and the desire for the bays to be subject to greater restriction elsewhere within Warren Road, are noted.</p> <p>The setback distances in Warren Road are in keeping with those used elsewhere. They reflect the number of properties each access serves, the residential nature, width and geometry of the road and the fact that it has a 30mph speed limit.</p> <p>The present combination of 4-hour limited waiting shared-use bays and unrestricted bays offer residents, their visitors and other users flexibility. Presently, there is very little demand for permits and for space to be prioritised for particular user-groups. Indeed, there are currently only 2 permit-holders in the section of Warren Road within Area I. Furthermore, it is seldom the case that these spaces are fully occupied, suggesting that the availability of space for short and medium stay visitors is not an issue. Additionally, the present 5-tonnes restriction on the bays and their restricted width prohibit larger vehicles from using them.</p> <p>Concerns about vehicles unable to fit within the bays being parked</p>

		<p>for extended periods without enforcement action being taken have been forwarded onto the Parking – Operations team.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
	<p>It is disappointing to note that Free Parking Without Time Limit will continue to be allowed in the blue dotted areas on your plan.</p> <p>This concession is very freely taken advantage of by very large commercial vehicles parking for several days and I would suggest commercial vehicles without permits are excluded from parking in Warren Road.</p> <p>The section of Warren Road between Tangier Road and One Tree Hill Road intersection is frequently extraordinarily busy and traffic is forced by the parking to negotiate what is effectively a single lane road, particularly difficult for drivers turning left when they enter Warren Road from Tangier Road. At this point parking should be more restricted close to this intersection.</p> <p>A further point is that due to the relatively slow bend vehicles travelling from One Tree Hill Road into Warren Road are often moving at relatively high speed presenting a danger, particularly to dog walking pedestrians and approaching traffic, not helped by the not infrequent vehicles entering Warren Road from the unmarked gravel drive (that leads onto the Downs and serves a number of properties). A GO SLOW sign in One Tree Hill Road might help.</p>	<p>Concerns about various other aspects of the present parking arrangements noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were primarily about the parking situation in Warren Road close to the junction and bend. The proposals are intended to improve safety near of these features and militate against the potential for the parking that takes place there to displace to other undesirable locations.</p> <p>Having been raised and considered previously, the continuing desire for various existing parking bays to be subject to greater restriction elsewhere within Warren Road, are noted.</p> <p>The present combination of 4-hour limited waiting shared-use bays and unrestricted bays offer residents, their visitors and other users flexibility. Presently, there is very little demand for permits and for space to be prioritised for particular user-groups. . Indeed, there are currently only 2 permit-holders in the section of Warren Road within Area I. Furthermore, it is seldom the case that these spaces are fully-occupied, suggesting that the availability of space for short and medium stay visitors is not an issue. Additionally, the present 5-tonnes restriction on the bays and their restricted width prohibit larger vehicles from using them.</p> <p>Concerns about vehicles unable to fit within the bays being parked for extended periods without enforcement action being taken have been forwarded onto the Parking – Operations team.</p> <p>Although it does not fall within the remit within the on-street parking review, the concerns about traffic speed and a desire for additional highway signing have been forwarded onto Surrey County Council Highways.</p>

		Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.
46 Page 88	<p>I live in Warren Road. There are parking bays outside my house on both sides of my drive which is the only exit I have onto Warren Road. These bays are marked to be extremely close to my drive and viewing traffic up and down the road past parked cars in the bays is almost impossible. My neighbours and I have had several near accidents as it is almost impossible for traffic coming up and down Warren Road and that turning onto the road from Tangier, to see us trying to exit our drives onto the road. This is particularly unsafe at busy rat-run times when school traffic is at its worse and fastest!</p> <p>I make a plea to make this busy part of Warren Road safer for all users by reducing the length of these bays, making the driveways serving various properties in Warren Road much wider to allow a view of the road and its traffic.</p> <p>In these times when Councils need to listen to their residents on issues of safety, I do hope you will pay attention to my concern over these bays and particularly their closeness to our drives onto Warren Road and reduce their size, giving us all a better view.</p>	<p>Concerns about various other aspects of the present parking arrangements noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were primarily about the parking situation in Warren Road close to the junction and bend. The proposals are intended to improve safety near of these features and militate against the potential for the parking that takes place there to displace to other undesirable locations.</p> <p>Having been raised and considered previously, the continuing concerns about the setback distances of various existing parking bays are noted.</p> <p>The setback distances in Warren Road are in keeping with those used elsewhere. They reflect the number of properties each access serves, the residential nature, width and geometry of the road and the fact that it has a 30mph speed limit.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
65	<p>I am very pleased to hear that you intend to put double lines at the end of Downside Road.</p> <p>We have complained to the police in the past about the obstruction caused to large vehicles but to no avail.</p> <p>The sooner they are in place the better.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">66</p>	<p>We were delighted to see the notice giving details of the proposed yellow lines in Downside Road because we feel that they are long overdue.</p> <p>The proposal is a very sensible solution to a real and long-standing problem - namely that inconsiderate parking close to the island at the junction of Downside Road with Warren Road &amp; One Tree Hill Road makes it awkward to drive into Downside Road in a normal size car and extremely difficult and often impossible for delivery lorries, refuse lorries, coaches, and emergency service vehicles to get into the road at all. We have seen them going the wrong way round the island on occasions because they had no alternative.</p> <p>A far less acceptable solution would be to remove the island and 'One Tree' - a step that I'm sure none of the local residents would want to see taken.</p> <p>We cannot see that yellow lines would detract in any way from the appearance of the road as a whole. We are very lucky to live in such a pleasant area and we would have no problem with dog walkers (the main 'culprits') parking outside our house while they enjoy all that the Downs have to offer.</p> <p>The provision of yellow lines will not lead to any increase in the number of dog walkers but those who do park in the road will be forced to do so more considerately than the majority do at present.</p> <p>The proposal therefore has our unqualified support.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">67</p>	<p>I live close to the entrance of Downside Road. A house which is impacted directly by your proposal.</p> <p>I am not sure why yellow lines are intended as I do not see a problem at present. There are dog-walkers who park their cars outside my house every day but they park considerately and I fear that adding yellow lines only serves to move these cars further up the road where there aren't such long stretches of available parking and they will interfere with peoples' driveways. Secondly, I remember very well when Tangier road had its yellow lines painted and I noticed straight away ( I was not local at the time but used to drive down Tangier daily) as it detracted so completely from the 'un-urban' look that Tangier had before. In my personal opinion, they</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were primarily about the parking situation in Warren Road close to the junction and bend. The proposals are intended to improve safety near these features and militate against the potential for the parking that takes place there to displace to other undesirable locations.</p> <p>Indeed, others have suggested that parking within Downside Road close to its junction with Warren Road is already a problem and has been for some time. These issues are likely to be exacerbated by the introduction of additional restrictions within Warren Road and</p>

	<p>have spoiled the look of Tangier.</p> <p>So, despite the fact that I would 'benefit' as such from not having cars outside my house, I would vote against having yellow lines for aesthetic and practical reasons. They are simply not needed in my view. We do not have commuters parking outside our houses, they really are just for people who use the common and I would hate to see their quick access removed or made more difficult.</p>	<p>One Tree Hill Road, if militating measures are not also introduced within Downside Road.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
69 Page 99	<p>I am horrified, that as a resident of Downside Road in Guildford, we are now to have double yellow lines marked on the first 30m of our road. Why? There is absolutely no need for the council to waste money either painting these lines on the road, and or paying for wardens to patrol in case of parking infringements. <b>This is a total and utter waste of money</b> and it is something that the residents of our road <b>do not need and or want</b>.</p> <p>I am officially objecting to the lines coming to our road. Which mad council person or persons has made this suggestion?!</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were primarily about the parking situation in Warren Road close to the junction and bend. The proposals are intended to improve safety near these features and militate against the potential for the parking that takes place there to displace to other undesirable locations.</p> <p>Indeed, others have suggested that parking within Downside Road close to its junction with Warren Road is already a problem and has been for some time. These issues are likely to be exacerbated by the introduction of additional restrictions within Warren Road and One Tree Hill Road, if militating measures are not also introduced within Downside Road.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
70	<p>We would welcome the new yellow lines as per the proposal. It is sometimes difficult and potentially dangerous to enter Downside Road from Warren Road when dog walkers park their cars so close to the end of the road and the 'One Tree' landmark in the middle of the road. Delivery vans and lorries on occasion have to go round the landmark on the wrong side of the road to get past. The painting of the short length of double yellow lines is an imaginative and sensible safety precaution which should neither inconvenience dog walkers or Downside Road residents to any significant degree.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

76	<p>Having looked at the proposed parking restrictions for the corner of Downside Road/One Tree Hill/Warren Road, we do not regard them as being necessary. It is rare that anyone stops temporarily on the corner and we have never seen anyone park on the corner. Double yellow lines would very much detract from the semi urban nature of the area as the entrance to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>We would therefore be against the proposed parking restrictions.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were primarily about the parking situation in Warren Road close to the junction and bend. The proposals are intended to improve safety near these features and militate against the potential for the parking that takes place there to displace to other undesirable locations.</p> <p>Indeed, others have suggested that parking within Downside Road close to its junction with Warren Road is already a problem and has been for some time. These issues are likely to be exacerbated by the introduction of additional restrictions within Warren Road and One Tree Hill Road, if militating measures are not also introduced within Downside Road.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
88	<p>I have lived in Downside Road for nearly 25 years and there has never really been a serious parking problem in our road. Once or twice a year we may get a lot of cars parked if the sports ground is used for a school sports day, but to be honest the school normally warns us and asks the parents to park with care.</p> <p>The area at the entrance to Downside Road, where the parking restrictions are being proposed, is often used by dog walkers on the Downs, who park their cars there (especially on the south side where there are no driveways, so they don't interfere), for maybe half an hour or so at a time. If double yellow lines were put there, these dog walkers' cars would have to park further along Downside Road and in front of other peoples' driveways etc. This could well cause more difficulties with less space for delivery vans, builders' and tradesmen's vehicles, visitors' cars etc.</p> <p>I do agree that the corner from Warren Road to One Tree Hill Road is a sharp bend which should, in any case, be navigated with care. However, the visibility (in both directions) when exiting from Downside Road is excellent (unlike the situation at Little Warren Court nearby), and I have never had a problem with poorly parked vehicles getting in the way. I therefore strongly believe that such measures as the proposed parking restrictions, which I presume</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were primarily about the parking situation in Warren Road close to the junction and bend. The proposals are intended to improve safety near these features and militate against the potential for the parking that takes place there to displace to other undesirable locations.</p> <p>Indeed, others have suggested that parking within Downside Road close to its junction with Warren Road is already a problem and has been for some time. These issues are likely to be exacerbated by the introduction of additional restrictions within Warren Road and One Tree Hill Road, if militating measures are not also introduced within Downside Road.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>mean double yellow lines, would increase the urbanisation of this part of Guildford, and should be avoided.</p> <p>I am therefore strongly objecting to the plans.</p>	
95 Page 92	<p>We live in Downside Road and are commenting on the proposed double yellow lines up to 30m from the junction with Warren Road.</p> <p>We can understand the concerns about people parking near the junction of Warren Road and Downside Road (and frequently outside our house), which they do to go to the common area land usually to walk. However, we have not seen this as a problem or causing a risk for motorists or pedestrians.</p> <p>We believe the addition of double yellow lines up to 30m from the junction would cause a bottleneck in the street as the road narrows. People are likely to park further up the road and walk back to the common. It could be more inconvenient for road users and pedestrians and possibly be more dangerous.</p> <p>We would propose that either (1) the yellow lines are not put on Downside Road at all and the current situation continues or (2) the yellow lines continue considerably further up the street so people are discouraged from parking there.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited safety concerns raised prior to the start of the review. These were primarily about the parking situation in Warren Road close to the junction and bend. The proposals are intended to improve safety near these features and militate against the potential for the parking that takes place there to displace to other undesirable locations.</p> <p>Indeed, others have suggested that parking within Downside Road close to its junction with Warren Road is already a problem and has been for some time. These issues are likely to be exacerbated by the introduction of additional restrictions within Warren Road and One Tree Hill Road, if militating measures are not also introduced within Downside Road.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Elmside, Guildford</b>  <b>(convert various existing parking bays and parts of parking bays to single yellow line, no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm restriction)</b>  <b>7 representations</b></p>		
22	<p>I am writing concerning parking bays in Elmside, Guildford.</p> <p>I certainly support the removal of the parking bay outside No. 4 Elmside. The existing position of this bay is dangerous because it is on a blind bend and really should never have been placed there. I have no objection to any of the other proposals.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
37	<p>With reference to the changes to the parking bays in Elmside we would like to request that the parking bays opposite the joint driveway to numbers 19 and 21 be replaced with a single yellow line. Not only is it very difficult to get in and out of our driveway when cars and other vehicles are parked at the top of the driveway but it is also extremely dangerous as many vehicles use Elmside as a "run through". This is especially so at peak times and school run times. We are very close to Queen Eleanor's School.</p> <p>We do support the proposed changes and hope our application can also be included.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety, access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>Considering additional, more restrictive controls at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review, which we still plan to complete within 18 months. Depending on the number of additional items considered, I estimate that it would extend the review by 9-12 months. It would also probably delay the implementation of the measures aimed at resolving the issues already being considered.</p> <p>It is also the case that some of those residents opposed to the existing proposals cite the loss of parking, and a possible increase in traffic speeds as reasons for their objection. Clearly, any further removal of parking spaces could exacerbate these concerns.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it may be possible to consider the representee's concerns during a future review.</p> <p>A balance has to be struck on the use of the highway in respect to parking space, safety, access and traffic flow. The modest changes aim to improve safety, access and traffic flow, whilst not</p>

		<p>unduly restricting the amount of parking space available.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>Page 94</p> <p>75</p>	<p>I would like to write in support of the proposal to reduce the size of the 4-hour parking bay opposite 32 Elmside to (presumably) 3 spaces rather than the current 4 spaces. This seems reasonable due to the restricted exit and entry from 32 Elmside caused by the current arrangement. Also, the proposal to remove the parking bay opposite 4 Elmside, to improve driving visibility and safety seems reasonable. However, I feel strongly that efforts should be made to find other locations along Elmside to compensate for these reductions.</p> <p>More broadly, I am sure that all Elmside residents (as well as those in Queen Eleanor's road) feel that the cumulative impact of three developments need to be considered. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the impact of the increasing admission numbers to Queen Eleanor's School (bringing increased traffic causing congestion and danger to pedestrians)</li> <li>• the huge and increasing impact of the poorly devised, and indeed lacking, road infrastructure associated with the ever-growing Surrey Research Park.</li> <li>• the fact that Elmside (and Queen Eleanor's road) have become 'rat runs' with drivers taking a shortcut through Onslow Village to get from the A31 to the A3.</li> </ul> <p>During term time, we now experience a daily stationary traffic jam along the length of Elmside, and a large part of Queen Eleanor's Road. There is a further jam along the length of the Chase, leading all the way to the Research Park from 8am to 9.30am. This is frustrating and a new phenomenon, which needs to be addressed by something on a more holistic scale than removing a couple of parking spaces.</p> <p>A thorough traffic management review is needed for the area, which starts with the acknowledgement that the previous travel plan linked</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety, access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>Considering additional changes at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review, which we still plan to complete within 18 months. Depending on the number of additional items considered, I estimate that it would extend the review by 9-12 months. It would also probably delay the implementation of the measures aimed at resolving the issues already being considered.</p> <p>It is also the case that some of those residents commenting want to improve accessibility to their properties. This would involve further reductions in the availability of parking space. The position of the various driveways within the road, combined with its width and geometry make the provision of compensatory parking impractical, without it greatly impacting accessibility to other properties.</p> <p>Although it does not fall within the remit within the on-street parking review, the wider concerns about issues associated with school run and various other developments within the area have been forwarded onto Surrey County Council.</p> <p>A balance has to be struck on the use of the highway in respect to parking space, safety, access and traffic flow. The modest changes aim to improve safety, access and traffic flow, whilst not unduly restricting the amount of parking space available.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>to the expansion of Queen Eleanor's School was 'nodded through' without any real scrutiny (and this is just year one of a three-year expansion plan), and responds to the ongoing impact of inadequate transport access to the Research Park which was predictable, and is getting worse as time goes on - and now requires remedial action.</p>	
	<p>I live in Elmside and have a great deal of difficulty getting my vehicle in and out of my drive due to one parking space directly opposite, outside No.18. I have complained in the past to no avail.</p> <p>The road is a cut-through from A31 to A3 and drivers exceed the speed limit, adding to this problem.</p> <p>I would also like to point out, children walk down Elmside to go to Queen Eleanors school.</p> <p>Hoping something will be done about this problem before an accident occurs.</p>	<p>Concerns about the parking situation noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety, access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>Considering additional, more restrictive controls at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review, which we still plan to complete within 18 months. Depending on the number of additional items considered, I estimate that it would extend the review by 9-12 months. It would also probably delay the implementation of the measures aimed at resolving the issues already being considered.</p> <p>It is also the case that some of those residents opposed to the existing proposals cite the loss of parking, and a possible increase in traffic speeds as reasons for their objection. Clearly, any further removal of parking spaces could exacerbate these concerns.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it may be possible to consider the representee's concerns during a future review.</p> <p>Although it does not fall within the remit within the on-street parking review, concerns about the use of the road as a rat run and traffic speeds have been forwarded onto Surrey County Council and Surrey Police.</p> <p>A balance has to be struck on the use of the highway in respect to parking space, safety, access and traffic flow. The modest changes aim to improve safety, access and traffic flow, whilst not unduly restricting the amount of parking space available.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as</p>

		advertised.
83	<p>We have discussed the proposals with our neighbours and wish to make the following representation.</p> <p>We are opposed to the wholesale removal of the parking spaces as we feel that the removal would encourage the increased use of Elmside as a "rat run" and have the effect of increasing the speed at which drivers travel along the road. The narrow pavement is used by both young and elderly people who may need to step into the road to gain passage. At the end of the road where we live the visibility is poor and limited by the bend in the road and the fact that we are on a hill. It is also a useful facility to have parking there for 4 hours.</p> <p>However, parking in the space opposite numbers 3 and 5 can make it very hard to access our drives.</p> <p>Our compromise suggestion is that the present space which is sufficient for three cars be reduced in length to be adequate for two cars by shortening it ON THE UP SIDE OF THE SLOPE so that the end nearest the junction is retained to slow cars entering Elmside at that end and discourage speeding.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>Some of those residents commenting on the proposals want further spaces removed to improve accessibility to their properties. This would involve further reductions in the availability of parking space.</p> <p>Considering additional changes at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review, which we still plan to complete within 18 months. Depending on the number of additional items considered, I estimate that it would extend the review by 9-12 months. It would also probably delay the implementation of the measures aimed at resolving the issues already being considered.</p> <p>A balance has to be struck on the use of the highway in respect to parking space, safety, access and traffic flow. The modest changes aim to improve safety, access and traffic flow, whilst not unduly restricting the amount of parking space available.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
84	<p>I am broadly in agreement with the alterations to parking bays in Onslow Village, but would like to suggest that 'Residents Only' bays are introduced, particularly along Elmside. A number of houses are terraced and have no driveway, so residents have no choice but to park on the road.</p> <p>Many cars are parked in this area, staying over time regularly, with drivers then going to work, probably at the university, knowing the</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety, access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The present combination of 4-hour limited waiting shared-use bays offer residents, their visitors and other users flexibility. Most</p>

	<p>traffic warden rarely visits. It is highly frustrating to return home and not be able to park as 'incomers' are occupying the spaces.</p> <p>Also, parents collecting children from Queen Eleanor's School show little or no regard for any parking restrictions and frequently park in front of driveways, despite notices in the school newsletter asking them to be considerate of the school's neighbours.</p>	<p>properties within the road have off-street parking facilities, and presently, there is limited demand for residents' permits.</p> <p>Nevertheless, if the number of permit-holders were to increase, it may be possible to consider the representee's concerns during a future review.</p> <p>Even so, a balance has to be struck on the use of the highway in respect to parking space, safety, access and traffic flow. The modest changes intended to improve safety, access and traffic flow, whilst not unduly restricting the amount of parking space.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
	<p>As residents on Elmside we would like to strongly oppose the plans to remove the parking bay outside no.4 Elmside for the following reasons.</p> <p>Safety is of the upmost concern, particularly for parents and the elderly on this road. Elmside is used as a 'rat-run' shortcut during rush hour periods and cars parked in the designated bays act as a prevention to excessive speeding.</p> <p>Vehicles accessing Elmside from the Old Palace Road tend to increase speed accelerating up the hill and enter the road without slowing down, apart from when cars are parked in the bay outside no.4 and to wait to manoeuvre round oncoming traffic. To remove this first bay on the road would increase cars speeding along Elmside.</p> <p>Traffic flow is mainly affected during school pick up and drop off times on refuse collection days. The parking bays have limited impact as parents stop at any point on the road to drop off children as close to the school as they can. The removal of parking bays would realistically make little difference.</p> <p>Visibility of cars using the roads in Onslow Village is impacted most by the hedges which are protected by the covenant. Slower moving traffic as a consequence of parked cars improves the safety of drivers exiting their driveways.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety, access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>Ongoing concerns have been raised by residents about the position of the parking bay outside No.4 and its proximity to the brow of the hill and bend.</p> <p>Additionally, some of those residents commenting on the present proposals would like to see further spaces removed to improve accessibility to their properties. This would involve further reductions in the availability of parking space.</p> <p>A balance has to be struck on the use of the highway in respect to parking space, safety, access and traffic flow. The modest changes aim to improve safety, access and traffic flow, whilst not unduly restricting the amount of parking space available.</p> <p>For those without off-street parking facilities, the County Council consider the need to provide on-street parking facilities near the homes of blue badge-holding residents.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>In addition, without access to a nearby parking space a registered disabled family member would find it near possible to access our house.</p>	
--	---	--

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Epsom Road, Guildford (convert two sections of existing single yellow line to double yellow line, no waiting at any time restrictions) 3 representations</b></p>		
	<p>Thank you for letter dated 7 July 2017 with ref. APH/8501 re. proposed changes to the parking controls in Epsom Road. You have said you are keen to hear whether we support the proposals and as one of the residents of Wodehouse Place, 41 Epsom Road I have an acute interest in the contents of the letter and the proposals generally.</p> <p>Broadly speaking, the proposals are welcome and I am pleased the council has acknowledged that there is a problem with the yellow lines, particularly at the town-centre end of Epsom Road at the intersection with Jenner Road. However, I was very surprised and dismayed to see that Wodehouse Place is excluded from the measures. I am not sure if you are aware but there have been serious on-going problems with parking along the approach road for Wodehouse Place for many years now. Given its town centre location, it is an absolute magnet for workers to park even though it is supposed to be a private road with no parking. The problem is that there is zero enforcement from the council which suggests the council do not actually care about the problem. I do not say this lightly but the problem has been going on for years now with no resolution so that is impression I have.</p> <p>I look forward to your thoughts about including Wodehouse Place in the proposed changes. Thank you.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>In respect to the comments specifically about Wodehouse Place, the access road is not public highway. Therefore, the access road is not within the remit of on-street parking review. Instead, the access is privately-owned by Guildford Borough Council, and managed by the Neighbourhood and Housing team. Therefore, the request has been forwarded onto them, for their consideration.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
24	<p>I would like to comment specifically on the proposed changes to single yellow lines on Epsom Road.</p> <p>Although I agree that cars parked on the stretch of Epsom Road between Hunter Road and Jenner Road can obstruct the flow of traffic, the proposed changes do not address the increasingly difficult situation along Wodehouse Place just opposite.</p> <p>Cars park along the entire stretch of pavement on a daily basis</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>In respect to the comments specifically about Wodehouse Place, the access road is not public highway. Therefore, the access road is not within the remit of on-street parking review. Instead, the access is privately-owned by Guildford Borough Council, and managed by the Neighbourhood and Housing team. Therefore, the request has been forwarded onto them, for their consideration.</p>

	<p>which means children cannot keep safe as they have to walk in the middle of the road. Cars parked along Wodehouse Place closer to the block of flats also make access for emergency services extremely difficult if they were required.</p> <p>Any further restrictions to "free" parking in other areas in the vicinity will exacerbate the problem of parked cars along Wodehouse Place. I therefore request that the parking issue at Wodehouse Place needs to be addressed at the same time, otherwise the cars that currently make use of free parking opportunities in the surrounding roads will simply park at Wodehouse Place once the changes take effect, adding to the existing problems here.</p>	<p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>Page 100</p> <p>79</p>	<p>1 There is clearly a shortage of parking provision in Epsom Road compared with the demand.</p> <p>2 Deliveries and local repairs require that vehicles sometimes have to park on yellow lines (and pavements) to carry out their functions.</p> <p>3 At times there are <b>high concentrations of toxic engine fumes</b>, especially when traffic is queueing at traffic lights, or queueing to pass parked vehicles or obstructions.</p> <p>4 Mostly, vehicles drive within speed limits, but on occasions (say 3 or 4 times a day, or night), a small number of drivers want to race (seriously) on the road (Epsom Road).</p> <p>5 The <b>pavements on both sides of Epsom Road feel narrow to pedestrians</b> (especially the south side), the curbs are low, and on the south side feel as if they slope into the road, making walking uncomfortable by feeling unsafe. And when refuse bins are left on the pavements, negotiating a route, whilst avoiding traffic, is precarious.</p> <p>There is a danger area when coming out of properties on foot (particularly nos. 50, 52 and 54) on to the narrow, lowered pavement can result in people facing cars, buses and lorries travelling at some speed, bearing down on them only a few centimetres away from them, especially if the vehicles have not been forced to reduce speed by stopping at the traffic lights. This is a potentially dangerous situation. There are small children living in and visiting these properties. And there are frequently small children</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety, access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The nature and use of the road, its geometry, width, the presence of junctions and accesses mean that it is not possible to introduce parking bays along much of its length.</p> <p>Parking is permitted on the single yellow lines when they do not operate. However, despite the previous introduction of additional lengths of double yellow line, ongoing concerns have been raised about the impact that parking still has in the evening and on Sundays.</p> <p>Although it does not fall within the remit within the on-street parking review, the concerns about speeding, and suggestions about rearranging traffic flow, lowering the speed limit and traffic calming have been forwarded onto Surrey County Council and Surrey Police.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

and prams, as well as people with dogs, on the narrow pavement, some probably due to the Nursery School on the corner next to the traffic lights. This 100 – 200 metre stretch of the pavement on the south side of Epsom Road approaching the traffic lights is particularly narrow and slopes into the road, feeling unsafe for pedestrians, due to the speed and proximity of vehicles of all sizes coming into the town from the direction of Merrow. This is exacerbated at times by refuse bins awaiting emptying, or retrieving.

6 On average the volume of traffic generally on Epsom road does not seem exceptionally high, except at peak periods, and there is a steady flow of pedestrians, but not large volumes.

7 In order to satisfy the demand for local parking, to reduce the effects of toxic engine emissions, to enable pedestrians to feel safer, it would be worth considering a one-way traffic system, and possibly a lower speed restriction in parts, or speed humps for traffic calming, rather than just reducing parking facilities by tightening existing restrictions. Roads such as Epsom Road, Harvey Road and Hunter Road might form a nucleus for a one-way system, with others further afield possibly being included.

The area close to the traffic lights really does need to be made safer, both in terms of the very narrow pavement on the south side, speed of traffic coming downhill and into town and in terms of high levels of harmful traffic fumes from idling traffic, intense at peak times.

If this were considered constructively there may be benefits to all of the issues raised, providing more parking, less toxicity, safer pavements, and slightly slower vehicles, rather than just imposing even more parking restrictions and penalties to the existing regime.

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Jenner Road Road, Guildford (convert existing single yellow line outside Turret House to double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction) 2 representations</b></p>		
<p>21</p>	<p>As one of the residents of Turret House, 1 Jenner Road, Guildford, I write to inform you that I fully support the proposed changes to parking restrictions - specifically the conversion of single yellow lines to double yellow lines.</p> <p>The current situation on exiting Turret House underground car park is very hazardous, and any vehicles parked on the road outside Turret House create an additional obstruction of view of traffic driving up Jenner Road.</p> <p>It is only a matter of time before there is a collision, as traffic driving up Jenner Road often does so at speed.</p> <p>As well as converting this part of Jenner Road to double yellow lines, I believe there is a case for speed bumps to force traffic to slow down as vehicles approach Turret House from the bottom of Jenner Road.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>61</p>	<p>Wholeheartedly support the proposed yellow line changes which will greatly improve the road safety situation.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

**ANNEXE 2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Josephs Road, Guildford</b>  <b>(convert existing limited waiting shared-use parking place outside Springside Court to permit only and introduce double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction at junction with Springside Court)</b>  <b>2 representations</b></p>		
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 103 54</p>	<p>I reside at Springside Court.</p> <p>We, along with many residents of Josephs Road have had enough of irresponsible parking, specifically from Enterprise at the Springside Court end of Josephs Road.</p> <p>Enterprise are not only a nuisance, but at times when they park their vans on opposite sides of the road, they have posed a safety problem in that emergency services are not able to get down the road. In fact, the refuse collectors have even had to turn back on more than one occasion due to their irresponsible parking so - yes, I do agree with your proposals for permit parking.</p> <p>I will be more than happy to put my point across at any council meeting to approve this plan.</p> <p>I wholly support the idea of permit parking. I do however worry that Enterprise employees will then start to park their vehicles AND work vehicles in Springside Court which is a private parking residential area.</p> <p>I have advised the housing association of your proposed plan.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>68</p>	<p>Regards the proposal above I am writing my objection. The reason for my objection is that there is no proposal for tightening of controls on Stocton Road as per neighboring Josephs road. Please can you let me know why this is? We are the road most impacted by spillover parking from the lido and college and frequently we can't park near our house.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>The objection to the proposal in Josephs Road is based on the fact that similar proposals are not being considered in Stocton Road.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in Josephs Road in response to unsolicited safety and availability of space concerns raised prior to the start of the review. We have received very little correspondence about there being similar issues in Stocton Road, since the parking review we conducted in 2006-7. This review</p>

		<p>increased both the number of spaces available and the proportion prioritised for permit-holders only.</p> <p>Nevertheless, if there are such issues in Stocton Road, a future parking review may provide us with an opportunity to revisit the situation.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
--	--	--

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Linden Road, Guildford (convert existing single yellow line adjacent to the rear of No.5 Recreation Road to double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction) 1 representation</b></p>		
43	<p>I support the proposal for double yellow lines across our private driveway in Linden Road at the rear of 5 Recreation Road. It will help to stop vehicles parking there and blocking our access/egress to our parking spaces which we own.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.  Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Lower Edgeborough Road, Guildford</b>  <b>(convert two existing unrestricted parking places adjacent to Sheldon Court and outside Danesrood to limited waiting shared-use parking places)</b>  <b>15 representations</b></p>		
<p>5</p>	<p>I live in Elmhurst Court and I have my own parking space outside my garage. I therefore feel that parking in Lower Edgeborough Road is not of too much concern but I think if more spaces were created in this road it might make driving down to, say, the A3, a little more hazardous as there is a constant flow of traffic in proportion to the nature of the road itself. I realise I am very fortunate, as are the rest of the residents in this Court, but on the whole I am in favour of the status quo!</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The proposals do not increase the number of bays / spaces. Instead, they amend the proportion that are limited waiting shared-use and unrestricted. A greater number are being prioritised for permit holders, to more closely reflect demand.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed parking regulation changes throughout the area in which I live. I believe I am missing a fairly important piece of information w.r.t these changes, namely the financial impact to the Borough or Country through their implementation.</p> <p>While I have no vested interest in the changes as proposed I feel it is disingenuous to avoid all mention of financial matters in the documentation made public for scrutiny (<a href="https://guildford.gov.uk/parkingformaladvertisement">https://guildford.gov.uk/parkingformaladvertisement</a>) .</p> <p>I am bound therefore to <u>object</u> to the changes until such information is made available.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The committee reports held on deposit and accessible from the Borough Council's website via links to the County Council's website outline the financial implications associated with the review and the implementation of any changes.</p> <p>In general, the objective of formalised parking controls is to deal with safety, access and traffic flow issues and manage parking space equitably for the various user-groups. Ideally, parking operations should be self-financing. In Guildford, the operation makes a surplus. This helps fund other transportation initiatives, such as park and ride.</p> <p>The relatively modest changes proposed in Lower Edgeborough</p>

		<p>Road, and more generally, are unlikely to have a significant impact on this.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
7	<p>I support the proposals referred to in the above reference relating to proposed changes to the parking controls in Lower Edgeborough Road.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
	<p>I agree and support your proposals for parking changes. In my opinion your proposed changes need to include all the free parking bays in the area.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The proposals increase the number of spaces that are being prioritised for permit holders, to more closely reflect demand. Making all the spaces limited waiting shared-use would reduce flexibility for residents and their visitors. Increasing the level of restriction at this stage would also require the proposals to be re-advertised and thereby delay their implementation.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
23	<p>As one of the residents of Telford Court GU12EA the property is adjacent to the junction of Lower Edgeborough Road and Clandon Road which has unrestricted parking on both adjacent roads. Commuters park in these bays from 7.00am to 6.00 pm which often makes it impossible to park near our property.</p> <p>We have two cars, like many residents of Telford Court, and only one parking space within the complex.</p> <p>Could consideration be given to extending the proposed parking controls, in Lower Edgeborough Road adjacent to Clandon Road and/or in Clandon Road between Lower Edgeborough Road and Cross Lanes, convert the existing unrestricted bays into limited</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review. No such correspondence was received from residents of Clandon Road.</p> <p>There are around 34 spaces in Clandon Road (Area C). 20 of these spaces are currently prioritised for permit-holders. There is currently 1 permit-holder in Clandon Road.</p> <p>Making changes elsewhere, at this stage, which would involve increasing the level of restriction, would also require the proposals</p>

	waiting shared bays.	to be re-advertised and thereby delay their implementation.  Nevertheless, future reviews may allow us to revisit the situation if demand for permits increases.  Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.
25	<p>We fully support the proposed parking controls in Lower Edgeborough Road.</p> <p>This is on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permit I spaces at Sheldon Court cannot support the amount of Permit I users in the surrounding areas</li> <li>• There seems to be an increasing number of abandoned cars in the free parking bays around Lower Edgeborough road, as this is not a controlled bay these cars remain here for weeks / months at a time taking up valuable spaces</li> <li>• Commuters from the nearby railway station (London Road) and offices use the free parking spaces to park, all day. Surely these free spaces are not intended for this purpose and it is severely impacting the amount of spaces for residents who actually live in this area.</li> </ul>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
41	I am delighted to see that the proposal is for permit only parking in Lower Edgeborough Road but wonder why it has not been extended to the Epsom Road end of Lower Edgeborough. This has several dwellings of multiple occupancy and the few parking places are generally taken up by people who do not live in Lower Edgeborough Road but use it as convenient free parking for London Road Railway Station, thus leaving little or no spaces for residents.	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
42	<p>I was pleased to see your proposals for Lower Edgeborough Road, however, I am unsure if this extends to the parking opposite 18 Lower Edgeborough Road. There are 7 apartments here residents often find they cannot park due to people using London Road station during the week and also as a result of people living in areas such as Waterden and York road leaving cars there over the weekend as free parking.</p> <p>The residents at 18 Lower Edgeborough often return from shopping to find no parking in the road.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review. The availability of space at the Epsom Road end of Lower Edgeborough Road has not been raised as an issue, nor are there any permit holders in this section of the road.</p> <p>There are around 31 spaces in Lower Edgeborough Road and Sheldon Court (Area I). Currently, around 7 of these are prioritised</p>

	<p>Please would you confirm that your proposals do extend to the upper end of Lower Edgeborough Road too.</p>	<p>for permit-holders. There is currently 1 permit-holder in Lower Edgeborough Road and 11 in Sheldon Court. The proposals will increase the number of prioritised spaces to 15.</p> <p>The prioritised spaces are located predominantly where there is the demand for such spaces from permit-holders. Future reviews may allow us to revisit the situation if demand for permits increases.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
	<p>As one of the residents in Telford Court, I just want to express my opinion about the changes to the parking controls in my living area. In general, the parking spaces are good at this moment, and usually, there are no problems for parking at any time in any of the parking areas where is not necessary to pay and display. The movement of the cars parked are daily and, from my point of view, nobody is taking advantage of this situation and everybody is using correctly this parking area.</p> <p>In general, there is no need to modify this parking status by now, because there are no problems by now. Probably in the future, if this is changed, the situation will be worse, and living in this nice area in Guildford will be worse for all the neighbours.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The proposals in Lower Edgeborough Road will increase the number of prioritised spaces in that road so that it more closely matches demand from permit-holders in that area.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it will slightly reduce the availability of unrestricted spaces for those residents that prefer the flexibility of them and their visitors being able to park without the need for a permit.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>63</p>	<p>I am writing to advise you that I strongly disagree.</p> <p>I have lived in Sheldon Court for 13 years. When I first moved here many of the owners were elderly and never had cars. Over the years, younger people have move in many with two cars. A high percentage do not use their garages. Also, the garages are very small and larger cars just do not fit in. We have seven bays in Sheldon Court with two hour restrictions until 6.00pm. During the day it means visitors and trades people 74 per cent of the time can park their vehicles. Once the restrictions are removed, there is a huge problem, there is no visitor parking here. This means visitors often have to park in Clandon Road and lone women have to walk down Lower Edgeborough Road in the dark. Lower Edgeborough Road is extremely dark and the house right next door often has some dodgy residents. I have in the past suggested an extra lamp</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The proposals in Lower Edgeborough Road will increase the number of prioritised spaces in that road so that it more closely matches demand from permit-holders in that area. The creation of more time-limited spaces is also likely to increase the availability of space for short-stay visitors.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it will slightly reduce the availability of unrestricted spaces for those residents that prefer the flexibility of them and their visitors being able to park without the need for a permit.</p>

	<p>post but with no success.</p> <p>By having unrestricted parking outside Sheldon Court it means that after about 5.30pm-6.30pm during the week there is visitor parking. If I have a weekend visitors, they can park there from a Friday evening until Sunday evening with no problem.</p> <p>What do you think you will gain from issuing parking permits? I tell you what will happen if you give parking permits to residents of Sheldon Court. Many residents will park their cars and their cars will stay there for days.</p> <p>To sum up. We already have a serious problem here regarding visitor parking. If you go ahead with the above proposal, you will turn a serious problem into an acute problem. With visitors unable to park their cars close to Sheldon Court it is also not going to help the value of our homes.</p>	<p>The modest changes are unlikely to encourage more residents to acquire permits to use their off-street parking facilities fo</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>Page 110 74</p>	<p>I am in favour of changes to the parking in Lower Edgeborough Road which favour those resident in this road and permit holders.</p> <p>There is a general shortage of parking in this road, and Abbeyfield (having no gates) is suffering from parking by persons not resident in this house.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>85</p>	<p>Please can these proposed changes be extended to also include the two parking areas on either side of Telford Court (on Lower Edgeborough Road and on Clandon Road).</p> <p>There are 24 properties at Telford Court, and all the residents here suffer constantly from not being able to find roadside parking for themselves or their visitors. This is possibly because of proximity to the high street, and of London Road Station.</p> <p>I believe that including spaces on either side of Telford Court to also be "Monday-Saturday 8:30am-6pm 2-hour limited waiting no return within 1 hour or permit holder parking places" would increase the use of space for Telford Court residents and their visitors.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review. We received no such correspondence from residents of Clandon Road.</p> <p>There are around 34 spaces in Clandon Road (Area C). 20 of these spaces are currently prioritised for permit-holders. There is currently 1 permit-holder in Clandon Road.</p> <p>Making changes elsewhere, at this stage, which would involve increasing the level of restriction, would also require the proposals to be re-advertised and thereby delay their implementation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, future reviews may allow us to revisit the situation if demand for permits increases.</p>

		<p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>90</p>	<p>I oppose the proposals to increase the prioritisation of space for permit holder in the existing unrestricted bays adjacent to Sheldon Court and Danesrood into limited waiting shared use.</p> <p>I have one car garaged in the block at Sheldon Court and have to get daily parking tickets if I want to visitor for more than 2 hours. When I applied for a parking ticket, I was told I could only get one if I had 2 cars. I therefore feel that this proposal will lead people to own more cars.</p> <p>The need for householders with or without cars to have visitors with cars is very important, whether for hours, days, weeks or longer, in the case of illness, need for household repairs or redecoration of some other reason. It is also important for Doctors and other necessary Services to be able to visit on a short term basis.</p> <p>I am an elderly resident who at present needs to have a Gardener and a Cleaner for 2 hours at a time, and may soon be forced to give up my car due to being unable to use it when ill. I have only be able to go out a few times in the last 2 months due to illness.</p> <p>The parking situation in the area of Sheldon Court and Lower Edgeborough Roadhas become extremely difficult in the last year or so and clearly something has to be done about it. I feel sure that the Council could supply a better solution to this very difficult problem.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The proposals in Lower Edgeborough Road will increase the number of prioritised spaces in that road so that it more closely matches demand from permit-holders in that area. The creation of more time-limited spaces is also likely to increase the availability of space for short-stay visitors.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it will slightly reduce the availability of unrestricted spaces for those residents that prefer the flexibility of them and their visitors being able to park without the need for a permit.</p> <p>The modest changes are unlikely to encourage more residents to acquire permits and use their off-street parking facilities for other purposes. However, please note that residents within Area I can acquire one residents' permit irrespective of their off-street parking facilities.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>92</p>	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of Telford Court Residents Limited.</p> <p>Telford Court Residents Ltd owns the freehold property known as Telford Court, and manages the property here at Telford Court. We are a residents management company for the 24 owners of the flats at Telford Court (who each in turn own one share in the company).</p> <p>We discussed your parking proposal at a council meeting of Telford Court Residents Ltd on 03/08/17 and the Telford Court Council has</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review. We received no such correspondence from residents of Clandon Road.</p> <p>The proposals in Lower Edgeborough Road will increase the number of prioritised spaces in that road so that it more closely</p>

	<p>the following comments:</p> <p>There is currently unrestricted parking outside of Telford Court on both Lower Edgeborough Road and Clandon Road. The residents at Telford Court regularly have difficulty finding on street parking for themselves or their visitors in these spaces. Some cars, not from Telford Court, even use these areas as long term parking (as I write this, one car has even been left in the same place un-moved for three months).</p> <p>Restricting the parking in Lower Edgeborough Road outside of Sheldon Court, as you are proposing, will cause the parking areas outside of Telford Court to become even more contested than they already are. Therefore we are against the proposal as it stands.</p> <p>However, we are in favour of:</p> <p>EITHER – (A) Also including both of the parking areas outside of Telford Court in a similar restriction (2 hours limited waiting or permit holders),</p> <p>OR – (B) Not changing the parking restrictions at all for the full length of Lower Edgeborough Road and Clandon Road.</p>	<p>matches demand from permit-holders in that area.</p> <p>There are around 34 spaces in Clandon Road (Area C). 20 of these spaces are currently prioritised for permit-holders. There is currently 1 permit-holder in Clandon Road.</p> <p>Making changes elsewhere, at this stage, which would involve increasing the level of restriction, would also require the proposals to be re-advertised and thereby delay their implementation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, future reviews may allow us to revisit the situation if demand for permits increases.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
93	<p>Having read the draft orders and inspected the plans showing the details of the proposed changes detailed in the above submission as a resident of Telford Court I can confirm that I am in agreement with them.</p> <p>Furthermore I would suggest that the parking areas in Lower Edgeborough Rd and Clandon Rd adjacent to Telford Court be similarly converted to the prioritisation of space for permit holders and limited waiting shared use.</p> <p>The above is required as the opportunity that your staff have of keeping the road clear of debris and carrying out necessary repairs is severely restricted.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the availability of space prior to the start of the review. No such correspondence was received from residents of Clandon Road.</p> <p>There are around 34 spaces in Clandon Road (Area C). 20 of these spaces are currently prioritised for permit-holders. There is currently 1 permit-holder in Clandon Road.</p> <p>Making changes elsewhere, at this stage, which would involve increasing the level of restriction, would also require the proposals to be re-advertised and thereby delay their implementation.</p> <p>Nevertheless, future reviews may allow us to revisit the situation if demand for permits increases.</p>

		Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.
--	--	--

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Mountside. Guildford</b>  <b>(convert the two existing permit only parking places in 'upper' section of the road to limited waiting shared-use parking places)</b>  <b>4 representations</b></p>		
10	<p>We residents of Mountside, are happy to confirm our approval of the proposal.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
60	<p>We have received notification of proposed parking changes in Mountside.</p> <p>While we do not object to these we would ask that consideration be given to making the 4 spaces (2 on each side of the road) outside numbers 44 and 47 Mountside be made into permit holder only spaces.</p> <p>Since the restriction of parking on Green Lane (at the top of The Mount) we have experienced considerably increased traffic volumes and parking pressure on these spaces, from people using the Mount Field. We consider the restriction of parking for non-residents of these particular spaces (which are closest to the field) would help to considerably alleviate the difficulties we experience as a result of this.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the flexibility of the parking scheme prior to the start of the review. These suggested that the need for permit only spaces in the 'upper' section of Mountside was unwarranted and unduly restricted residents and their visitors.</p> <p>Although the representee does not object to the proposals to convert the permit only spaces to limited waiting shared-use, they request that those spaces closer to the cul-de-sac end are converted from limited-waiting shared us to permit only.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
71	<p>With reference to your recent letter about changing the resident permit parking restrictions in Mountside,I would like to say that this idea is brilliant,and has my wholehearted support!</p> <p>I have lived in Mountside for 15 years,and have often struggled when friends visit or come to stay,bringing their cars:the business of needing to go and move their car every 2 hours in order to avoid a fine is very annoying ,as is the necessity for residents to buy visitor permits each year and to "spend"them carefully so that they last the year.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>I live near the top of Mountside, where it's very unlikely that anyone would choose to park for the town centre or station and have always felt that in our particular road the permit scheme is an unnecessary annoyance that we would all be glad to be rid of.</p> <p>One suggestion that I would make is that if there is any concern amongst residents about scrapping the current scheme, why not issue each household with one or two reusable permits for visitors (i.e. which don't require the vehicle reg. number or date) so that we can give these to our visitors for as long as they are needed?</p> <p>I very much hope that the decision will be to scrap the current scheme in Mountside.</p>	
	<p>We live in the 'upper' section of the road.</p> <p>Over the last two weeks we have been monitoring the parking situation. There is no evidence that the parking arrangements in this 'upper' part of Mountside need to change as there are always spaces available for both residents and visitors and dog walkers.</p> <p>How many concerns have been raised? Have these been raised by residents lower down Mountside on behalf of builders who have been working temporarily at their premises?</p> <p>We would ask that Parking Wardens should regularly visit the upper section of Mountside to stop illegal parking. The wardens could also count the number of vacant parking spaces thus confirming our view that the present system does not need to be changed.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns raised about the flexibility of the parking scheme prior to the start of the review. These were from residents of the 'upper' section of Mountside. They suggested that the need for permit only spaces in the 'upper' section was unwarranted and unduly restricted residents and their visitors.</p> <p>Making all the spaces in this section of Mountside limited waiting shared-use will increase flexibility and is unlikely to unduly influence the existing availability of space for permit-holders.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
	<b>Old Farm Road, Guildford (formalised existing advisory disabled only parking place outside No.6 The Stables) 0 representations</b>	
	Implement as advertised.	

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Pewley Hill (lower), Guildford (convert existing single yellow lines outside Nos.7,9&amp;9a to double yellow lines, no waiting at any time restrictions) 4 representations</b></p>		
13	<p>We are writing in response to your letter dated 7 July regarding parking restriction proposals to convert single to double yellow lines to improve/protect access to Nos. 7, 9 &amp; 9a Pewly Hill, Guildford. We would like to confirm our wholehearted support for these proposals.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.  Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
17	<p>I am writing in support of your proposed parking controls changes for Pewley Hill.</p> <p>I live in one of the properties and we are frequently faced with the situation where we cannot either leave or enter our garage on Sundays or evenings. Since we do not have a parking permit to park elsewhere and only have one car, this can cause considerable inconvenience.</p> <p>The problem becomes particularly acute in the run-up to Christmas, when people will often park across our garage for an entire day.</p> <p>The issue is made worse because our garage entrance is not perpendicular to the road, so often people will obstruct access accidentally, even though they may have no intention of doing so.</p> <p>In a more general sense, having cars parked all the way up the road from Oxford Terrace to Harvey Road makes it very difficult for cars to pass and this can cause significant congestion. Having double yellow lines would mean that there were always sufficient places for people to pull over to let traffic pass in both directions.</p> <p>I appreciate your response so far to the concerns I have raised previously and I hope that we arrive at a pragmatic solution.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.  Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

20	<p>As the householder directly affected, I heartily welcome the proposals.</p> <p>I assume that a visitor to my house cannot legitimately leave his car on these yellow lines when parking controls do not operate; please confirm.</p> <p>If a car is parked on the yellow lines so as to cause an obstruction, what action can I take at the time, particularly as traffic wardens are unlikely to be in the vicinity?</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
58	<p>I am a resident of Pewley Hill and totally support the proposed changes to the parking controls in my area. Sundays are a nightmare for my neighbours with shoppers parking on the single yellow lines, preventing safe access to their properties.</p> <p>South Hill is also a problem with it becoming, in effect, a single lane, due to shoppers parking and preventing easy access to those of us who wish to use the Shalford Road.</p> <p>I fully support this proposal.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Pewley Hill (upper), Guildford (convert section of existing single yellow line outside Nos.46&amp;50 to a limited waiting shared-use parking place) 3 representations</b></p>		
	<p>We are writing to express our serious concern on the proposed changes to Parking controls in Pewley Hill (outside No's 46 &amp; 50).</p> <p>We live nearby. The parking controls were changed recently to introduce parked cars very close to our drive. This has resulted in poor visibility in seeing cars in the road approaching from our right, when we leave the drive. The proposed additional parking on the other side of our drive, would further limit our visibility to cars on the road approaching from the left. We are very concerned this will result in an accident.</p> <p>In addition, planning permission has been granted for two new homes at No 46 Pewley Hill. Both of these homes have a new driveway, apparently exiting onto the road where the new parking spaces will be. During the construction of these house (due to start shortly), there will be a significant increase in vehicle traffic, particularly heavy lorries. We are already concerned about this, but the addition of extra cars parked in this exact area, is likely to result in the road being impassable at times.</p> <p>We therefore strongly urge you to reconsider these proposals on the grounds of road safety.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>The intention of the proposed parking bay was to compensate for the loss of parking associated with other recent residential developments within the road. This would assist those wishing to access the Downs for leisure purposes. It would also help those involved in the school run at the nearby Pewley Down School. However, with the prospect of developments conflicting directly with the proposal in the near future, it is recommended that the proposal is not progressed.</p> <p>However, in view of the potential conflict with the proposed development at No.46, it is recommended that the proposal <b>IS NOT</b> implemented.</p>
96	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed changes to the parking controls outside nos 46 &amp; 50 Pewley Hill.</p> <p>I am concerned that these have not been made in the light of planning approvals for the development of the property at 46. This provides for the demolition of the existing house and the creation of 2 new properties and 2 new driveways, which will cut across the proposed bay. This proposal is therefore ill conceived.</p> <p>Even allowing for the new driveway, the proposal will create parking spaces adjacent to the driveways at 50, 46 and the "new" 48, which</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>The intention of the proposed parking bay was to compensate for the loss of parking associated with other recent residential developments within the road. This would assist those wishing to access the Downs for leisure purposes. It would also help those involved in the school run at the nearby Pewley Down School. However, with the prospect of developments conflicting directly with the proposal in the near future, it is recommended that the proposal is not progressed.</p>

	<p>will impede the view of the road. It is well known that people use the road to access the Downs with bikes and balls and people often walk down the middle of the road at this end of Pewley Hill. The visibility from these drives will be poor and potentially unsafe.</p> <p>Your letter states that recent development has led to the loss of parking space but I am not clear that this is the case, given the last changes to the parking following the developments in the road.</p> <p>Most importantly it is exceptional for the parking spaces to be full and this usually only occurs when there is a major event at Pewley Down school on 3-4 occasions a year. For all these reasons I hope this proposal will be rejected.</p>	<p>However, in view of the potential conflict with the proposed development at No.46, it is recommended that the proposal <b>IS NOT</b> implemented.</p>
<p>Page 120</p> <p>97</p>	<p>We are writing to object to the proposed changes to the parking controls outside numbers 46 &amp; 50 Pewley Hill.</p> <p>We are concerned that these proposed changes do not appear to take into consideration a recent planning approval for the development of the property at No. 46 Pewley Hill. This planning consent provides for the demolition of the existing property, and the construction of two new properties (including two new driveways) which will directly bisect the proposed new parking bay.</p> <p>This parking proposal appears ill conceived in this context.</p> <p>More generally, this end of Pewley Hill is used heavily by cyclists, hill walkers, dog walkers, and those accessing the allotments at the end of the road. Restricting views from the properties on the south side of the street through the introduction of additional parking bays on this side of the road is not conducive to safe entry and exit of vehicles from these properties in the context of heavily utilised pavements and the cul de sac road more generally.</p> <p>Whilst writing, we would also point out that the parking bay directly opposite the entrance to my property is also something of a hazard as we have often observed those reversing off our drive come perilously close to hitting the vehicles parked directly opposite our drive entrance.</p>	<p>Concerns about the proposals noted.</p> <p>The intention of the proposed parking bay was to compensate for the loss of parking associated with other recent residential developments within the road. This would assist those wishing to access the Downs for leisure purposes. It would also help those involved in the school run at the nearby Pewley Down School. However, with the prospect of developments conflicting directly with the proposal in the near future, it is recommended that the proposal is not progressed.</p> <p>However, in view of the potential conflict with the proposed development at No.46, it is recommended that the proposal <b>IS NOT</b> implemented.</p>

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Quarry Street, Guildford (convert existing pay and display only parking place outside Nos.9-13 to a pay and display dual-use parking place) 8 representations</b></p>		
28	<p>Further to your letter dated 7 July 2017, where we may have our say regarding the proposed changes to the parking controls as per reference number KM/17/0003-5, I would like to reiterate our full support for this change which will positively affect all residents along Quarry Street.</p> <p>As Quarry Street is almost entirely residential now, this is a common sense approach for all concerned.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
29	<p>We are delighted the proposed changes to the parking controls as per reference number KM/17/0003-5 are being considered, and continue to be fully supportive of this change.</p> <p>As Quarry Street is now almost entirely residential, the impact to residents would be immensely positive and would seem to be a fair approach.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
30	<p>Further to the proposed changes to the parking controls in Quarry Street (KM/17/0003-5), as a local resident I would like to offer my full support of this change, given how the street has changed into a residential environment over the last few years.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
31	<p>I wholeheartedly support the plan to change the parking bays in Quarry Street to Residents' parking.</p> <p>This as the whole street is now almost exclusively residential.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

34	<p>In reference to your letter dated 7 July 2017 regarding the proposed changes to the parking controls in Guildford (KM/17/0003-5), I would like to express my strong support for these changes on Quarry Street, that will be of benefit to the many residents who live here.</p> <p>I look forward to a positive outcome in this consultation.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
35	<p>We just wanted to say we believe the change is absolutely essential now the street is so residential.</p> <p>It would make a huge difference to all of us.</p> <p>Thanks!</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
39	<p>I write in full support of the parking proposal It will have a positive outcome to all who reside in Quarry Street. Thank you for your consideration</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
44	<p>We are 'new' residents of Quarry Street, and have lived here for sixteen months. Our house fronts on to Quarry Street and has gated vehicular access from Chapel Street. Two properties currently share this access and a third is on the market.</p> <p>We are happy with the proposals regarding Quarry Street. Deliveries etc. remain a problem but I suppose this is to be expected in the town centre.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
62	<p><b>Queens Road, Guildford</b>  <b>(extend existing parking bays outside Nos.19 &amp; 29 and [TECHNICALITY] formalised length of existing single yellow line)</b>  <b>1 representation</b></p>	
	<p>I looked at the new parking proposals on Queens Road. All good there.</p> <p>Can you shed any light on the top end of Queens Road?</p> <p>There is a bend that leads to the flats at the top and people park on this bend.</p> <p>Having lived here for 30 plus years, now with the newer flats, the parking on the bend causes chaos.</p> <p>I understand the road goes private at the bend. Is that your opinion too?</p> <p>Do you know owns it?</p> <p>Double yellow lines just on the bend would help enormously.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Prior to the review, we received some correspondence about the area outside Hillcrest Court. Residents suggested that the area should become subject to controls / part of the adjacent controlled parking zone. However, having met with them on site, the residents concluded that they did not want to progress the matter. Whilst they wanted measures to prevent parking wholly within the carriageway on the bend, they wished to retain the ability to park their vehicles partially on the footway in this location.</p> <p>Considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review.</p> <p>Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>St Luke's Square, Guildford</b>  <b>(introduce double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction in uncontrolled section on west side between Warren Road and Cadogan House)</b>  <b>16 representations</b></p>		
2	<p>Totally agree with proposed changes for St Luke's Square.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
3	<p>We strongly support the changes proposed to the parking in St Luke's Square.</p> <p>The current situation is a danger as well as a cause for the damaged to residents vehicles.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
9	<p>We are writing in support of the proposals to extend the yellow lines at the entrance to St Luke's Square.</p> <p>Since the initial installation of parking controls some three years ago, this unmarked particular stretch of road has become more hazardous. As your recommendation indicates, sight lines have become severely compromised by the cars that park there and drivers leaving St Luke's Square are forced to pass on the opposite side of the road, often encountering oncoming vehicles entering at some speed which are almost impossible to spot.</p> <p>Although it is not indicated that if approved, parking controls would extend across the adjacent lay-by we have also been concerned that during the daytime, cars regularly park at right angles into the "Warren Road end of the bay" outside Cadogan House, jutting out, sometimes almost an entire vehicles length into the road. This adds to the problem as well as creating a "pinch point" which is difficult to negotiate and for any delivery, public service or emergency vehicle a serious obstruction. If there is any way therefore if some control</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety and access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The existing controls and proposed measures primarily protect junctions, bends and points of access. During a previous review in 2012-14, residents expressed a preference for such limited measures. They discounted their road's inclusion within the neighbouring residents' parking scheme / controlled parking zone. The latter would control all kerb space and lay-bys, using a combination of yellow lines and formalised parking bays. These might help resolve some of the additional concerns raised.</p> <p>However, considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review.</p>

	<p>could be incorporated into proposals to prevent this additional hazard, it would be appreciated.</p> <p>We are therefore totally in support of any proposals to improve the safety at the entrance to St Luke's Square.</p> <hr/> <p>Further to our e mail regarding support of proposals to extend the yellow lines at the entrance to Luke's Square. We mentioned that motorists park at right angles into the adjacent bay, jutting out into the road. I have attached an example. This is now a daily recurrence during weekdays. There is a relatively small car today but it is often a longer vehicle, protruding even further into the carriageway and almost opposite a designated, occupied parking bay, which narrows the road even further. Is there any way that the lines could be extended to prevent this without obviously prejudicing legitimate parking within the bay?</p>	<p>Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
	<p>I write as I generally support the proposals to extend the double year lines in St Luke's Square from outside Cadogan House towards Warren Road: at times there a three vehicles parked on this short strip (sometimes partially up on the kerb at the entrance to the bay directly outside Cadogan House, blocking the pavement) which potentially limits access to the Square for larger/emergency vehicles. Indeed, I have seen refuse collection lorries struggle to squeeze past them.</p> <p>However, I do feel there is potential to revise the proposals stop the new lines short of where they meet the existing lines at the Warren Road junction to leave one parking space at this end - the road is sufficiently wide at this point to allow a single vehicle to park with plenty of space for others to park - and retaining one space would maximise the amount of parking available to visitors and their guests.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety and access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The existing controls and proposed measures primarily protect junctions, bends and points of access. During a previous review in 2012-14, residents expressed a preference for such limited measures. They discounted their road's inclusion within the neighbouring residents' parking scheme / controlled parking zone. The latter would control all kerb space and lay-bys, using a combination of yellow lines and formalised parking bays. These might help resolve some of the additional concerns raised.</p> <p>However, considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review.</p> <p>Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.</p>

		Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.
18	<p>We'd like to support the proposal to increase the double yellows in St Luke's Square, as much as possible around the square.</p> <p>We have a young child and do also get concerned about the speed of some cars so a speed limit sign and a sign warning of children in the area should also be considered.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
33	<p>I refer to the Council's letter dated 07/07/17 regarding the proposed changes to the parking controls in St Lukes Square. I wish it to be noted that I am in support of the yellow lines being extended up to the layby outside Cadogan House – this is on the grounds of safety and the ease of vehicles such as ambulances / fire engines together with the Council Tipper trucks entering the Square. Vehicles are being parked in this area with little concern for other road users.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
36	<p>Over the past year, the amount of people now using St Lukes Square as a means of free parking and then walking into town has steadily increased. This increase in traffic has now inadvertently created competition for space with some road users now parking in hazardous places causing danger to other road users as well as pedestrians.</p> <p>I do believe that the level of risk made by non-residents is now at an unacceptable level and action should be taken. It must also be noted that the amount of litter being left in the square has increased and I have even been witness to senior pupils of the nearby school urinating against a wall before getting in their car and driving away.</p> <p>I believe and would support at the minimum for double yellow lines to be placed as per the proposal. However, this would be worthless unless the council ensures St Lukes Square is patrolled on a regular basis and those who ignore the markings fined appropriately.</p> <p>Ideally I would prefer and support a permit system being put in place as per the other roads that surrounding St Lukes Square.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety and access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The existing controls and proposed measures primarily protect junctions, bends and points of access. During a previous review in 2012-14, residents expressed a preference for such limited measures. They discounted their road's inclusion within the neighbouring residents' parking scheme / controlled parking zone. The latter would control all kerb space and lay-bys, using a combination of yellow lines and formalised parking bays. These might help resolve some of the additional concerns raised.</p> <p>However, considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review.</p> <p>Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear</p>

		<p>evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
	<p>In regard to proposed changes to parking controls in St Lukes Square.</p> <p>I fully support these changes, which I suggested to Mr Harkin in my letter of 17 January 2013, during a previous parking review of the area (Ref: APH/8406).</p> <p>As part of the current review, please could you also consider enhancements to the junction of St Catherine's Park and St Bartholomew's Court. It is usual for vehicles to be parked opposite the entrance to St Bartholomew's Court, and on the nearby pavement within St Bartholomew's Court. This causes a number of issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restrictive width and manoeuvrability. It is not possible for two vehicle to pass, resulting in reversing considerable distance around bends and obstacles.</li> <li>• Pedestrians (including young children) are forced to walk in the road at the junction.</li> <li>• Larger vehicles are often unable to negotiate the junction without damaging street furniture (which is rarely repaired).</li> <li>• Vehicles travel at speed on the incorrect side of the road across the junction entrance. This makes exiting the junction dangerous.</li> </ul> <p>View North East from St Bartholomew's Court towards junction with St Catherine's Park, showing parking on pavements:</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety and access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The existing controls and proposed measures primarily protect junctions, bends and points of access. During a previous review in 2012-14, residents expressed a preference for such limited measures. They discounted their road's inclusion within the neighbouring residents' parking scheme / controlled parking zone. The latter would control all kerb space and lay-bys, using a combination of yellow lines and formalised parking bays. These might help resolve some of the additional concerns raised.</p> <p>However, considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review.</p> <p>Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>



View North West along St Catherine's Park towards St Lukes Square, showing damaged street furniture:



Thank you for your kind attention in this matter.

53

I am a resident of St Luke's Square and I **strongly** support the extension of the double yellow lines at the entrance to St Luke's Square.

I have on multiple occasion seen vehicles parked in an inconsiderate and unsafe manner at the entrance. These vehicles could very easily block access to the property by Emergency Services Vehicles.

On a related note, might I add that most of the cars that seemed to be parked this way are owned by non-residents of St. Luke Square. These people use the square as a place for *free-parking* whilst they work/shop in Guildford. This is detrimental in two ways:

- Loss of Parking revenue to Guildford Borough Council operated Car Parks
- Inconvenience to residents, guests and delivery vehicles trying to find a place to park in front of our properties

I know that these people are not owners/ tenants of properties because they drive in to the square, park and then leave St. Luke's Square immediately.

Is there anything that can be done to ensure that the parking places are reserved for residents of St Luke's Square and their guests?

General support for the proposals noted.

We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety and access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.

The existing controls and proposed measures primarily protect junctions, bends and points of access. During a previous review in 2012-14, residents expressed a preference for such limited measures. They discounted their road's inclusion within the neighbouring residents' parking scheme / controlled parking zone. The latter would control all kerb space and lay-bys, using a combination of yellow lines and formalised parking bays. These might help resolve some of the additional concerns raised.

However, considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review.

Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.

Although it does not fall within the remit within the on-street parking review, concerns about litter have been forwarded onto Guildford Borough Council's Street Cleansing team.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.

General support for the proposals noted.

We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety and access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.

The existing controls and proposed measures primarily protect junctions, bends and points of access. During a previous review in 2012-14, residents expressed a preference for such limited measures. They discounted their road's inclusion within the neighbouring residents' parking scheme / controlled parking zone.

72

The parking in St. Lukes Square & Warren Rd could definitely be improved, I wouldn't extend the yellow lines but I would make everything for permit holders & only residents only!! On several occasions I have not been able to park in the bays outside Eaton house as the general public use this as a free parking area , this needs to be sorted and has to stop !! I pay a lot of money to live here as a resident I expect to be able to park at any time of day.

		<p>The latter would control all kerb space and lay-bys, using a combination of yellow lines and formalised parking bays. These might help resolve some of the additional concerns raised.</p> <p>However, considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review.</p> <p>Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>Page 130</p> <p>73</p>	<p>I support the extension of the double yellow lines from the entrance of St Luke's Square at the junction with Warren Rd along to the parking bay parallel with Cadogan house flats. I think it's important to extend them far enough to prevent motorists from parking at right angles which happens every week day and which dangerously narrows the road - see attached photo.</p> <p>Please could you also put double yellow lines alongside the short stretch of corner pavement into the left hand arm of St Bartholomews Court. When people park here it completely obscures the sight lines into that area where children play.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety and access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The existing controls and proposed measures primarily protect junctions, bends and points of access. During a previous review in 2012-14, residents expressed a preference for such limited measures. They discounted their road's inclusion within the neighbouring residents' parking scheme / controlled parking zone. The latter would control all kerb space and lay-bys, using a combination of yellow lines and formalised parking bays. These might help resolve some of the additional concerns raised.</p> <p>However, considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review.</p> <p>Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

I am writing in support of the proposed changes to parking restrictions on St. Luke's Square.

I am very aware that unlike me as a non-driver, many residents in Guildford, as well as commuters, are very reliant on their cars. However many drivers park badly or unsafely, and without considering other road users, or residents.

There are a lot of children living here, and they are placed at risk with poor sightlines when crossing the road to get to Lancaster Park, or journeying to school. I know a lot of residents have exactly the same complaints.

I had Bahram Assadi visit this morning, and as a result I have also included some other areas that I would like to be considered on the estate specifically (corresponding pictures are attached):

1. St Catherine's Park, outside the rear of Grosvenor House, opposite St Bartholomew's Court.
2. The lower right-hand-bend at the entrance to St Bartholomew's Court. Cars park here sometimes, and cause the same access and sightline problems for drivers exiting and entering the road, as well as children and other pedestrians.
3. The upper left-hand-side at the entrance to St Bartholomew's Court. This has a car parked on it almost daily. It is only a matter of centimetres that would impede access for large vehicles, including bin lorries, emergency services and regular delivery lorries and trucks.
4. The lower left hand side at the entrance to St Bartholomew's Court. This has cars parks on it from time-to-time, which can cause the same problems with access, and sightlines for drivers and pedestrians - particularly children crossing the road.

I would also like to know whether it is possible to consider speed warnings, and potentially, warning signs indicating that children live and play nearby (also important given that a lot of children attend the local schools at Pewley Down and Holy Trinity particularly, and walk through and cross the roads).

General support for the proposals noted.

We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety and access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.

The existing controls and proposed measures primarily protect junctions, bends and points of access. During a previous review in 2012-14, residents expressed a preference for such limited measures. They discounted their road's inclusion within the neighbouring residents' parking scheme / controlled parking zone. The latter would control all kerb space and lay-bys, using a combination of yellow lines and formalised parking bays. These might help resolve some of the additional concerns raised.

However, considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review.

Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.

	<p>There is a serious need to address the problems you have highlighted, and also I believe, consider implementing further changes as I have outlined here. There have been from time-to-time close shaves, where speeding cars have come close to hitting children and other cars. I am concerned that it is only a matter of time before serious injury occurs.</p> <p>If there is anything else I need to do to get these issues escalated in any way, other than sending you this email and pictures, please let me know.</p>	
82	<p>Regarding adding double yellow lines to the entrance of St Lukes Square, as a resident I'd fully support that. When someone is parked there it forces you into oncoming traffic on a bend, which is a dangerous.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
86	<p>We wish to affirm our support for the proposed amended controls to St Luke's Square to extend the existing double yellow lines to the lay-by outside Cadogan House. Currently vehicles parked by the entrance to the estate cause access difficulties for cars entering and leaving the estate and also have the potential to restrict access for larger vehicles such as the emergency services and refuse lorries.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
87	<p>I write in support of the proposal to extend the existing double yellow line on the northwest side of St Lukes Square to the lay-by outside Cadogan House. As a resident of the Square who regularly drives in and out of it I find that cars parked in the area in question limit visibility of possible oncoming traffic and also hinder easy passage through that part of the Square.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
91	<p>As residents of st lukes square delighted with proposed changes. May we suggest you continue the yellow lines into the corners of the bays, otherwise they park into the corners, with the rear end causing an obstruction.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about safety and access and traffic movement raised prior to the start of the review.</p> <p>The existing controls and proposed measures primarily protect junctions, bends and points of access. During a previous review in 2012-14, residents expressed a preference for such limited measures. They discounted their road's inclusion within the neighbouring residents' parking scheme / controlled parking zone.</p>

		<p>The latter would control all kerb space and lay-bys, using a combination of yellow lines and formalised parking bays. These might help resolve some of the additional concerns raised.</p> <p>However, considering additional issues it at this stage would require the development, approval and advertisement of further proposals. This would undoubtedly extend the duration of the review.</p> <p>Nevertheless, if residents were subsequently to submit clear evidence in support of such measures, then a future review may be able to revisit the issue.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
--	--	---

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>South Hill, Guildford (convert existing single yellow lines outside Nos.6,8&amp;8a to double yellow line, no waiting at any time restrictions) 3 representations</b></p>		
<p>16</p>	<p>I am a resident of Holy Trinity ward. Parking in Castle Street (irrespective of the current building work on The Tunsgate shopping centre) is often illegal and seems rarely to garner parking tickets. I routinely have to weave around cars that are parked on double yellow lines, which, with cars that are parked on single yellow lines after 6pm, almost blocks the road. Emergency vehicles would struggle to get through.</p> <p>Single yellow lines on South Hill and Warwicks bench also seem to have outlived their usefulness. Cars routinely park where it is, in theory, legal, but not safe. Lines of sight are not maintained on blind corners and cars that drive too quickly down the hill are often in the middle of the road because they don't realise that there are cars parked on both sides.</p> <p>I would urge the council to change these roads to double-yellow lines throughout. There is ample parking in the multi-storey car park above Sainsbury's and there will be spaces when the new Tunsgate development opens.</p>	<p>General support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Double yellow lines tend to be used to protect junctions and bends. Single yellow lines tend to be used elsewhere to protect points of access onto the carriageway, and in locations where parking would cause traffic flow issues and congestion at busier times.</p> <p>We have previously introduced additional lengths of double yellow line in South Hill and Castle Street. When we introduced them in South Hill, some residents raised concerns about the loss of facility that this would cause for residents and their visitors. Clearly, introducing double yellow lines throughout the area might exacerbate these concerns.</p> <p>Concerns have also be raised about speed of vehicles using South Hill. The removal of parked vehicles at less busy times, might increase these concerns.</p> <p>The concerns about the enforcement of the existing controls have been forwarded onto colleagues within Parking – Operations.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>38</p>	<p>I was pleased to receive your letter of 7<sup>th</sup> July 2017, advising me that the parking on South Hill is to be reassessed, and as you will know, I have previously written to you on the very subject and have made my thought known to you.</p> <p>I should be delighted to see the new proposals, which I hope will alleviate difficulties that we all encounter when leaving and entering our respective properties.</p> <p>I look forward to seeing your suggested improvements in due</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

	course.	
48	<p>I agree with the proposal to convert the single yellow line to double yellow line. I would strongly object to any proposal to move the parking bays any close to my vehicular access gate as visibility is already severely restricted.</p> <p>It would help to make the situation far less dangerous if the speed limited in South Hill were to be restricted to 20mph especially in view of the nursery school at the top of South Hill.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Although it does not fall within the remit within the on-street parking review, the request for a reduction in the speed limit to 20mph has been forwarded onto Surrey County Council Highways.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

Page 13 of 14

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Spiceall, Compton</b>  <b>(remove existing formalised disabled only parking place outside No.36)</b>  <b>1 representation</b></p>		
50	<p>I am in full support of the proposal to remove the disabled parking bay outside No36 Spiceall Compton. This bay was put in for a resident who no longer lives on Spiceall. By removing that bay it will free up parking space for 2 small cars. Any extra parking space is very much needed on Spiceall.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Stocton Close, Guildford</b>  <b>(convert section of existing single yellow line outside Jubilee Social Club to a limited waiting shared-use parking place)</b>  <b>0 representations</b></p>		
<p>Implement as advertised.</p>		

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
	<p><b>Stoke Road, Guildford</b>                      (convert short section of existing limited waiting shared-use parking place opposite No.133 to a double yellow line, no waiting at any time restriction)  <b>0 representations</b></p>	
	Implement as advertised.	

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
	<p><b>The Oval, Wood Street Village</b>                      (remove existing formalised disabled parking place outside Nos.17&amp;19)  <b>0 representations</b></p>	
	Implement as advertised.	

**ANNEX 2: COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER**

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments / Recommendation / Response
<p><b>Tormead Road, Guildford (convert two existing unrestricted parking places outside Nos.7&amp;9 and adjacent to No.19 to limited waiting shared-use parking places) 2 representations</b></p>		
<p>51</p>	<p>Having reviewed the parking proposals for Tormead Road to change existing parking bays from free unrestricted parking places to 4 hour limited waiting, I fully support the proposals.</p> <p>This will no doubt increase the availability of parking to residents and their visitors.</p> <p>The proposals will restrict the unneighbourly parking behaviours of a small number of Tormead Road residents who have 'adopted' these parking bays for a number of years. These particular residents park cars, off-road vehicles and luton vans for extended periods of time despite having sufficient off-road parking at their properties. The GBC application criteria will also prevent Tormead Road residents from applying for a resident parking permit in order to flout these proposals as all properties have a minimum of two parking spaces.</p> <p>More troubling is the illegal parking of vehicles (particularly vans) by resident on double yellow lines close to the junction at the cul-de-sac on Tormead Road, thereby creating access/egress restrictions which could impact emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Could GBC provide regular monitoring once these proposals have been implemented to prevent people from abusing the parking restrictions.</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about the availability of space raised prior to the start of the review. These suggested that certain non-permit-holding residents and residents from nearby private roads were monopolising the use of the unrestricted spaces, to the detriment of other residents and their visitors. The impending introduction of controls in nearby Duncan Drive, to resolve issues there, may exacerbate some of these issues.</p> <p>However, the present arrangement provides a balance between flexibility and prioritisation. Cllr Nelson-Smith has indicated that she would prefer the existing situation to remain.</p> <p>Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal <b>IS NOT</b> implemented.</p>
<p>78</p>	<p>We are writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed change to the two areas in Tormead Road which currently allow unrestricted parking, to become areas restricted to 4 hours.</p> <p>Since the introduction of the yellow lines and controls some years ago the parking spaces in Tormead Road have become extremely limited. To reduce the parking provision even further, by making all spaces have a 4 hour limit, would be totally unreasonable, unbalanced and cause considerable inconvenience to the</p>	<p>Support for the proposals noted.</p> <p>We have developed the proposals in response to unsolicited concerns about the availability of space raised prior to the start of the review. These suggested that certain non-permit-holding residents and residents from nearby private roads were monopolising the use of the unrestricted spaces, to the detriment of other residents and their visitors. The impending introduction of controls in nearby Duncan Drive, to resolve issues there, may</p>

community.

Tormead Road is too far from the town centre to be used for parking by people working there. However there are many reasons why residents in Tormead Road would want to be able to park a vehicle for longer than 4 hours, e.g.:

- Elderly (or otherwise) relatives visiting for the day who do not want to be moving their vehicle around or walk a long way to the house they are visiting
- Carers helping someone in a household don't want to have to worry about how long before they have to move their car
- Families with more than one car
- Residents who have a separate vehicle or van for work which does not fit on their drive
- Workmen working at a property all day do not want to stop work to go and move their vehicle
- A family member home from university for the holidays who has a vehicle which does not fit on the drive.
- A resident who wants to park their car off the drive while they do work on the house or garden for the day

Further restricting parking on Tormead Road would inevitably mean that vehicles would have to be parked in neighbouring roads which could cause inconvenience in those roads. The vehicles will need to be parked somewhere so if Tormead Road cannot accommodate them they will be parked in other roads nearby.

We would strongly request that you do not approve this change but to leave the two areas in Tormead Road with unrestricted parking.

exacerbate some of these issues.

However, the present arrangement provides a balance between flexibility and prioritisation. Cllr Nelson-Smith has indicated that she would prefer the existing situation to remain.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposal **IS NOT** implemented.