

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Lower' part of development (St Luke's Square)	
St Bartholomew's Court 11 properties 7 comments 64% response rate	I would like to respond to confirm that I am in favour of the proposed parking controls attached to the letter dated 14th December 2012.
	My partner and I support the proposed controls due to the issues that badly parked cars are causing.
	I agree with the proposal as set out in your letter and attached plan dated 14th December 2012.
	I broadly agree with the proposals as detailed in your letter and plan dated 14th December 2012, but have the following observations – 1. The proposed yellow lines should be continuous around the square. Any cars parked on the north west and south west sides restrict the road to a single track. It was designed and built as a two way road. Any obstruction limits sight lines and access particularly for commercial vehicles. 2. Ideally the yellow lines should continue on all other sections of the highway. There are adequate parking bays for local residents around the square and along St Catherine's Park. Vehicles parked on the opposite side of the road to St Bartholomew's Court make exiting more dangerous as it becomes a single track road. In addition larger commercial vehicles for example the council's recycling lorries and those attending the Thames Water pumping station struggle to safely enter/exit the junction as they have a limited turning circle, hence the loss of the bollards on the corner as they are forced to mount the pavement. They require the full width of the road at this point. This parking issue has only come to the fore over the last few years. It seems that given the gradual implementation of parking restrictions around area, people have found it to be a cheap and convenient place to park for the day. Those vehicles causing most of the problems are strangely absent at weekends and during holidays although are often replaced by shoppers at weekends. I understand the reticence of Lancaster Gate to have any parking restrictions as this development has less off street parking available. However, just because St Luke's is a better development in this regard it should not mean that the residents should have to see the area become the local free car park and the cause of the current problem.
	It has been over two years since we corresponded by email in regard to this matter, and I am pleased that proposals are now being considered. I am fully supportive of all the draft proposals detailed in your plan. However, may I suggest that the following also be considered. - Restrictions to the West side of the entrance to the development. Parking on this side of the road will be dangerous for incoming and outgoing traffic, as it will severely impede the line of sight. - Restrictions to include the North West and South West pedestrian entrances to the St Luke's Square garden, as the current proposals permit parking across these. - Restrictions opposite the junction of St Bartholomew's Court. There is no lay-by in this area (unlike opposite St Thomas's Mews) and vehicles currently travel at speed on the incorrect side of the road across the junction entrance.

I would like to state that I am all for the suggested parking controls and am very much in favour of the double yellow lines as detailed in drawing GBC/APH/StLuke'sSquare (TWO EXACTLY THE SAME COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE SAME ADDRESS)

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Lower' part of development (St Luke's Square)	
St Bartholomew's Court (continued) 11 properties 7 comments 64% response rate	<p>We have been resident in St Bartholomew's Court for five and a half years and experienced a steady increase in the parking problems in and around St Luke's Square. This is the only vehicular route onto the lower part of the St Luke's Park estate and gives access to approximately 120 households. The proposals put forward in your attached plan certainly address all the issues which we, and many of our neighbours have been seriously concerned about – those which compromise safety, sight lines, access for emergency and other public service vehicles and frequently the prevention of deliveries and collections to and from households. Pedestrian links (to properties within the estate, the open spaces, and children's playground and nearby doctor's surgery and pharmacy) have also been affected with inconsiderate parking on pavements. Our close proximity to town means we have become a "free car park" for many which has exacerbated the problem as mentioned above, particularly during the working week. Every single re-development in the town centre and nearby in recent times has resulted in a further onslaught of parking by contractors or displaced motorists on our estate to make matters even worse. The only comment we would like to make that in an ideal situation, if there was any way the parking controls could be "no waiting Monday to Saturday 8.30 – 6 p.m." in some places in The Square, rather than the proposed "no waiting at any time double yellow lines" it would continue to afford residents/visitors the opportunity to park overnight and at weekends when the parking problems are not so acute. However, if it is a choice between double yellow and the current situation, then we confirm we fully endorse your proposals and look forward to hearing from you further.</p>

<p>St Catherine's Park 15 properties 3 comments 20% response rate</p>	<p>We live in the St Luke's Park area and support the proposal to protect the junctions and bends within St Luke's Square. In addition we frequently have cars parking opposite our house, which restricts or even obstructs access along St Catherine's Park road; so we suggest an extra set of double yellow lines is also provided here in this raised section of pavement (opposite No.1) to prevent this from occurring. Whilst the proposed protection of junctions and bends within the Square will improve safety and decrease road obstruction, the problem of parking within the area remains unaddressed; indeed is likely to be exacerbated by the proposed yellow lines in the Square, moving the parking of cars (non-residential) up from the Square towards Lancaster Avenue. In our view the parking can only be managed with some type of parking control - be it restricted hours (between 10.00am and 3.00pm) and/or permits. We would strongly recommend a site visit to see the problem in person before any decision is made on parking provision.</p>
---	--

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Lower' part of development (St Luke's Square)	
<p>St Catherine's Park (continued) 15 properties 3 comments 20% response rate</p>	<p>I have a couple of comments. 1) I think not considering St Luke's Park is incorrect, as a resident of St Catherine's park (which adjoins St Luke's park) the primary problem in parking in our area is residents of St Luke's Park, who take the "short cut" of walking through the bollards to their estate, making parking impossible for us. If we have to suffer yellow lines so should they. I am concerned that adding the double yellows, just increases the problem of lack of parking rather than addressing it. I haven't seen anyone park in front of the end of St Catherine's park but as its fire access it should probably be protected from parking, but the idea that line of site is a problem on the T junction St Thomas mews into St Catherine's is very unlikely. Its a no thru road so quite possible to pull forward safely to see any traffic (little as there is) . As such i feel the lines should only be on the one side of the road. The issues people worry about is would a fire engine get down the road, and blocking one side from parking would be sufficient. It should be the left hand side as facing out of St Thomas.</p> <p>I do not agree with the proposals as set out in your letter and attached plan dated 14th December 2012. This snowy weekend every corner was taken as parts of estate Inaccessible. I had to park off the estate. Removing spaces will not help this.</p>
<p>St Luke's Square 91 properties 18 comments 20% response rate</p>	<p>I live within Bloomsbury Court and for some time now have become concerned at the dangerous parking from visitors. It seems especially a problem with boys from RGS. My real concern is the parking on the corner from St Luke's Square down to Bloomsbury court, often is just a car it is hard to make this turn when cars are there let alone my fear an ambulance or Fire engine. I therefore whole heartedly support your proposal to introduce</p>

	double yellow lines in the areas you have suggested in the map you enclosed.
	I fully agree with the proposal put forward in your letter dated 14th December 2012. I have on a number of occasions witnessed the refuse lorry and other such delivery vehicles experiencing issues with manoeuvring within the area. On several occasions recently this has also been a problem with cars , not just large vehicles. This is generally due to poor and inconsiderate parking by owners of cars that obviously are not local residents. I feel this should be implemented without delay as it is causing problems on a daily basis, predominately on week days.

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Lower' part of development (St Luke's Square) continued...	
<p>St Luke's Square (continued) 91 properties 18 comments 20% response rate</p>	<p>I would just like to add my viewpoint as a Resident regarding the proposed parking controls for the above development. Firstly, I believe all the proposed “No waiting at any time – double yellow lines” are required for safety reasons. From personal experience, I very nearly struck a young boy with my car (whilst driving at a safe speed) simply because I was unable to see him running out from between dangerously parked vehicles in one of the areas you are proposing to “double line”. On another occasion Fire Engines responding to an emergency call had difficulty accessing the car park for Bloomsbury Court, again because of vehicles being parked dangerously and inconsiderately within the areas under consideration. Secondly, I feel the introduction of the double yellow lines proposed will cause the remaining uncontrolled parking areas to be over used by non residents and thereby causing a lack of parking for residents and their visitors. Consequently, I think it may well become necessary to introduce “Limited Waiting 2 Hours No Return Within 1 Hour Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm or Permit C (or I) Holder” for the remainder of the St. Luke’s Development in order to protect Residents and Visitors essential parking needs. Hopefully, the SCC Guildford Local Committee will be in a position to make an early decision in order to expedite a solution to this long standing problem.</p>

I live at 13 Bloomsbury court which is directly effected by these people parking outside my flat dangerously. I have on many occasions either had access issues and many near miss accidents because of people parking around this area. I fully support the introduction of these double yellow lines but more importantly hope that this is actioned as soon as possible as people have been dangerously parking around my flat for a very long time now. Every single day of the week the road is crammed with cars from office workers to school students, therefore reducing visibility around corners and making my corner very dangerous. I hope this work can be actioned as soon as possible.

I'm writing to voice my support for the proposed changes to the parking in St Luke's Square. It appears more and more cars have begun parking in the square which causes poor visibility on the already narrow corners and entrance to the square and restricts access for larger vehicles including emergency vehicles. If any changes can be made to remedy this I'm all in favour for them.

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Lower' part of development (St Luke's Square) continued...	
St Luke's Square (continued) 91 properties 18 comments 20% response rate	<p>When my partner and I first became tenants of Cadogan House in 2009 we were told that the Square benefitted from private parking around the Square as well as our individual numbered spaces around the back of our building. This was one of the main attractions to living in the Square. Since moving in we have experienced a steady increase in the parking problems in and around the Square and when we queried this early on we found out that the Square is in fact adopted, and benefitted from no private parking on the Square at all. Shortly after this the signs stating that the Square was private were removed. Naturally, if the road is adopted by the Council then we as residents must accept that people will park here. If the parking was considerate and safe, this would be not be an issue, but with increasing numbers of people trying to use the Square as a free car park, the result is much the opposite. The Square is the only vehicular route onto the lower part of the St Luke's Park estate and gives access to approximately 120 households. We find that on a regular basis, people are obstructing our entry to our parking spaces by parking on the corners of bends, obscuring sight lines around the Square by parking on the corners of the Square and creating problems for access for delivery vehicles, bin men and potentially emergency vehicles. Pedestrian access to both properties within the estate and the open spaces, children's playground and doctor's surgery and pharmacy have also been affected with inconsiderate parking on pavements. The young drivers who attend the Royal Grammar School are a particular problem, although they are by no means the only people responsible for hazardous and inconsiderate parking. We have even experienced people parking in the private numbered</p>

spaces around the rear of the buildings when the Square is completely full, in spite of the fact that these spaces are private property and form part of our demised premises, which is clearly illustrated by signage. The ideal resolution would be creating a No Waiting : Monday to Friday 8.30am– 6 pm CPZ around the Square (or certain parts of it), which would continue to afford residents and visitors the opportunity to park overnight and at weekends when the parking problems are not so acute. I do agree with the proposals to put double yellow lines around corners and bends which are where the dangerous parking occurs. As you can see from the attached photo, people continue to park in these awkward locations even during the snow, creating a high risk of damage to vehicles. These problems need an urgent resolution and we look forward to your response.

I would just like to add my name to those who have endorsed the recommendations made in your letter dated 14th December 2012 about parking in St Luke's.

I fully support the suggested parking controls within the St Luke's development (ref: APH/8406). I believe that more stringent parking controls in junctions and bends, would improve safety.

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
<p>St Luke's Square (continued) 91 properties 18 comments 20% response rate</p>	<p>'Lower' part of development (St Luke's Square) continued...</p> <p>I support the introduction of parking restrictions detailed in the attached drawing. My preference would be either "No Waiting at Any Time" or "No Waiting Mon-Sat 8.30-6pm". As a resident of St Luke's for nearly 10 years, I have witnessed the huge increase in 6th form students, shoppers and workers using St Luke's as their "free" parking area with no regard for residents, not to mention inconsiderate and dangerous parking. They seem undeterred despite our requests for them to desist using the Square for this purpose. The situation has reached a point now, where something constructive must be done. I appreciate that there are some residents further within the development who oppose this view. However, in my view, their decisions are not made in consideration of genuinely dangerous driving – which is clearly the main issue here. Wendy Bennett and Alan Waters representing the SLRA (St Luke's Residents Association) of which I am a member, have worked tirelessly to provide you with evidence of such dangerous and at times ridiculous parking. These offenders do it because they don't care who they affect by their actions and because they know they can get away with it – it is high time this is addressed. We are in a position now where action must be taken for the benefit of all and before a serious accident occurs. I look forward to seeing conclusion in this matter and the introduction of parking controls.</p>

I would be grateful if you could note my support for parking controls within St Luke's Square. I believe that the proposed introduction of yellow lines will improve the safety for all who drive into and out of St Luke's Square.
We live at 6 Eaton House, St Luke's Square and recently received the parking restriction proposals. We are in full agreement with the proposed areas of restrictions, however we would see a benefit for the residents if the restrictions could be limited to "No waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm" (rather than "No waiting at any time").
I agree with the proposals as set out in your letter and attached plan dated 14th December 2012. As a council your policy(ies) for public transport / cycle routes (etc) is abysmal. Give folk and alternative to the car.
I agree with the proposals as set out in your letter and attached plan dated 14th December 2012.

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Lower' part of development (St Luke's Square) continued...	
<p>St Luke's Square (continued) 91 properties 18 comments 20% response rate</p>	<p>As a resident of St Luke's Square for over three years, I fully support the introduction of such controls to help alleviate the number of workers, sixth form students and shoppers who use St Luke's Square as Guildford's unofficial free car park, causing a danger by often parking on blind corners and a nuisance to residents who are unable to park outside their own properties or have to squeeze past cars parked up on the kerbside. The situation at present is intolerable, and a remedy is long overdue. I agree that the areas of the Square identified for parking controls in the enclosed plan are the areas in need of controls, covering the key junctions and corners where the problem is at its worst. My preference would be to introduce 'No waiting Mon-Sat 8.30-6pm' restrictions, rather than 'No waiting at any times double yellow lines'. This would give residents the flexibility to park outside their properties overnight and on Sundays, when the parking problem tends to be at its lowest due to the lack of workers and sixth form students. However, if it is a choice between double yellow lines and the current status quo (i.e. no parking controls) I would be content with double yellow lines as, I have said, the current situation cannot be allowed to continue. I look forward to hearing the results of this latest consultation exercise, and I hope that Guildford's Local Committee will find in favour of introducing parking controls.</p>

I'd liked to express my general support for the latest controls proposed on 14 December. In particular, I think the double yellow lines in the vicinity of the junctions of the road leading around the square to St Catherine's Park will be of value. However, I also note that you have marked the Knightsbridge/Grosvenor House sides of the square (block paved roads) for double yellow lines. I don't think this is necessary. I haven't observed cars parked there, and it is probably too narrow to park anyway without causing a complete obstruction.

The Problem At certain times, there can be too many cars parked in and around the uncontrolled areas of the St Luke's development and this has given rise to safety concerns. It is first worth making the point that residents of the St Luke's Square blocks have access to their own numbered parking bay (typically but not exclusively one parking space per flat). This parking is not included in the GBC/SCC proposals; however, it is quite possible that a single flat has more than one car and any second car will likely need to be parked within the zone under consideration. I think it is important to understand who is parking in the uncontrolled areas and whether the profile is different at different times of the day or week. In this regard, it would seem appropriate to differentiate between a) weekday daytime parking and b) weekday evening/overnight parking and weekend anytime parking. During weekday evenings/overnights and all times at the weekend, parking pressures appear to be driven more by those with a connection to the residents, e.g. residents' visitors, residents' second cars which have been at a workplace during the working day. Conversely, during the weekday daytime, parking pressures are ostensibly due more to the use of parking spaces by non-residents. This begs the question: "is it right that this residential development should play host to town shoppers, local school sixth formers, tradesmen working on other developments, local office workers, commuters etc without financial impact or time restriction?" In this regard, a resident ought to be confident that they will have reasonable access to parking (either for a second car or a visitor's car) at all times and ahead of a non-resident.

The Solution An initial point to make is that a "Residents Only" parking sign was originally situated at the entrance to the development which seemed to serve, in part, to deter parking by non-residents; however, somewhat disappointingly, this signage has now been re-positioned at the entrances to each of the St Luke's blocks (beyond which, parking places are the resident-specific, numbered bays). A second point is that when I originally moved into my flat, attached to the kitchen pin board I found a plastic yellow visitors parking permit bearing the inscription "SLS" and it has remained pinned-up and untouched ever since. I'm not sure what I'm expected to have been doing with it and what rules I may have been unknowingly contravening by not using it; was it part of an abortive scheme and thus can I now throw it away? Regarding the GBC/SCC proposed actions, whilst I support additional double yellow lines from a safety point of view, I'm not convinced that on their own will serve to rectify the parking issue within the St Luke's development. Reducing the available parking as they will, this may serve to increase the competition for the remaining spaces. I therefore believe that of central importance is the need to restrict the number of vehicles which currently enjoy free and unfettered access to parking. This could be achieved by way of controls Mon-Sat 8.30am - 6pm and could take on a profile along the lines of: 1a) Limited Free Parking (e.g. 2 hrs with no return within 1 hr); OR 1b) Pay & Display Machines with the first hour or two free and then charges applying on an appropriate scale (so, someone could park for an extended period but at

financial cost); PLUS 2) Permit Parking. What types of permit could be available? Residents-only and free of charge? Residents-only but chargeable? Residents free of charge plus non-residents chargeable, residents and non-residents both chargeable? If a chargeable permit, what charge and for what duration - 6-monthly? annually? Further, would more permits be issued than parking spaces available? Presumably so, meaning a permit would represent access to any available space rather than exclusive reservation of a permanently available yet not necessarily permanently utilised space. I tend towards Pay & Display with the first two hours free and then charges applying; plus a non-transferrable, vehicle-specific residents-only permit with two expiry options of 6 months and a year. A small charge could be made for this to cover admin costs. Any resident's visitor(s) would be treated as any other non-permit holder and hence be expected to pay for parking via the pay & display route should they intend to stay for longer than 2 hours during Mon-Sat 8.30am - 6pm.

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Lower' part of development (St Luke's Square) continued...	
St Luke's Square (continued) 91 properties 18 comments 20% response rate	<p>I have always been opposed to double yellow lines, and stated so in the initial questionnaire - and in fact looking at the map of the draft proposal, the areas look quite extensive. Whilst I am against double yellow lines, I suggested single yellow lines, but only at the entrance to St Luke's - I do not necessarily think that they are warranted at the junctions. I very much hope that the plans to place double yellow lines does not go ahead.</p> <p>As a resident of Knightsbridge House I agree with the proposed changes to parking restrictions in the St Luke's Square vicinity</p>
St Thomas's Mews 8 properties 4 comments 50% response rate	<p>I agree with the proposals as set out in your letter and attached plan dated 14th December 2012. We think it is essential that: 1. vehicles leaving our Mews have a clear view of any oncoming cyclists or cars in St. Catherine's Park 2. emergency vehicles' access is no restricted by cars parked at the top of our Mews.</p> <p>I fully support your proposal which should stop the inconsiderate parking which continues to be an issue in our area - in St Thomas's Mews our recycling has not been collected for the last 2 weeks due to cars being parked either side of the cul-de-sac meaning that the vehicles have been unable to gain access to the close. Luckily there has been no need for an emergency vehicle over this time.</p>

	<p>I was extremely pleased to see this letter and the proposals contained therein. For a long time now the situation with parking from students from the Grammar School and people working in the town centre has caused the residents of St Luke's much inconvenience and distress. The parking is not only inconsiderate but extremely dangerous. I agree totally with the proposed measures for double yellow lines. I would however request that these go completely around St Luke's Square (on the map there are 2 areas not highlighted). Although these are by drop curbs and crossing areas people are already parking in front of them causing drivers coming into the estate to have to 'pull out' to go around them. This causes these drivers to approach the 'blind' bend on the wrong side of the road. Therefore please could it be considered for the double yellow lines to go completely around the Square.</p>
<p>'Lower' part of development (St Luke's Square) 125 properties 32 comments 26% response rate</p>	<p>I agree with the proposals as set out in your letter and attached plan dated 14th December 2012.</p>

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
<p>'Upper' part of development (St Luke's Park)</p>	
<p>Lancaster Avenue 52 properties 13 comments 25% response rate</p>	<p>I do sympathise with the residents (of St Luke's Square), as their area has become a free car park for people working in the high street and the students of the Grammar School. As a resident of Lancaster Avenue, we also experience this to some degree already and I can only assume that the situation will get worse if we are not considered in the proposal. In addition to this, those at St Luke's Square and St Luke's Park that only have access to one parking spaces are also going to be seeking out alternative parking, and guess where the obvious option is! Now, it doesn't take much to work out that Lancaster Avenue will be left with the problem that will then be brought to your attention and you will have to go through all this again! I live at the entrance of Lancaster Avenue and I am constantly asking people to re park their cars so that they are not obstructing the only entrance for such things as delivery vans and more importantly, Fire Engines. This only then means they end up parking on the paths so I have to use the road for my buggy but it's the lesser of two evils.</p>

	<p>Surely, I should have to put up with either. I don't have a solution that would be acceptable for everyone involved but, if you go ahead with the proposed double yellow lines, I would expect the whole site to be considered. I would also personally support double yellow lines on appropriate parts of Lancaster Avenue such as the entrance. A lot of the time I have great difficulty getting out of my drive due to parked cars! I don't know if it has been considered/tried or if feasible but, could a parking ticket of some description of 'notice of warning' be issued to cars that either obstruct the pavement or access for emergency vehicles? I assume you are not permitted to do either.</p>
	<p>I believe that if parking controls are implemented in the St Luke's Square development, then those people who choose to park there will simply relocate to Lancaster Avenue. Therefore I consider that a form of parking control should be implemented throughout the development. However, rather than ban parking outright throughout the day, the restriction should be limited to no parking from 7.00 am 9.00 am on weekdays which would prevent those working or commuting from parking the entire day, but would not prevent casual visitors from parking.</p>
	<p>In response to your letter about parking controls in St Luke's Square, I would just like to say that while I can see the need to control the parking the amount of restrictions you suggest seems excessive and will probably lead to the problem simply being moved further along. There should certainly be lines at the corners of St Luke's Square to prevent delivery lorries getting blocked but perhaps they could be single lines and don't need to be on both sides of the road.</p>

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Upper' part of development (St Luke's Park) continued...	
Lancaster Avenue (continued) 52 properties 13 comments 25% response rate	Our immediate worry is that the parking problem will be pushed into Lancaster Avenue. The cars parked by people not living at St. Luke's Square will start parking their cars in Lancaster Avenue. That is their right of course, but Lancaster Avenue already have a lot of cars parked on the road by its residents. We live in No. 11 Lancaster Avenue right on the corner to Sells Close and within a few meters from a junction. Cars are often parked right outside my house which is within 10 meters of a junction and the corner to Sells Close. It makes it difficult to get out of our drive as our view becomes restricted. Often cars are parked at the junction which restrict the traffic flow and makes it impossible for visitors to see the road sign <Sells Close - Lancaster Avenue >. If parking controls are introduced in St Luke's Square we would like to see it in Lancaster Avenue as well or at least if you could do something about the junction we mention above.
	Expressions such as 'sledgehammers to crack nuts' spring to mind with the draconian measures suggested for St Luke's Square parking problems. A simpler restriction such as no parking between 9.30 – 11.30 would discourage the inconsiderate day time parking, while residents could be issued parking permits to cover them for those times. To lay double yellow lines around the square seems an overkill that would only move the problem up to the next road and so on and so on. We hope that you will reconsider the plan before it is set in stone.
	I understand that the current proposals do not directly affect Lancaster Avenue. However, I wish to register my continuing opposition to any suggestion off parking controls being imposed on Lancaster Avenue either now or in the foreseeable future. The arguments I communicated by e-mail to Carolyn Anderson at Surrey County Council last year remain unchanged. I realise that the subject I am about to raise does not fall under Parking Services but I would appreciate it if you could forward a copy of this letter to whichever department (fo for that matter council) is responsible. In my e-mail to Ms Anderson I raised two subjects that I think are much more worthy of council attention and investment that all the "sound and fury signifying nothing" that has been kicked up over parking restrictions in St Luke's Square: 1. Junction safety at the intersection of Warren Road, Upper Edgeborough Road and Lancaster Avenue. 2. The possibility of a pedestrian crossing near the intersection of Epsom Road and the two parts of Edgeborough Road. As far as I am aware no further action had been taken on these issues. I wish to add a third issue. The recent snow has required the use of the salt held in the two salt boxes on Lancaster Avenue. I was horrified when I was reminded that these boxes and their contents were purchased by the St Luke's Park Residents Association. I am delighted that the Association did get involved, but why on earth is the council not responsible for this service? The mobile gritters do not venture down Lancaster Avenue or Sells Close so the boxes are the only way of keeping the steep slopes ice free. Given the doubtless huge council take for the St. Luke's Park development, it is outrageous that a microscopic fraction of that cannot be used to stock these boxes with salt. The only

personnel cost is dropping of salt off after the current supply has been used up. The actual spreading is done by the residents. If the money that has been spent on the parking saga had been spent on salt we would have enough to rival Siberia.

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Upper' part of development (St Luke's Park) continued...	
<p>Lancaster Avenue (continued) 52 properties 13 comments 25% response rate</p>	<p>As residents of St Luke's Park, we supported the majority view shared at the recent consultation that there should be no parking restrictions in the St Luke's Park part of the development. We are pleased to see that the Council have noted this in their current recommendations. We hope that the residents of St Luke's Square will still consider the distinct disadvantages of these proposed new restrictions. However, as long as the Council can be assured that it is a majority view of the St Luke's Square residents who want such restrictions, then it would not be appropriate for us in St Luke's Park to oppose these. It still however remains our view, and that of the majority of residents here in St Luke's Park, that even if restrictions are imposed in St Luke's Square we would not want to see similar here in St Luke's Park.</p> <p>We are indeed concerned with the potential spillover effect of the new St- Luke's Square parking controls in the St Luke's Park section. In fact it is hard to see how this could not result in a spillover effect. May we request that: a. the GBC re-assesses whether there has been such spillover effects within one year of the parking controls coming into effect at St Luke's Square b. if spillover effects are detected, that the GBC takes appropriate mitigation measures, such as re-opening the St Luke's Park Parking debate which had apparently been put on ice for a few years, or any other measures you deem appropriate to eradicate the spillover effect. The parking situation is already highly problematic at or near the vicinity of our house (43 Lancaster Ave) due to the absence of any parking controls whatsoever. We certainly do not need this overcrowding situation exacerbated by a parking spillover from down the road! How sad to see people having to push a loved one in a wheelchair or parents pushing prams using the main road given that the pavements are fully clogged up</p>

with vehicles jacked up with one tire on the road and one on the pavement. Refuse trucks can hardly get by at best of times in the narrow defile in front of our house when vehicles are parked on both sides; we'd hate to see a fire truck trying to get by. As for our own safety, our view as we proceed out of our drive is completely blocked 80% of the time by cars parked on the pavement immediately adjacent to our driveway.

We are totally opposed to this as the problem of excessive parking has abated since the completion of the Radisson Hotel as the contractors working on that project no longer visit this area.

I would like to object to the proposals that you are making in their entirety as I believe that much simpler, less draconian measures could be put in place to solve the (relatively minor) problem that a minority of the residents of the development are complaining about.

I would like to say that in my opinion any parking controls in the proposed area are likely to cause more problems than they resolve, please do not carry out any further parking restrictions in the area because I believe that any vehicles displaced will just move further into the surrounding roads. At times when most residents are at home there are very few extra parking spaces available for visitors and trades at present.

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Upper' part of development (St Luke's Park) continued...	
Lancaster Avenue (continued) 52 properties 13 comments 25% response rate	I am actually a resident at the end of Lancaster Avenue where the bollards are between there and the St Catherine's Park area. My preferred resolution would be to have 'no parking' restrictions yellow lines on one side of the road on St. Luke's & St Catherine's and leave the other side as it is. In that way there will be a better opportunity for deliveries etc without the draconian restrictions which will have a knock-on effect for residents of both communities. As per your letter it is the will of the residents of Lancaster Avenue to leave the situation as it is: i.e. no restrictions to parking. It is often easy to lose sight of the real objective of restrictions which is to make life both safe and pleasant for the residents of the area. In my opinion restrictions on just one side of the roads within the area of 'St. Luke's & St Catherine's would fulfil such an objective.

	<p>As a resident of Lancaster Avenue I would like to object to the proposed parking controls in the St. Luke's development. I believe they are excessive and should be revised. I am concerned that car parking will be unnecessarily displaced into Lancaster Avenue.</p>
<p>Newlands Crescent 12 properties 1 comments 8% response rate</p>	<p>I have no objection to the proposal to introduce double yellow lines at the critical points in St. Luke's Square, as indicated on the plan attached to your letter. I have a further suggestion for Warren Road. The section of the road adjacent to St. Luke's is currently designated as "no waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am to 6.00pm". I suggest that this restriction be extended to "no waiting at any time". I have experienced situations where parked vehicles on this section of the road have caused a problem for larger vehicles trying to get past, as the road here is not wide is bounded by high walls and hedges. I am also concerned about the mini roundabout at the junction of Warren Road, Lower Edgeborough Road and Lancaster Drive. Many drivers seem not to see the give way signs before the roundabout and proceed straight ahead across the roundabout at some speed. I have seen several near-accidents. The signage should be made more clear and the road markings more visible. This may not be your area of responsibility and if so please pass it on to your colleague responsible.</p>
<p>Sells Close 40 properties 7 comments 18% response rate</p>	<p>We write to express our wish that parking controls in the lower half of St Luke's Park ie around the square be as limited as possible. If huge restrictions are applied to this area it will impact not just on the rest of St Luke's Park but also into the main part of Charlotteville itself, which is already hugely overcrowded in terms of parking for the residents & visitors to the schools etc.</p> <p>I wanted to write to you and object to the parking controls you are once again suggesting. Whilst this may seem like a solution for St Luke's it will simply push all the people up the other end of the park where no controls are being suggested - none of which are wanted. As per the meeting earlier this year the parking in St Luke's square is better since the G Live complex has been finished and the builders are no longer there. I don't understand why people renting in St. Luke's square, who don't own the flats are causing us so many issues. Putting in parking controls would be an absolute nuisance - one which would probably prompt me to move home. Just to re-iterate - I fully object to any parking controls in the St Luke's development.</p>

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
'Upper' part of development (St Luke's Park) continued...	
Sells Close (continued) 40 properties 7 comments 18% response rate	Whilst I agree that on occasion St Luke's Square in particular can be busy, I have never thought changes to parking regulations would help. The square provides easy and safe parking for quite a few cars, many for residents in the evenings and for others during the day. I walk through almost every day to go to the station and it's very rare that I see anything that appears dangerous, restricts access or might be unfair to residents. My primary concern I that the introduction of controls, especially to the extent described, would simply push the parking 'hot spots' further south east into St Catherine's Park and restrict the amount of available parking overall. My recommendation is to introduce a very limited amount of double yellow lines only the corners that absolutely need it to enable reliable access. This is the west corner of the square where it meets the section by the steps. I hope you are able to establish a measured, effective and permanent closure to this. Having lived in St Luke's for some time, this is a topic that I think the vast majority of residents would like to put behind them.
	The proposed yellow lines will materially reduce the number of cars which can be parked on the road. In my view, this is not necessary. The standards you have used are no doubt suitable for roads with a lot of traffic, but St Luke's has very little traffic, all slow-moving, and none of it through traffic. You are in danger of taking a sledge-hammer to crack a nut!
	With regard to the proposals for Double White Lines in the St Luke's Square area, as the issue is primarily one of non-residents parking during the day time during the week and causing access and delivery problems, then wouldn't it be better to consider Single Yellow Lines so congestion is avoided during the day, but allows residents and their visitors easier parking during the evenings and at weekends ? It would seem a more practical solution than Double White lines which would cause problems for residents and visitors at all times.
	I am writing to strongly object to the parking changes that are being proposed in the St Luke's development. I feel that they will not work and all the signs and yellow lines will make the area look ugly and detract from the classy feel the place has.
	As a resident of St. Luke's in Guildford I would like to oppose the proposed painting of the double yellow lines. The main reason for this is that they will cause displacement parking into other roads on the estate. The planned double lines will extend too far and cause a considerable reduction in available parking spaces.
'Upper' part of development (St Luke's Park) 104 properties	

21 comments
20% response rate

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Page 87

Road	Comments
<p>Residents' groups / management companies 3 organisations 3 comments 100% response rate</p>	<p>I have left it until the end of the consultation period before responding to your further consultation document in my capacity as chair of the St. Luke's Park Residents Association (SLPRA), in order to gain as much feedback as possible from our residents. As you may recall, the SLPRA represents the residents of Lancaster Avenue, Newlands Crescent and Sells Close in Guildford, originally called 'St. Luke's Park' by the developer Crest Nicholson. Some 104 households in all. We would like to object to the proposed parking controls in St. Luke's Square and St. Catherine's Park as detailed in the consultation document you sent out on 14th December 2012. We feel that the extent of the proposals is grossly excessive for the parking 'problem' that you are trying to cure. In order to clarify exactly what the problem is, I have spoken to Wendy Bennett of St. Bartholomew's Court, who is leading the campaign to have these parking controls introduced in the Square, on several occasions and also heard her speak at the meeting of the Guildford Local Committee of the Surrey County Council in June (which you were not able to attend). I have spoken to Kevin McKee in GBC Parking Services and also to Stephen Anderton who chairs the management company representing the interests of the owners of the flats in three of the blocks in the Square. In many respects Stephen doesn't represent the residents because 95% of these flats are let to tenants. I have spoken to a small number of residents of the St. Luke's Square part of the St. Luke's development and to many of our residents in the St. Luke's Park part. The 'problem' seems to be occasional (approximately every two weeks) difficulties that delivery lorries have, negotiating their way between parked cars and a series of bollards on the bend in the road on the west corner of the Square. Apart from 'no parking at any time' double yellow lines on both sides of the road on this corner you have proposed a large number of double yellow lines in other parts of the St. Luke's Square half of the St. Luke's development, including along St. Catherine's Park. I have never heard of anyone complaining about parking in these areas. It is this sort of 'overkill' that we were concerned about if parking controls were ever introduced on our roads. You may ask what it has to do with us in St. Luke's Park if the residents of St. Luke's Square want to fill their area with double yellow lines? Well, we are concerned that the excessive extent of the lines you propose will displace far more cars than just those that park on the inside edge of that one corner in the Square. They will most likely be displaced into our roads in St. Luke's</p>

Park, mainly Lancaster Avenue & Newlands Crescent, which are closest to the St. Luke's Square part, and are (so far) uncontrolled. It is not just non-resident parkers who may be displaced. As the vast majority of the flats in the Square have only one allocated parking space, those flat tenants who have two cars in their household or who have visitors may well have to park their cars in our part of the development if your proposed parking controls are fully implemented. This will create an unnecessary increase in parking in our area and could well give rise to those of our residents with enough off-road parking of their own to call for parking controls in here, regardless of the effect on their neighbours who don't have enough off-road space for all their cars. Unlike the St. Luke's Square part, which is filled with flats and small, two bedroomed houses, almost all of the houses here have four or five bedrooms, and many residents have teenage children with their own cars. These all need parking places on our roads and the displaced parking from St. Luke's Square and St. Catherine's Park would reduce the quality of life of our residents, who are all Guildford Borough Council tax payers and voters in local government elections. Surely a more phased approach to the problem would be more sensible? I know that there is a four year cycle in parking reviews but to use this as a reason to go in 'all guns blazing' with excessive controls now, just in case they are found to be inadequate, is too much of a 'kill or cure' approach to the problem. Could you not initially try just single yellow lines on the inside edge of that one problem corner? You could even make the sides of the Square one-way so that there is no worry about allowing for two way traffic, reducing the perceived necessity for lines on both sides of the road. I realise that this would mean involving Surrey County Council Highways in the solution, but it is still better than just painting lots of double yellow lines all over the place. The extra wide sections of pavement with bollards might have to be adjusted to allow lorries to move around the northeast and southeast sides of the Square, but this would give more flexibility to the flow of such vehicles. In the fourth paragraph of your letter you say 'In the vast majority of cases, controls are only suggested on the bell-mouth side of the junction to protect site lines, by preventing parking in close proximity,'. Looking at the plan, it seems that the proposed lines go unnecessarily far away from the curved edge of the road at the corners. You have only to look at how far the existing double yellow lines go along a virtually straight piece of kerb on the west side of the bell mouth entrance to the estate in from Warren Road to see what happens when the yellow paint tin comes out. I commented about this at the Guildford Local Committee meeting in June, suggesting that they be reduced in length from the 54ft/16.5m existing length in this current parking review to allow a few more cars to park there (safely). As regards sight lines needing to be protected, the estate is a cul-de-sac so there is very little traffic. I am sure it is rare to meet a car coming in the other direction, as is the case in our (also cul-de-sac) part of the estate. Traffic speeds are slow and residents all know that the junctions should be approached slowly and with care. Consequently there is no real need to take up existing car parking spaces by extending the yellow lines away from the curved part of the kerb. As many of the inconsiderate parkers that some residents of the Square are complaining about are commuters or RGS sixth formers who park there in the day time, when many of the residents have taken their cars to work, you could initially try two hour parking only between 8:30am and 6pm instead of no parking at any time. This would allow visitors of residents to park but stop those all-day parkers as well as the builders vans that park there when there is a major construction project going on in the town. One of the Square residents reports seeing a bus coming to collect building workers

who have all parked their vans in the Square in the morning, then returning them after work at the end of the afternoon. I am not suggesting that these two hour controls be placed on areas other than those in your plan, but instead of the proposed double yellow lines, and again on a much smaller area than that which you propose. Another solution to the 'problem' corner is to remove the bollards that protect the heavily cobbled part of the extra wide pavement the builders of the estate put in (for some unknown reason) at the Southwest end of the parking bay outside the flats in the Square. There are seven such large areas of extra wide pavement with bollards around the Square and on one side of the junction of St. Catherine's Park and St. Bartholomew's Court. There were originally 29 such bollards installed by the developer, Crest Nicholson, but six of them have so far been removed. The pavement in these areas is 14.5ft/4.4m wide, including 8.2ft/2.5m of more heavily cobbled extension into the roadway, with bollards on the edge. Cars could safely park on these cobbled sections without getting in the way of pedestrians. Doing this and just placing a short single yellow line on the inside edge of the western corner of the Square, not extending to any of the straight edges, would go a long way to solving the delivery lorry access problem that some of the residents are complaining about. May I suggest you go onto Google Maps on the internet and put in the GU1 3JX postcode of the Square. Then go onto the satellite view which gives a good plan view of the roads and the length of the extra wide sections of pavement. You can also see how few cars are parked on the roads at the time (in 2013) that the satellite went over. Going to street view and moving around the estate gives an even better picture of a typical day in St. Luke's Square. From these images you can clearly see how the situation could be improved by simply removing the bollards. I should point out that the St. Luke's Square part of the development only had a 39% response in your survey last year, and only 73% strongly agreed with (limited) parking controls and 10% 'tended' to agree. That is, just 32% of all the residents in the St. Luke's Square part of the St. Luke's Development wanting controls. There is a possibility that the other 68% don't want controls, but some of them have not responded to (or received) your survey. Please listen to what we are saying and reconsider the extent and severity of the controls that you are proposing.

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
<p>Residents' groups / management companies (continued) 3 organisations 3 comments 100% response rate</p>	<p>During the consultation period SLRA has been encouraging the 120 households within the association to respond to your letter and comment individually on the proposals to put yellow lines in place in and around St Luke's Square - in order to address the issues of health and safety and access. We hope that our endeavours have resulted in a good and positive response. As a group, we continue to endorse what we feel is the majority vote from households at this end of the estate - that the inclusion of double yellow lines, especially at the SW corner of The Square, on both sides of the road leading to Bloomsbury Court and the opposite 90 degree corner, should be put in place. By also extending the double lines at the entrance to the Square, and putting in place double lines at the T junctions to St Bartholomew's Court and St Thomas's Mews, we feel would also add to the safety of vehicles moving round the estate and prevent motorists from parking on the pavements at these junctions which is becoming common practise. I understand a number of residents feel that single lines in some straight parts (opposite Eaton House and Cadogan House) would afford residents and their visitors the opportunity to park at weekends and during the evenings when the parking situation here is not so acute, and we are sympathetic to these views. In an ideal world, if some kind of "timed" parking areas could be put in place in conjunction with yellow lines, to deter long stay visitors, this might also help towards a solution. In general though, the feedback we are getting from residents is that if there is no alternative to the plan as laid out in your letter of 14 December then we endorse these proposals.</p>
<p>Residents' groups / management companies (continued) 3 organisations 3 comments 100% response rate</p>	<p>Thank you for inviting our views on behalf of the owners at Cadogan, Knightsbridge and Grosvenor Houses. The great majority, as you are aware, are non-resident, but they have a long term and pro-active interest in maintaining a high quality of life at St Luke's Square. In principle we support the proposed Parking Controls, as laid out in your note of 14 Dec 12. In particular we support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Double yellow lines for all junctions in the areas you propose, particularly the 'bell mouth' junction and around the majority of the central square garden area o Leaving the lay-bys in front of our three blocks with no restrictions o Not introducing any form of 'Residents Only' or 'Pay by Meter' regimes in the Square o However, we believe you should consider extending the double yellow lines to include both sides of the entrance road into the Square from Warren Road. Lines only on one side, as you propose, could lead to parking on the opposite side, so simply transferring the parking from one side to the other and still restricting access by emergency and refuse vehicles. <p>The bollards on the deliberately wide pavement areas around the Square ensure that cars don't park illegally there. However, several bollards outside both Knightsbridge and Cadogan House have been knocked over by delivery vans and although the damage to the pavement has been 'made good' by (I assume Surrey CC) these bollards have not been replaced. However, several similar bollards outside Eaton House on the south side of the Square have been replaced when damaged. In order to ensure the</p>

pavements outside Cadogan and Knightsbridge Houses remain free from 'aggressive parking', once your controls are introduced, we believe you should ensure that Surrey CC reinstates these 'lost bollards' – there are 4 or 5 – as part of a complete solution to this parking issue. Our only other concern is that of "unintended consequences" here and having those still aggressively seeking 'free parking' to illegally use the private parking bays behind our blocks, particularly Cadogan House.

ST LUKE'S AREA - FURTHER INFORMAL CONSULTATION RESPONSES SUMMARY (DEC 12 - JAN 13)

Road	Comments
<p>No address 3 comments</p>	<p>I'd like to take this opportunity to say that my partner and I are strongly opposed to this. One of the reasons we chose to live on St Luke's was the ease of parking and we pay a premium to have the benefit of such parking, which is threatened to be taken away. Parking around the square (communal garden area) is not a problem at all, it poses no obstruction or safety issues. The only obstruction comes when people park in the entrances / side roads which lead to the private parking areas at the back of the block of flats. I believe this issue to be a waste of time and money and would be glad to see an end to it with no action needed to be taken.</p> <p>As a St Luke's resident I am concerned that the proposals seem to be overly restrictive for achieving the aims the original complainants had raised. It is my understanding that occasionally some delivery vehicles are unable to pass on the SW quadrant of the square due to the habitual parking of residents and non-residents alike. This formed the basis of the original complaint. I was present at the Council/Borough Meeting in Womersley on the 13 of June where the original complainant expressed this as her primary concern to the Committee. Your proposals, at a stroke, reduce the un-intrusive and completely legal parking in this area by a substantial percentage. Further the parking control that you propose (No Waiting At Any Time) seems disproportionate to the aim it trying to achieve i.e. creating space for the occasional delivery vehicles to pass. It is interesting to note that at the NW quadrant medium sized delivery vehicles cannot negotiate the corner due to the physical geometry of the road [in this instance parking restrictions are irrelevant!] A large number of residents have only one parking space allocated yet many have more than one vehicle, this will create a substantial problem for us all. Given that you have a variety of parking restrictions at your disposal I wonder if the use of a Single Yellow Line on the SW quadrant only would be more appropriate? It would prevent the</p>

problematic parking that the complainant highlighted at the meeting in June, yet continues to provide the flexibility of use of available space that the residents need. If this approach still fails to manage the parking to a satisfactory degree then the issue can always be revisited. I am guessing that painting a few more lines is easier to do than removing them! I urge that you reconsider your proposal by using a Single Yellow Line only on the SW quadrant of the square.

I am a resident of St Luke's Park. I have a concern that the proposed parking controls in St Luke's Square will result in transferring any problems associated with non residents opportunistic parking to St Luke's Park. Consequently I am against the proposed parking controls in St Luke's Square.

**Overall Total
232 properties /
organisations
59 comments
25% response rate**