

ITEM 7 : ANNEXE 6 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Summary of Representations

Total representations – 97 (including 2 petitions)

Cranley Road schools area – 42 representations (including a 123-signature petition)

Dene Road area – 10 representations

Rivermount Gardens – 5 representations (one of which also refers to the proposals outside Bury Fields Clinic)

St Luke's Square – 26 representations

Other – Abbot Road – 1 representations

Other – Cline Road – 2 representations

Other – Curling Vale - 2 representations

Other – Joseph's Road - 1 representations

Page 47 Other – Margaret Road – 1 representation

Other – Walnut Tree Close – 3 representation (including a 37-signature petition)

Other – Warren Road - 4 representations

Proposals where no representations were received:

Addison Road, Artillery Road, Artillery Terrace, Clifford Manor Road, College Road, Eagle Road, Falcon Road, Finch Road, Friars Gate, High Street (Ripley), Iveagh Road, Madrid Road, Mareschal Road, Markenfield Road, North Street, Onslow Street, Pewley Way, Poltimore Road, Queens Road, Recreation Road, Springfield Road, Stoughton Road, Thorn Bank and Wodeland Avenue.

ITEM 7: ANNEXE 6.1 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

ITEM 7

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
	<p>Cranley Road schools (Cranley Rd, Aldersey Rd, Hillier Rd, Maori Rd, Pit Farm Rd)</p>	<p>(36 representations including a 123-signature petition)</p>
<p>9728</p>	<p>We are writing to object to one of the proposed amendments in relation to Hillier Road. We are resident at 7 Hillier Road. We are writing to object to the proposal to change the spaces outside numbers 10-12 Hillier Road from 4 hour spaces to unrestricted spaces.</p> <p>Having lived in this road for 15 years, we are aware that the unrestricted spaces in our road typically fill up by 8:30am with people parking for the whole day either to go to Tormead School (staff/older students with their own cars) or to commute/work in the town. Except during school holiday periods, such spaces are therefore of little benefit to the local residents of the road.</p> <p>At present the 4 hour spaces outside numbers 10-12 are well used by parents dropping off/collecting from Tormead School, by visitors to the Tennis Club on the road, by dog walkers, postal vans, delivery vans and by other visitors and tradespeople working at local properties. If the spaces are filled by commuters there will be nowhere for these people to go.</p> <p>We appreciate that some of the unrestricted spaces at the other end of the road will, it is proposed, be amended to 2 hour spaces. This is a good idea which we support and it will</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

	<p>be helpful for the school parents and visitors. However for the visitors to local residents and the tennis club, 2 hours is often not enough time. In any event that end of the road is a four way junction and becomes a danger zone at drop off and pick up time as cars and coaches come from all directions. Many parents drive up onto the pavements to squeeze through. It would therefore be helpful to retain the 4 hour spaces at numbers 10-12 in addition to having a 2 hour zone outside the school. That way some of the parents can continue to use the quieter end of the road in a safe manner as they already do at the moment.</p> <p>In summary, we are not sure there is any need to have the spaces as unrestricted spaces as it will just serve to support numerous all day commuters parking here and preventing our end of the road from being accessed by parents and visitors during the day; whereas there is a need to have some spaces in each part of the road where people have a chance of being able to park during the day if they arrive after 8:30am.</p>	
9798	<p>My neighbour, Graham Ellwood, suggested that I contact you regarding the proposals for changes to on-street parking specifically in and around Hillier Road. It is appreciated that the Council recognises that there are parking issues that need to be resolved.</p> <p>I grew up in a house at the top of Hillier Road (Lynwood) since the early 70s and my mother still lives there. I am also a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club having joined as a junior in 1976. I'm sure that you are aware that Pit Farm Tennis Club has been a proud part of our Guildford heritage for over a century.</p> <p>I would like to explain why I believe that the swapping of unrestricted parking slots outside the school with 4-hour limited</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

slots further up the road would be an excellent way to relieve some of the congestion at school drop-off and pick-up time. However, the changing of the 4-hour slots to be 2-hour slots will make no difference at all to the school congestion but will have the undesired effect of damaging Pit Farm Tennis Club leading to its potential closure. I know that this could sound unnecessarily shocking but please bear with me.

During weekdays in private school term time, all of the unrestricted parking in the vicinity of my mother's house is taken by Tormead School teachers and older pupils. Tormead School used to have its own parking for the teachers but have built on their parking land. I have observed this since I attended Lanesborough school during the 70s through to 1980 and it now seems that Tormead School are further extending their buildings and thereby removing further parking provision for their employees.

For the entire period of advertising the proposals, Tormead School will be in Summer recess so it won't be possible to see the problem as it exists until after the holidays. The teachers and older pupils from Tormead will continue to use the unrestricted spaces wherever they are moved and the change from 4 hour to 2 hour limits will not affect this but, as I have already written above, I believe that moving the spaces is a good proposal that would ease the congestion at busy school times.

Changing the limited parking spaces from 4 hours to 2 hours will have no effect on the school busy-time congestion but, with the unrestricted spaces all being taken up all weekdays as I have explained, only the limited spaces are available to those visiting the tennis club and residents and 2 hours is insufficient for tennis, bearing in mind that a typical tennis visit would include some social chat before and after the exercise and could

	<p>include refreshments and perhaps a shower. Without sufficient parking time, existing and potential members will look move elsewhere and membership numbers will start to drop leading to the inescapable conclusion that the club would close. Those that would also be affected includes retired members where they have weekday exercise and social sessions, and members that are no longer able to play but enjoy those sessions for much needed social contact.</p> <p>Can I therefore please request that you do not pursue the reduction of 4-hours to 2-hours in the vicinity of Hillier Road.</p> <p>Please forgive the format of my approach. I am unfamiliar with the processes of responding to such proposals and whether it's appropriate for me to make alternative suggestions. I would like to make a brief suggestion and that is simply to limit all of the parking in the area to 30 minutes before 10.30am on weekdays only. That would free up spaces for those visiting residents, the tennis club as well as the school. It would also stop commuter parking and so would lead to employment businesses such as Tormead School making parking provisions of its own. Finally, parking would surely be cheaper to administer since warden attendance would be limited to the first couple of hours during the week.</p>	
9801	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/parkingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from the Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools

	and other residences.	
9802	<p>Thank you for your time this morning to discuss the proposed changes to the parking restrictions around the vicinity of Pit Farm Tennis Club and the likely impact on the members of the club with Steve Knight, the Club Chairman and myself.</p> <p>We did propose the minor adjustments to the current proposal with the alternatives of either dropping the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots as they are now or to trade off some of the all day slots for additional four hour slots in Hillier Road which could free up some space for our members and others provided that these zones are adequately enforced to avoid all day parking. It would be extremely helpful to our members if these small adjustments to the plan can be made.</p> <p>Our written submission which you already have covers the reasons for proposing this adjustment and we think you can appreciate the potential impact of the original proposal on the Club's members. We do also expect that a large number of our members will be making written representations ahead of the 9th August and we trust that their views will be given due weight when the issues are considered.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>
9803	<p>We are responding to the proposals for the above. As mentioned to you, we request a face-to-face meeting with the Parking Team to discuss the issues and possible options from the perspective of our members and players. We represent 600 stakeholder members (of which 245 are juniors from age 5 up to 18) and have a responsibility to all.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting..</p>

Background

Pit Farm Tennis Club has existed for more than 100 years. Our six all weather courts are heavily used though the day by adult groups of all ages and by the junior members. We have no onsite parking and are totally dependent on street parking for members and spectator access. The club, unlike many tennis clubs, is thriving with a very strong take up of junior places which we are encouraging as part of the Olympic Legacy with our exceptional coaching programmes. We also host a prestigious LTA sponsored Open Junior Competition (which is being run this week) attracting high calibre players from across the South of England. In short, we have a very active and thriving club at present and we want to protect that for future generations.

Current Parking

Difficulties in parking reasonably near to the club have been steadily increasing over recent years especially during the morning period from about 9 a.m. until lunchtime. During the school term time all of the “all day” parking and most of the four hour slots near the club in Hillier Road and Cranley Road are already taken and blocked for the morning if not the day mostly by teachers, staff and sixth formers from Tormead whose own parking facilities are greatly reduced by buildings on their car park area. There is also displacement parking spilling out from the offices nearer to town unable to park along Cranley Road.

Level of Activity

We have all courts in use most mornings with doubles matches – i.e. 24 players all arriving individually although those that can come on foot or cycle do so. We have a Mens’ Morning on

Wednesday on some of the courts lasting the whole morning (we regularly get 16-18 active and fit older members playing) whilst other doubles take place on the remaining courts. Similarly we have active Club Sessions on Saturday and Sunday afternoons when we often have 36-40 members coming to play and to socialise – a key element of the club. On weekday afternoons, we have extensive junior coaching with many parents coming along to watch. Mostly these parents are not immediately local and will use their car to visit the club and need access to parking.

We have a large number of teams at all levels competing in the National, Surrey and Chaucer Leagues up to Veteran ages and visiting teams need to be able to park within reach of the club for the duration of the match and lunch – usually at least four hours.

Current Proposals – likely impact

The new “2-hour” parking proposals, as currently tabled, will damage the immediate and long term viability of the club. Our members will be unable to use these as the vast majority of games run on beyond two hours allowing for changing, showers and the essential social interaction which is at the heart of the club. As explained above, the All Day parking areas are rarely of use to us as they are taken in full before 9.00 a.m. Existing displacement parking already reduces options in other nearby (and not so nearby) streets.

We do understand the conflicting priorities and requirements of the schools, parents and other groups. It would be helpful to understand how the two hour slots will resolve any problems given that they will not affect the morning drop off or afternoon pick-up times. The underlying issue is that there are too many parents looking for a finite number of parking slots for just a half hour period at the start and end of the school day.

	<p>Suggested Changes</p> <p>We feel that some small changes to the proposals could minimise the impact on the club. Firstly, to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. Secondly to trade off some of the all day slots for additional four hour slots in Hillier Road which could free up some space for our members and others provided that these zones are adequately enforced to avoid all day parking.</p>	
<p>Page 56</p> <p>9804</p>	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.</p> <p>Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.</p> <p>My family attends the club approximately 3 times a week and it is so encouraging to see our children dedicating themselves and</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

	<p>progressing in such a great sport. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.</p>	
9805	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/parkingformaladvertisement as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two-hour slots at the expense of some four-hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.

I would like to sincerely object to the proposed local changes to parking in our area. Specifically I am talking about the change from 4 hour to 2 hour bays in Cranley Road, Aldersey Road and Hillier Road. It is stated this is *'Following previous concerns about the lack of short-stay parking in the vicinity of the schools'* and *'we propose to change the period of waiting in the limited waiting spaces closest to the schools from 4 hours to 2 hours, again to increase the likelihood of the spaces being available, particularly at the end of the school day'*.

I think that to inconvenience local residents in favour of a private venture such as these schools is not a sensible approach to local community parking. The local residents should be put first, and if our visitors can no longer use spaces for suitable lengths of visits in order to benefit the private schools then this is a sorry state of affairs. Why should our visitors have to either only stay for 2 hours or dash out and move their vehicles, just so that a business can find suitable parking for its clients is ridiculous. Let the schools sort the issues out themselves.

Years ago I wrote to Tormead School suggesting they had an internal drive put in to allow drop offs, and although this was soundly rejected by the then headmistress, this is precisely what is happening. Why therefore are we not waiting to see how this works out before taking measures in the neighbourhood for the schools convenience and the residents inconvenience?

Not long ago the whole area was not parking restricted, and has had to be included in the town parking schemes because of restrictions elsewhere pushing parking out to this area – that was possibly a necessary step, but a not small inconvenience and a change to our lifestyles as it is. Now to be forced into further inconvenience for the benefit of private businesses, all be they

Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.

	schools, in my view is not taking the interests of the local community at all.	
9815	<p>My sons and my family are regular users of Pit Farm Tennis Club and I do have major concerns about the proposed parking changes on Hillier Road. Please can you reassure me and other members of the club that we will be able to continue to park on the road directly outside the club. We would prefer not to see 2-hour parking bays introduced at all, as that would have major implications for the way that many of our members use the club. Please note that what we also foresee is that, whilst 4-hour parking bays will remain just outside our club; we will see these more regularly used by non-club users, as they will be displaced away from the 2-hour bays elsewhere in Hillier Road and adjacent road. I trust you will understand our concerns.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>
9816	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

of the school day.

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.

Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.

I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.

9819

	<p>I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.</p>	
	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.</p> <p>Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.</p> <p>Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

	<p>establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.</p>	
9820	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.

9830	<p>I am a long term member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by these proposed changes. I understand very well the need to control the congestion and parking in this part of town at peak times and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking at school drop off and pick up times. However, these changes will unfavourably affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited effect in solving the congestion at the start and end of the school day. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem much worse.</p> <p>These changes in the parking restrictions (Hillier Road) will impact on the club at all times, any changes that make it harder for the members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and will affect its future (the club has been in the area for well over 100 years). Unlike the schools in the area the Club does not have any on site parking.</p> <p>I would like to make the following two step proposal;</p> <p>Retain the parking restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are today or abandon the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots but change some of the all day slots to additional four hour slots in Hiller Road. This would benefit our members and parents accessing the schools in the area.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>
9833	<p>I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes. Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour</p>

9835

	<p>slots will make the problem worse not better.</p> <p>Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.</p> <p>I would request that you retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are.</p>	<p>limited waiting.</p>
	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.</p> <p>Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

	<p>better.</p> <p>Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.</p>	
9836	<p>My sons are club members of Pitfarm Tennis Club. I've received this email from the club about the school runs parking problem that the the local residents experience. I am empathetic to the local residents as well as the school and the club. And the council must have received complaints and is under pressure to deal with the problem. My empathy leads me to write this response to you.</p> <p>I have experienced this very same problem with the school round</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

the corner from my house, the school which my children attend. School runs created parking problems to the local residents and people like myself walking to school with young kids.

My view is that the problem of school runs clears within the hour and only happens at drop of and pick up time during term time. So by shortening the parking hour even to one hour would not solve this problem. This will only become a new problem for the local residents and their visitors, and the club members.

My local school tackles this problem by allowing parents to drive through dropping off at the gate in the morning. The kids are then brought into school playgrounds by their staff and the parents do not get off the car. The other schemes are that the school encourages parents to park and stride, or bringing their children in with car share schemes. The council also kindly assigned some police officers around to check the parking situation at school runs hour in a few occasions.

If school runs parking problem is what needs to be dealt with here, I believe a good communication between the school and the parents of the children from the school, is essential. The multiple tactics that my children's school has employed, in my opinion, have gained positive results to school runs parking problem.

I hope by sharing my experience here, will help the locals and relieve the stress of parents in finding a space for their cars during school runs. It is not a perfect strategy for the school as it requires the school to make a little effort to ensure their children safety after the parents dropping off their kids. However, an effort to be a good neighbour for the surrounding local residents, and to set up a good example for kids, learning to accommodate others, is as important a skill as an education.

<p>Page 70</p> <p>9837</p>	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisement as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.</p> <p>Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.</p> <p>Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

	<p>sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.</p>	
9838	<p>I am writing to you to request that the parking restrictions in around Hillier Road do not get changed from 4 hour parking. 4 hours is really important for Pit Farm tennis club - anything less will mean tennis players having to move there car part way through a tennis match. Sport is an part of Guildford's make up and Pitt Farm Club makes an important contribution to tennis in Surrey.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>
9840	<p>I am putting my name to the list of those objecting to the implementation of 2hour parking bays around Pit Farm for all the reasons succinctly described in the letter I received recently. Please re-consider.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">9841</p>	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisement as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.</p> <p>Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.</p> <p>Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

	<p>sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.</p>	
9842	<p>I wish to add strong support to the Club members of Pit Farm in asking can you please consider the future of this quite outstanding Club in matters of local parking.</p> <p>I have been a member since the 1980's and am still playing and am a very strong supporter of all sports being played, especially by children, as they are all such excellent character building, healthy, enjoyable activities. This club is particularly strong and caring in promoting Junior tennis and we have just hosted one of the big Junior Tournaments to encourage beginners and advanced players alike. Please think about this unique situation when you consider your parking changes.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.

I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.

9844

	<p>I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.</p>	
	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.</p> <p>Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.</p> <p>Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

	<p>establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.</p>	
9845	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.

9846	<p>On arriving at the tennis club this morning and managing to park directly outside, I was advised by our Club Captain that there could be changes to the parking hours in the street from four hours to two. Why is this necessary? Surely, Hillier Street is mainly used for parking by the tennis club, and at times, by parents with children at the local school. Sometimes during the day, I have noticed very little parking in the street and it seems very quiet.</p> <p>We tend to play tennis for about one and a half hours and then go into the club for some socialising (which can go well past the two-hour limit) and I know that tennis matches take up to at least four hours to complete. This reduction in parking hours could be so detrimental to our club which is proving to be a highly successful one. It's just a pity that we don't have our own parking facilities, as does Merrow Tennis Club.</p> <p>I do hope that the parking hours, in Hillier Street at least, can stay as they are so that the tennis club can continue to thrive, and so that we tennis players can play without worrying about returning to our cars within the two-hour limit.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting..</p>
9847	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.

I am concerned about the proposal to amend the parking arrangements in and around Hillier Road and specifically the proposal to reduce the four hour slots to two hour slots. Whilst I appreciate the parking problems in the area, any changes to reduce the length of time that a vehicle can be parked will have a profound effect on Pit Farm Tennis Club. The club is to a large extent reliant on on-street parking.

Reducing the period a vehicle can be parked will make it very difficult for the club to operate in the same way as at present. The club whilst offering a sporting facility it is also important in providing a social outlet for its members. There are several activities that require more than two hours.

Matches against visiting teams. These require four sets or more to be played. It is very unlikely these can be completed in less than two hours. It is also customary to entertain the visiting teams after the match requiring anything up to and in excess of four hours. Some matches not only attract the players but also spectators.

Saturday afternoon club sessions for members to come and play and socialise is attended by most in excess of two hours and for some the time extends beyond 6pm when parking restrictions do not apply. There are also mid week join in sessions which extend beyond two hours.

Competitions at the club such as finals days attract players and spectators for a full afternoon. It is important to provide adequate time for the matches to be played and the social aspects to be enjoyed.

The annual junior tournament which is run from Monday to

Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.

	<p>Saturday requires that competitors, organisers, helpers and spectators are at the club for more than two hours. Normal friendly play and socialising extend beyond two hours.</p> <p>I fear that if the new restrictions are imposed the operations of the club will be severely affected. The effective restriction of access will mean that the club will be unlikely to provide what members expect. This will very probably lead to a reduction in the membership and a loss of income with the effect of making the club non-viable both financially and as a facility for members. In a worse case scenario it may mean the closure of the club. In summary I feel that we should help preserve and not prejudice what is and has been an important sporting and social outlet available to the residents of the borough for over one hundred years.</p>	
9850	<p>I refer to the proposals to alter the parking restrictions in and around Cranley / Hillier Road and wish to record my objections. I do so as a resident of a nearby community, as a frequent pedestrian in the impacted area and as a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club. With regard to the latter I am aware that the club has submitted their objections, which I endorse and have added my signature to the list of objectors. The following are a few personal grounds for objection.</p> <p>1. The literature attached to the formal notice states in the third paragraph that " <i>The reason for proposing to swap some of the free parking is to increase the likely hood of spaces closest to the school being available for parents during dropping off and picking up</i>". Whilst this may initially seem a reasonable proposition, the reality is that parents will linger in their cars longer than on an official drop-off or pick-up zone. Human nature being what it is, they will note that the limit is 2 hours and will</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

utilise as much as they feel is their right. Pick-up would seem to have the greatest probability of linger as parents must arrive with time to spare, whereas drop-off should be a virtually zero time activity.

2. The Statutory Notice makes no attempt to numerate the scale of the problem. There will always be some issue at any school. Has Tormead School reached a critical point where safety is an issue? If so that must be justified to the community in the same manner that, for instance, providing a new pedestrian crossing requires. Can the existing parking restrictions be proved to a recognised probability level to be "unsafe" or are they just causing "untidy" parking?

3. No mention has been made of neighbours objections to existing arrangements.

4. The availability of the 2-hour spaces also assumes that Tormead Scholl teachers will not already have parked in them well before 8:30am. Current habits would seem to suggest they will use the spaces

5. The perceived problem of drop-off and pick-up is a problem caused by Tormead School and they must play their part in providing a solution. Other schools in the area of similar size , such as St Peter's Catholic Comprehensive, George Abbott Comprehensive and Guildford High School have made provision for drive through drop-off / pick-up and administer accordingly. Why should Tormead School be allowed to take a different approach?

6. The current and proposed restriction refer to Permit Holder Parking Places. It would seem to the casual observer that houses in the vicinity of Cranley / Hillier Road have ample off-road

parking. The existence of such permits places in jeopardy any assumptions your office may have on the availability of drop-off / pick-up parking.

7. The proposals will have a disproportional impact on the sporting activities of the local and wider community and run counter to the initiatives of your Parks and Countryside Service department. Pit Farm Tennis Club has played a significant part in such initiatives over many years with junior coaching and junior tournaments. Only two weeks ago 140 of the finest U12 to U18 from the south-east participated in a week long tournament.

Many of the parents and players complimented the club on providing such a tournament. The proposed parking restrictions will threaten the viability of the tournament if parents cannot park for up to four hours. They will also threaten the viability of the actual club, for who wishes to join a club with parking time out of proportion to the length of the activity?

8. Given that drop-off / pick-up at Tornead School is only an issue Monday to Friday, why is it that parking restrictions exist weekends? There is no industry, commerce or religious facility near by, and Guildford Park And Ride schemes are extremely successful weekends. At the very least all restrictions should be removed in the Cranley / Hillier Road area on Saturday and Sunday

I have taken the liberty of copying these objections to my MP and local Councillors.

I am sorry, but I have just spotted an error in the email I sent you half an hour ago. The first sentence of the second paragraph should have read, "Pit Farm Tennis Club has been on the present site in Hillier Road since 1912 ..." not "2012". Hopefully, this was a fairly obvious error!

I understand that some of these proposed changes are to make it easier for parents for whom two hours is ample time to drop off and collect their children who attend the schools in the area and I am at a loss to understand why these parents are to be accommodated at the expense of Pit Farm Tennis Club members.

Pit Farm Tennis Club has been on the present site since 2012 - over 100 years. It has never had sufficient space for parking and, despite several attempts to acquire land a little further from the centre of Guildford where we could put in parking, these attempts have all failed. So the Club is reliant on having access to parking along the road often, particularly in the case of matches, for more than 2 hours. In fact, I think the Club has a good case for all the spaces along the Club boundary being restricted to Permit Holders, namely Pit Farm Tennis Club members.

At present on weekdays, members are often competing with Tormead school (mainly parents but also some staff) for spaces in Hillier Road. This is particularly the case on Monday, Wednesday and Friday afternoons, when there is tennis for juniors from 3.30pm - 6.00pm. As most of the Tormead parents arrive over half an hour before their daughters come out of school, it is well nigh impossible for parents/grandparents to find a space to drop off and stay with their 5-7yr old children for the

Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.

	<p>first session lasting three quarters of an hour. (Unlike the Tormead parents, they are unable to arrive early as the children don't come out of their respective schools until 3.20pm.)</p> <p>So I do hope that you will bear in mind, not only the points I have made, but also the point made by many other Club members before implementing your proposals for parking in Hillier Road.</p>	
	<p>Thanks for your response. I was concerned that parking was being altered purely for the benefit of the school but it seems this has been balanced by freeing up spaces at the top of the road (which are always empty) so it appears a common sense approach.</p> <hr/> <p>Thank you for your email regarding the above matter. Please find below a link to the documents presently available on line at:</p> <p>www.guildford.gov.uk/parkingformaladvertisment</p> <p>and more specifically in relation to the town centre controlled parking zone proposals (including those in Cranley Road and Maori Road):</p> <p>http://www.guildford.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=14905&p=0</p> <p>The proposals were developed as a result of previous requests from residents within several of the affected roads, and also the schools, for greater priority to be given to making parking available for the school run.</p> <p>If you have any further queries, or wish to make a formal</p>	<p>The general support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>However, given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

	<p>representation, please do not hesitate to do so.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Please can you tell me what the objectives are of altering the parking from restrictions on from unrestricted to 2 hr limited on Cranley Road and Maori Road?</p>	
9854	<p>I am writing to you to voice my concern over the proposed new parking restrictions in the of Pit Farm Tennis Club. The removal of 4 hour parking will have a detrimental effect on the club and could be catastrophic. Parking restrictions already have a negative impact on our members and visitors especially at busy school pick up and drop of times. I urge you to carefully reconsider these proposals as the future of the club depends on vehicular access of visitors and members alike.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>
9855	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisement as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.

I park in Hillier Road most Wednesdays at about 9.30am staying typically till 12.30pm for a morning's tennis. At this time of day there is little congestion indeed very few cars moving at all.

Yet the proposals would seriously inconvenience others and me who use the club during the working day. To take my case as an example, I am currently only able to use 4 hour slots since the all day ones are taken by others in the early morning. Whilst your proposals would still leave 4 hour slots immediately outside the tennis club, these are always full and, therefore, I use the ones that start about 50-60 metres south east of the club entrance.

You are proposing that these slots be converted to all day ones. Like those the other side of the road, these slots will be taken up early in the morning displacing me and other members of the club arriving later. The two hour slots lower down the road will be no substitute as I would not be able to stay for the full morning's tennis.

I've told you how it will affect me. It will impact other members too, pushing them to reduce their tennis or play elsewhere. I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that is what you want to deal with. However, I fear that your current proposal could reduce use of the club, reduce its membership and participation in sport. The club is a lively and healthy part of the local community and should be helped.

I hope, therefore, that you will consider further before implementing your current proposed solution for Hillier Road. In particular, I hope you will be able to retain the same level of 4 hour slots in this road given their suitability for the tennis club.

Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.

Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.

I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.

	<p>I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.</p>	
<p>Page 90</p> <p>9868</p>	<p>Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisment as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.</p> <p>I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.</p> <p>Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.</p> <p>Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

	<p>establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools, the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.</p>	
9869	<p>PETITION (123 signatures) – Pit Farm Tennis Club.</p> <p>It is noteworthy that a number of our members live outside Guildford, travelling from Woking, Ripley, Godalming and the like to be part of our great club. Whilst we do encourage members that are more local to cycle (we have facilities for bicycle parking in the grounds) you will observe that for many of our members living further afield, this is not an option.</p> <p>There is widespread opposition against the proposal to introduce 2-hour parking bays in Hillier Road. Whilst we are sympathetic to</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.</p>

issues during the school run, we do not want to be the victim of a perceived solution to one predicament that in turn creates further foreseeable problems.

Following on from the meeting held between Steve Knight, Iain Brown, Andrew Harkin and yourself on 30th July, I would like to respond to the parking proposals as set out at www.guildford.gov.uk/pakingformaladvertisement as I am a member of Pit Farm Tennis Club and will be adversely affected by the proposed changes.

I realise that there are issues around congestion and parking in the area at certain times of day and that the suggested changes are designed to improve parking matters at school drop off and pick up times. However, those same changes will adversely affect the tennis club at all times and will have a very limited impact in solving the congestion issues at the beginning and end of the school day.

Parking near the Club is already difficult during school term time especially in the mornings when many of our members want to play and to socialise. The introduction of two hour slots at the expense of some four hour slots will make the problem worse not better.

Our club is buoyant at present. We are playing a key role in establishing a legacy from Olympics and from Andy Murray's successes at the US Open and Wimbledon. Changes in the parking restrictions as set out in Hillier Road will impact upon our club at all times and I am sure that the council would not wish to inadvertently implement measures that discourage participation in sport. Any material changes that make it harder for members to access the club for tennis and social activities will impact on the viability of the club and its long term future. Unlike the schools,

9885

the Club does not have, or has never had on-site parking.

Recommendations

I would recommend one of two options. Firstly, retain the same parking measures/restrictions in Hillier Road as they currently are. The alternative, but also acceptable second solution, would be to drop the plan to have two hour parking in Hillier Road leaving them as four hour slots. However in conjunction with this, I would support a trade off of some of the all day slots being replaced by additional four hour slots in Hillier Road. This could then free up some space for our members, visitors to the schools and other residences.

I attach my comments on the proposals in relation Aldersey, Cranley and Maori Roads. As you will see, there are matters I would like to discuss. I am really concerned that this seems to be an advertisement for something you intend to press on with rather than a consultation. Are you taking views or seeing if there are formal objections. It seems I have to formally object but I'd rather meet to work up a better outcome. We risk making matters worse without solving any problems!

I assume I have to formally object to all the proposed changes to 2 hours from 4 hours if you are pressing for uniformity of approach and hereby do so.

Please advise me how to take my objection forward and whether there is a positive avenue available for addressing my concerns.

Reference: Guildford On-Street Parking Review - Aldersey

Given the concerns raised about the ability of tennis club members and visitors to find convenient parking close to the club, we recommend that the proposals are broadly introduced as advertised, but revised so that more of the parking spaces in Hillier Road are prioritised for 4-hour limited waiting.

In relation to the proposals in the other roads, however, these are to remain as advertised. There is no intention for us to remove all day parking from Cranley Road. The aim of the proposals is to continue to accommodate all day and medium stay parking, whilst also trying to prioritise space for those involved in the school run. The position and extents of the parking bays are not being changed and are appropriate in relation to the junctions, points of access and the widths of the various roads involved. Clearly, if we were to consider the visual impact of parked vehicles, on-street parking would seldom be provided anywhere.

Rd, Cranley Road and Maori Road

I would like to make the following comments on proposed changes:

**Please leave the bays as they are in Aldersey Road
ie do not change around positions of long term and shorter
term bays.**

ie do not change from 4 hour to 2 hour parking

ie do not introduce all day parking in front of Lyon House

**ie do not remove all day parking where it is less intrusive for
residents at either end of Aldersey Road**

We have changed our drive to adapt to the bays and restrictions you introduced when you brought in the CPZ because we could no longer get out of our drive with the layout brought in: we kept getting trapped in and I could not turn my neck due to long term illness. We now get trapped less often but we stare onto the road because we now have a very open frontage.

Under the changes you are suggesting, we would have to stare directly and upwards onto all day parking bays that would be full all the time. At present, the all day parking bays in Aldersey Road are located in places where they are not overly intrusive to any resident eg along Lanesborough field. (I am happy to walk the road and show you if that would help.) At least under the current arrangement we get relatively few cars outside pick up times in front of our very open frontage due to the 4 hour limit. It works well outside school pick up time and we tolerate things the rest of the time having moved our drive. Why spoil things for the whole day by putting an all day car linear office car park in front of our house when people will park along the entire road filling any gaps where they can squeeze in a car regardless at pick up time?

Please leave the all day parking bays opposite Lanesborough and Braganza on Cranley and Aldersey Roads to reduce school traffic congestion

At the school end of Aldersey Road opposite Braganza and along Cranley Road in front of Lanesborough, there is a strong argument for saying long term bays are safer and less disruptive. Much of the disruption at pick up and drop off times is caused by school cars pulling in and out. At present much of that activity happens a little away from the schools eg in front of us. If you allow that activity at the traffic pinch points nearer the schools there will be even more disruption. At present, you get cars pulling in and out on the side of Cranley Road by Lanesborough where there are no bays. Imagine if you had cars pulling in and out of both sides of the road at drop off and pick up time because one side had not been taken by all day parkers. It would be a nightmare and traffic flow would be even more disrupted waiting for people to manoeuvre. The same applies opposite Braganza on Aldersey Road. It is better that those bays are taken with longer term cars which fill before the peak school traffic.

Please do not change for 4 hour to 2 hour parking

This will make no material difference to problem parking times but will inconvenience residents, their guests and tradesmen. The four hour bays are relatively free so making them 2 hour will not make a significant difference in freeing up space.

Please do not remove all day parking on Cranley Road

You will shift the long term office parkers onto roads such as Aldersey Road and beyond where a long term space can still occasionally be found by visitors.

Please reconsider Saturday restrictions

These are a completely unnecessary bureaucracy.

I am aware there may be support for switching the position of longer and shorter term bays along Maori Road. This may be logical given the less obtrusive spaces for longer term parking are in the middle here. The concern about cars manoeuvring on both side of the road in front of the school may be less critical here as well due to the number of drives close together by the school. One size does not fit all.

Happy to discuss if that would help. This is hard to describe!

I wrote this assuming it was a consultation and now see I have to ask you to register my comments above as formal objections to your proposals. **I object to these proposals and to a more general switch from 4 to 2 hour bays.**

Tormead Road

(6 representations)

9715	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggested that 4 hour waiting near 62 Tormead Road should be allowed. This is on the approach to a bend in the road. There have been a number of head on collisions on or near this bend. Furthermore, the road was recently resurfaced at the white line on the bend near no.'s 50 – 54 has not been replaces. I have mentioned this to the local councillor and also spoken to the authorities. We have no been told that it will be re-instated. It makes so much work and causes so much additional expense if these things are not done when the markings were done after the resurfacing just recently. 2. Revocations (NW of Cranley Road) Tormead SW side. This is good. It is a narrow road. As it is parking takes place regularly on double yellow lines and even on the pavement. Thank you. 	<p>Given the concerns raised about the proximity of the proposed parking bay to the bend, we recommend that the parking bay opposite No.65 is converted to a single yellow line, but that the compensatory space suggested outside No.62 is not introduced.</p>
9870	<p>As the resident of No.62 Tormead Road, outside of which you intend to introduce a parking bay. I would like to relate my observations of traffic behaviour at this point in the road. Traffic rounds the sharp bend just below my property at excessive speeds often requiring the vehicle to straddle the (imaginary) centre line and without due care and attention to conditions and the numerous exits from properties located at this point in the road. Traffic proceeding down the road will often require a distance to brake to avoid the oncoming vehicle. If a parking bay is located outside No. 62 the distance for braking will become considerably lessened and become dangerous. Also, neighbours leaving or arriving at their homes add to this danger.</p> <p>At school in and out times, more often than not, vehicles are parked outside the existing single yellow line for up to fifteen minutes which adds to the congestion caused by those vehicles</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the proximity of the proposed parking bay to the bend, we recommend that the parking bay opposite No.65 is converted to a single yellow line, but that the compensatory space suggested outside No.62 is not introduced.</p>

	<p>driven by parents dropping off their children closer to the school. A double yellow line in this part of Tormead Road would seem more appropriate than a parking bay.</p> <p>I understand that Tormead School proposes coach pick-up facilities within the school grounds, thus getting the coaches off Cranley Road. This would surely allow more parents to utilise the space presently taken up by the coaches and lessen the congestion in Tormead Road.. At times when the school is on holiday not all the existing parking bays are in full use so is an additional one necessary?</p>	
<p>Page 98</p> <p>9872</p>	<p>I live at 63 Tormead Road and wish to object to the proposal to establish a new parking area outside number 62, as proposed in KM/13/0001. This will create a significant traffic safety hazard for all cars coming down Tormead road past my house as any parked cars in the proposed parking bay will force traffic to the wrong side of the road as they approach the corner just 30 yards away. In addition, depending on the exact location of the proposed bay, it may significantly interfere with the safe and easy access from my drive onto Tormead Road. If the proposal is driven by the desire to replace the bay outside 64 Tormead Road, my strong preference would be to live with the loss of a parking bay rather than the creation of a new bay which has safety implications for residents and through traffic, plus significantly impacting my ability to easily access my drive. I would appreciate your urgent reconsideration of this proposal.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the proximity of the proposed parking bay to the bend, we recommend that the parking bay opposite No.65 is converted to a single yellow line, but that the compensatory space suggested outside No.62 is not introduced.</p>

In view of the dangerous position of the proposed new parking space outside no. 66 Tormead Road, I am writing to oppose it on the grounds that it will in all probability cause an accident .. accidents.

I live at No.61A Tormead Road - right on the corner. Often my family and I have difficulty in reversing into our own drive with cars quickly coming round the corner - they have to swing out (coming up the road) to avoid our car . the proposed new parking space outside no.66 would not give room for them to manoeuvre, let alone what would happen with traffic coming down the road and being in the centre of the road? Were we to be reversing up the road into our drive and a car racing around the corner up the road and pulling out to avoid our car again where would that car go? In pulling out to avoid a car, whether ours, next door's, or indeed opposite's, of course, this could entail a vehicle (a lots of vans, coaches and heavy vehicles use this road) mounting the pavement to avoid a collision - heaven forbid this should happen when there is a person(s), children, baby in pushchair passing - of which there can be plenty, especially at school times. Racing around the corner whether it be even 30 mph and below is very speedy and leaves little time for a quick decision. There are schools locally which entails traffic at times with parents dropping off/collecting when they can be late! However, vehicles race around the bend at any time! Albeit the bend does not appear to be a sharp bend nor blind, in practice it is and drivers get very outraged often to find us reversing into our drive and having to alter their speed and avoid our car!

We are very willing to give a test run(s) with those who make this decision - it can then be experienced and understood that placing a parking space outside No. 66 will be 'waiting for an accident to happen'. This email we will keep and should this occur will serve

Given the concerns raised about the proximity of the proposed parking bay to the bend, we recommend that the parking bay opposite No.65 is converted to a single yellow line, but that the compensatory space suggested outside No.62 is not introduced.

	<p>that the authorities were warned. This may sound harsh, but living in our position on the bend, we already experience unsafe difficulties now, without an additional hurdle.</p> <p>I would welcome your consideration to the fact that this is a most unsafe proposition which I trust will be your decision.</p>	
<p>Page 100</p> <p>9877</p>	<p>I am writing in response to the proposed changes to the on-street parking arrangements recently announced, particularly in respect of those for Tormead Road. The change proposed is to remove the parking space outside no. 66 and in its place put a parking space outside no. 62.</p> <p>My concern is that this proposed parking place is too close to the sharp bend in the road. I believe that this will increase the likelihood of an accident on the right angle bend as traffic quite often comes round this blind corner too fast. It might look as though there is plenty of room on a map but in practice that is not so considering the speed at which vehicles are travelling round this corner. Many drivers seem not to take account of the sharpness of the bend, nor the fact that it is a blind corner and are unwilling to brake; rather they try to dive round any car. My family and I always reverse into our drive, which is just on the inside of the bend on the corner, and very often we receive dirty looks from drivers who race round the corner and find our car stationary or reversing. I also note that there is no sign pointing out that it is a blind corner and a sharp corner; neither is there a white line down the middle of the road around the corner to show how narrow the road is and to keep drivers fully on their own side of the road. I request that you do not implement this proposed change.</p>	<p>Given the concerns raised about the proximity of the proposed parking bay to the bend, we recommend that the parking bay opposite No.65 is converted to a single yellow line, but that the compensatory space suggested outside No.62 is not introduced.</p>

9878

Page 101

I live at 61 Tormead Road, Guildford and wish to comment on two aspects of the parking proposals for this road.

1. I wish to object to the proposal to establish a new parking area outside number 62 Tormead Road. I do not believe that this meets your own criteria of improving safety. It will create a significant hazard as it will push traffic coming down Tormead Road from Cranley Road onto the wrong side of the road too close to the bend in the road. In particular it will create a hazard for my wife and I, and any visitors, wishing to turn into our drive when approaching from Cranley Road as it will cause us to slow down on the wrong side of the road leaving us vulnerable to be hit by any car coming up the road fast round the bend.

2. I am disappointed to see that you are not planning to reinstate the double yellow lines around the bend in Tormead Road. This was a marking that greatly increased road safety when first introduced and the reduction of the restriction to a single yellow line has, in my view, introduced an un-necessary safety hazard to this bend. I would appreciate your reconsideration of the proposed change.

Given the concerns raised about the proximity of the proposed parking bay to the bend, we recommend that the parking bay opposite No.65 is converted to a single yellow line, but that the compensatory space suggested outside No.62 is not introduced.

The parking restrictions on the bend have always been single yellow lines and not double yellow lines.

ITEM 7: ANNEXE 6.2 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
<p>Dene Road area (Dene Rd, Denmark Rd, Eastgate Gdns, Epsom Rd, London Rd) (10 representations)</p>		
<p>9722</p>	<p>We have today received a letter outlining the proposed changes to parking in the Dene Road area.</p> <p>Although we understand the reasons for extending the permit hours, and agree that it will assist in freeing up the space for the residents, we would like to make a proposal with regards to the limits on the purchase of visitors permits.</p> <p>We are currently restricted to a maximum of 30 permits each year, which equates to no more than 2 visitor permits most months. At present this is satisfactory as they are really only needed at weekends. However, with the introduction of the new parking restrictions it will be impossible to have guests round in the evenings without asking them to pay to use a car park, which is frankly embarrassing, as I'm sure you can understand.</p> <p>Therefore whilst we agree that due to the use of the parking spaces by G Live patrons, there is a need to increase the restrictions; it is of the utmost importance that the limit on visitors permits is also increased for those living in the area.</p> <p>Many thanks indeed for the time taken to read this request.</p>	<p>Whilst visitor permits are restricted to 30 permits per annum, we offer a discretionary allocation in certain circumstances, to cover increased need. Whilst this is ordinarily restricted to situations where households have building work undertaken, if households in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens become more reliant on the use of visitor scratch-card permits, due to the extended operational hours of the controls, there is scope to increase their availability.</p> <p>A more formal increase in the number of visitor scratch-cards available, either in these specific roads, or more generally, would require changes to the articles of the traffic regulation order, with all the additional consultation and formal advertisement that this would entail. Nevertheless, there may be scope for us to consider this matter as part of a future parking review.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

My partner and I moved to Guildford from Central London in March 2013. We live within the parking zone that you refer to in your letter. Our reason for moving to Guildford is that my partner became a consultant anaesthetist at the Royal Surrey County Hospital. We have one vehicle in our household – necessary for Chris to drive from our home to the hospital when on call during the night and for emergencies. We applied for a permit for Zone D as soon as we arrived in Guildford, as evidently parking close to home is a necessity for Chris in order to be able to respond as soon as possible to emergency calls. Unfortunately we were told that there is a 6 month / 1 year wait for a resident's permit in Zone D.

Currently we, on the Zone D resident permit waiting list, are already struggling to park in the area in which we live and, therefore, are concerned regarding some of the changes you suggest.

There are 2 issues that we should like to raise please:

1) Waiting for a Zone D permit

With regards to the waiting list for a parking permit where we live – we would like to ask how you are addressing this please? What is the process with regards to allocating permits? How can it be that a household living within the Zone should have to wait for quite an extended period to acquire a permit? Our landlady, who lived in the flat prior to our arrival, had a permit and has since surrendered it – should that not transfer to the new residents in the same flat? Is it the case that some households are permitted more than one permit, so that other households have to do without?

We evidently pay council tax to live in our property and may

The threshold on the number of residents' permits on issue at any one time within Area D is linked to the number of spaces prioritised for permit holders within the area. This has been the case since we introduced the present permit scheme in 1997. Nevertheless, where we have made significant changes to the number of permit only and dual-use spaces available, we have adjusted the threshold accordingly. As a result, the number of permits on issue at any one time has increased from 250 to 273.

Qualifying households can only acquire one Area D residents permit. With around 1,400 residential addresses within Area D, if permits were handed down from the outgoing resident of a property to the incoming resident, those households that were not already in possession of one of the 273 permits would seldom have an opportunity to acquire one. As a result, these households could remain on the waiting list for a prolonged period of time. The present way the scheme is managed gives all permit applicants an equal opportunity to acquiring a residents' permit within a reasonable timescale. Even so, progress up the waiting list is dependant on existing permit holders relinquishing their permits.

Whilst it possible for single yellow lines to also be part-time parking bays prioritised for specific user-groups, the traffic flows associated with the evening economy located in the vicinity and on Sundays are such that the issues that parking on the single yellow lines cause at these times are similar to those that would be caused were parking allowed during the day. Nevertheless, the single yellow line outside St Joseph's Church facilitates dropping off and picking up and will also be available for those with mobility issues that hold a Blue Badges to park for up to 3 hours.

partner is trying to serve the local community in his role at the hospital as best he can – we would like to know when this situation shall be rectified please?

2) Parking changes you suggest on Eastgate Gardens & on Dene Road

We do not understand the logic behind some of the changes you suggest along Eastgate Gardens and Dene Road – with parking evidently in such limited supply in Zone D that it limits residents from having a permit – is there any logic to not making the bay outside St Joseph’s church and the areas along Dene road you suggest making ‘no waiting 8.30am – 9pm’ also available to permit holders after 6pm?

Also, with 2 paying carparks available so close-by – by the Grammar School and beside Dene Road – and an additional one made available by the Grammar school beside the astroturf pitch at the weekends - we believe that, given that there is a lengthy waiting list for residents to park in our own zone – all the areas possible along Eastgate Gardens and Dene Road should be made solely available to permit holders after 6pm , with perhaps dual use available in the evenings at the weekends until 9pm, when permit holders may not be in the area.

With parking such a problem for residents in our zone, we believe you need to prioritise extending parking to us as much as possible in order to reduce the permit waiting time – how is it that someone can pay to park near our residence currently but we cannot gain a permit to park there? We evidently suggest all of the above in the hope that we shall become permit holders in the very near future...

Another reason for having the single yellow lines operate over the same period as the parking bays is the clarity of the controls for motorists. Motorists should check the sign(s) relating to the restrictions of each specific parking bay. However, having passed controlled boundary signs and several hundred other parking bays which indicate that the controls operate Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm, if a handful of the bays in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens operate Monday-Sunday 8.30am-9pm, there may be a tendency for motorists to assume that the shorter operational hours that apply elsewhere also apply to these spaces. Therefore, to highlight the different operational hours, it is proposed to introduce boundary signs on all routes leading into Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens. The only way to do this is for the single yellow lines beyond to operate over the extended hours. Nevertheless, it should increase the effectiveness of and compliance with the changes to the prioritisation measures.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

	<p>Some clarity on this matter and when we should expect to receive our permit would be most appreciated please.</p>	
<p>9757</p>	<p>I have studied the On-Street Parking Review proposals for the parking controls in the Dean Road area and I make the following comments:</p> <p>Short Term parking to support businesses in this sector of Guildford is extremely limited. I believe the change to double yellow lines on London Road outside GLive will greatly improve congestion and road safety, especially in the evening time.</p> <p>I welcome the decision to change to double yellow lines from property no. 21 to 23 and beyond in Epsom Road as we experience constant problems with pizza delivery vehicles blocking the entrance to the Service Area. I do however have serious concerns about the position of the existing parking bay outside no. 21 Epsom Road. It is extremely difficult to exit to Service Area (between 21 & 23) onto Epsom Road as the parking bay outside property no.21 creates a dangerous blind spot when in use. I would suggest this bay needs to be removed on the grounds of safety to prevent a road traffic accident from occurring. I note that Service Area entrances in Dene Road have adequate provision of double yellow lines to prevent similar blind spots.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposals.</p>	<p>General support for the changes to the waiting restrictions in London Road and Epsom Road are noted.</p> <p>In respect to the access between Nos.21 and 23, the proposed conversion from single to double yellow line should improve matters. Although the parking bay is only setback the 'standard' 1-2 metres from the access, the access itself is around 12 metres wide. Therefore, those exiting it can improve right hand visibility greatly by using the eastern portion of the access, without it being necessary to increase the setback distance of the adjacent parking bay, which would increase the level of restriction and reduce the availability of parking space.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

In reference to your proposed changes, while I believe that this "could" improve parking issues on Epsom Road it will depend on how it is enforced.

Take Townends Estate Agents On Epsom Road where there are already double Yellow lines clearly marked. These lines are meaningless as there is a lack of enforcement or you are unable to stop Townends parking on them. I know this for a fact as I was nearly knocked down by a Townsend liveried car in April 2010 mounting the pavement with said existing double yellow lines. On this issue I am in contact with Surrey Police Commissioners office already as Guildford BC seems powerless . To date this is a 3 year issue, unresolved. Or, every G-live event where there is complete parking chaos on the pavements with any sort of yellow lines. Or, guildford taxis, generally pavement parking waiting for people.

So my point is, Guildford BC cannot/does not or chooses not to enforce existing double yellow lines in this area (especially after 5pm) so what value add does painting any more lines if you cannot enforce the existing ones ,on this very road, Epsom Road.

If you doubt what I am saying I can send you copies of correspondence or pictures of 3 years Townsends parking abuse. Funnily enough the parking control should have copies already and it was forwarded to 2x Guildford councillors at the same time as the Surrey Police Commissioner last month.

The public car parks in the vicinity are already enforced in the evenings. The enforcement of the on-street parking controls in the vicinity will be an extension of this operation.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

9814	<p>I would like to object to the change add charging on a Sunday and the change to the active times of the paid parking bays in London Road and the surrounding area. My wife and I park in one of the London Road bays most Sundays following a trip to Guildford Spectrum, in order to get a coffee in the town. We can always get a space and there does not seem excessive pressure on these spaces. If paid parking is imposed then we do not intend to stop in the town to spend money. There is no justification in road traffic, access or congestion terms in changing the paid times of these parking bays. They are already parking spaces and there does not seem to be adverse pressure on them on a Sunday or in the evening. This does not see a reasonable change and would seem to be purely a revenue raising exercise, which is unlawful as shown under recent case law:</p> <p>"The 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act is not a fiscal measure and does not authorise the authority to use its powers to charge ... for parking in order to raise surplus revenue for other transport purposes".</p> <p>Reference Barnet vs RAC foundation http://racfoundation.wordpress.com/2013/07/22/racf-evidence-helps-bring-barnet-to-book-over-revenue-raising-from-parking-charges-well-done-barnetcpzaction/</p>	<p>The proposals do not intend to extend the hours during which it will be necessary to pay to use the on-street parking bays in London Road and Epsom Road. The extended hours only apply to the permit only and dual-use parking bays situated in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens, which are fronted predominantly by residential properties.</p> <p>Nevertheless, a significant amount of parking already takes place on the nearby single yellow lines in both Epsom and London Roads during the evenings and on Sundays. This would suggest that there is greater demand than supply of formalised on-street parking spaces. The proposals developed also aim to address this, in order to resolve the safety and traffic flow issues caused by the parking which presently takes place on the single yellow lines.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9865	<p>I find that I must write to protest about the extension of parking controls in the area of St Joseph's Catholic Church and in particular those to Dene Road, and London Road (between Epsom Road and Waterden Road).</p> <p>Having seen signs posted in the area last Sunday – the first I knew of this plan - I called your office today to express my</p>	<p>The proposals were developed as a direct result of a petition received from many residents living in the area, who were concerned at the impact that parking by visitors associated with the evening economy and parishioners to the church caused them.</p> <p>Like other residents and businesses in the area, the church has been written to directly on a number of</p>

concern and dismay at what I consider at best completely unnecessary measures and at worst draconian measures which may appear to affect parts of our community. Why anyone would want to victimise people of faith – any faith – I do not know. They are a very important part of our community and do a lot of good for the wider community.

I was told that the new measures were in response to complaints by local residents and that the deadline for expressing my views is Friday 9th August, as extensive consultation has already taken place. But after much thought, I am sitting in my office this evening trying to fathom out how the new measures actually benefit anyone including, and especially, local residents.

You are not making parking easier or providing more spaces, in fact you are doing exactly the opposite and reducing the number of places where one can legally park on a Sunday. The residents themselves will also no longer be able to use single yellow lines on a Sunday as they can now do, so where is the benefit to them. The only benefit I can see is to Guildford Borough Council i.e. more cash in the council's coffers.

Dene Road already has parking bays on both sides which are used by resident permit holders and pay at meter visitors. Some stretches are single yellow lines but at present the restrictions do not apply to Sundays. By restricting parking on single yellow lines on a Sunday to 9pm you are actually reducing the number of cars that can be parked there – both visitor and RESIDENT.

Suggestion: make one side of Dene Road – the side which has properties on it - permit holders only. But leave the other

occasions during the current and previous stages of consultation.

The proposed measures prioritise the on-street space that is already available over a longer period, therefore improving the situation for permit holders. There will also be a small increase in the number of the permit only parking spaces available.

The traffic flows associated with the evening economy and on Sundays are such that the issues that parking on the single yellow lines cause at these times are similar to those that would be caused were parking allowed on the single yellow lines during the day. Nevertheless, the single yellow line outside St Joseph's Church facilitates dropping off and picking up and will also be available for those with mobility issues, that hold a Blue Badges, to park for up to 3 hours.

Another reason for having the single yellow lines operate over the same period as the parking bays is the clarity of the controls for motorists. Motorists should check the sign(s) relating to the restrictions of each specific parking bay. However, having passed controlled boundary signs and several hundred other parking bays which indicate that the controls operate Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm, if a handful of the bays in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens operate Monday-Sunday 8.30am-9pm, there may be a tendency for motorists to assume that the shorter operational hours that apply elsewhere also apply to these spaces. Therefore, to highlight the different operational hours, it is proposed to introduce boundary signs on all routes leading into Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens. The only way to do this is for the

side exactly as it is now. This would still give residents space for their overflow cars and would not penalise visitors to any great degree. A bit of give and take combined with a bit with common sense would resolve the issue, of that I am sure. London Road, between Epsom Road and Waterden Road, is obviously a much busier road, but it is also much wider. Again, it is pay at meter and resident permit on one side, and pretty much a single yellow on most of the other side.

Suggestion: On the side of London Road with the properties make it permit holders only, even though they have lots of off-street parking in that section. Leave the other side as it is. What your new measures are actually creating is a “Pay to pray” scenario, something the parishioners of nearby Woking have fought hard against and I believe have recently won some concessions.

I also understand that some boroughs have recently been taken to court for making excessive profits from parking. The law as it stands would appear to require councils to only charge for parking what is necessary to cover the cost of administering the parking controls in their area. It is not meant to be used as a cash cow to cover shortfalls elsewhere in the council’s budget.

My suggestions would maintain some limited free parking on a Sunday for those wishing to attend church – which is basically a free event, and also give more spaces to local residents. People wishing to attend G-Live or go shopping i.e. spending money, can use the larger car parks and spend a little of their money on parking, and most people – including myself - would expect to do so.

In general, I believe that parking on existing single yellow

single yellow lines beyond to operate over the extended hours. Nevertheless, it should increase the effectiveness of and compliance with the changes to the prioritisation measures.

There is little demand from permit holders to park in London Road. Therefore, we do not intend to convert any of the existing pay and display spaces in these roads to either dual-use or permit only. Nor do we intend to charge for parking within these bays in the evenings or on Sundays.

Both the Police and local residents have suggested the need for the single yellow lines in Epsom and London Roads to be converted to double yellow lines. During previous stages of consultation the G-Live venue has suggested that more of the single yellow lines in Dene Road should be converted to double yellow lines. We have not acted upon the latter request, mindful of the fact that we wish to allow parking to continue on the single yellow lines at less busy times.

The request to change the operation of the public car park situated below the church would be an issue for Guildford Borough Council to consider outside scope of the on-street parking review process.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

	<p>lines out of peak hours, does not usually cause any traffic congestion and does not prevent anyone else from parking where they are legally entitled to. In fact, in my humble opinion there should be no restrictions on single yellow lines on a Sunday – except of course in areas in or very close to main shopping areas and then only for the time the shops are open. There are also a lot of double yellow lines that could easily be used for parking on a Sunday where no congestion would occur.</p> <p>If you still decide to go ahead with your plans, then please can I ask that you consider a compromise relating to the underground parking area at St Josephs and scrap Sunday parking charges from the entire basement area of the church for the entire day.</p> <p>Many of these matters are for a wider forum, but what I would like to say specifically relates to Dene Road and London Road in the area around St Joseph's and I would ask you to think again. To my mind there are ways to keep everybody happy and I have outlined some suggestions above. Please understand that I have not had time to research all of my facts, and there may be some inaccuracies in the above, however, I do believe what I have said to be true and I write with sincerity about a situation I care about. A response would be appreciated.</p>	
9867	<p>I am writing on behalf of Little Dene, 14 Dene Road Guildford as their chairlady to submit some objections to your proposals to change the parking controls in Dene Road area, and to make some proposals to alter the current system.</p> <p>I believe that to change the parking controls by extending</p>	<p>The proposals were developed as a direct result of a petition received from many residents living in the area, who were concerned at the impact that parking by visitors associated with the evening economy and parishioners to the church caused them.</p>

them to 9:00 pm and by including sundays is unfair on those people who live in Dene Road for the following reasons:

- There are a number of houses divided into flats in the road, including Little Dene, where flat tenancy changes are frequent and due to the waiting time for a residents parking permit may preclude tenants from ever receiving a permit during their tenancy. The proposals would add extra cost to the parking in the road and therefore may dissuade potential tenants and add to the financial burden of anyone living in the road.
- The current parking controls allow working people to park free outside normal office hours during the week but the suggested changes will now affect anyone parking in the evening between 6:00 and 9:00 pm, adding to the cost of living in the road because of the need to pay for the evening hours.

Objection to the changes is therefore made because it appears that instead of making it harder for non-residents and users of G-Live to park free along Dene Road in the evening and at weekends, you are in effect making it harder and potentially more expensive for those who genuinely live there, and their visitors to park in Dene Road, because we do not have off street parking.

- I would like to propose that you introduce a loading/unloading parking permit for flat owners and tenants to purchase. This would be to allow those who do not drive, are elderly or have some kind of disability to be dropped at home by drivers or to take deliveries of goods without the drivers having to pay parking charges. This could be restricted to 15 minutes to allow

During the previous stages of consultation, all residents, businesses and other organisations have been written to. The fact that extending the operational hours of the controls will reduce flexibility, particularly for those that are either ineligible for permits, or on the waiting list for an Area D permit, has been highlighted throughout.

Despite this, during the first round of consultation, 82% of respondents expressed a preference for extending the operational hours of the controls. When given an opportunity to comment on the specifics of the proposals, 77% of respondents were supportive (42% fully and 35% with amendments). Some of those wanting amendments wanted greater restriction, whilst others wanted less restrictive controls.

There is a threshold on the number of residents' permits on issue at any one time within Area D, which is linked to the number of spaces prioritised for permit holders within the area. With around 1,400 residential addresses within Area D, and only 273 residents' permits on issue at any one time, there is always likely to be issues associated with the availability of permits and space.

The permit only and dual-use spaces can already be used for boarding and alighting and for loading and unloading without the need of a permit or to purchase a ticket. Yellow lines can be similarly used, provided doing so does not cause danger or obstruction.

Whilst visitor permits are restricted to 30 permits per annum, we offer a discretionary allocation in certain circumstances, to cover increased need. Whilst this is ordinarily restricted to situations where households have

	<p>loading and unloading to flats, and would still bring in revenue from annual sales and would be closed to abuse of the system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently the number of visitor parking permits that can be purchased by each house is only 30 a year. These are not free, costing £2 each. This is per individual building not per household and with a house such as Little Dene means only 30 permits can be bought for the 6 flats per year. These are quickly used up if the house has any kind of maintenance carried out on it. Little Dene pays 6 Council Tax payments from the house per month, and therefore it is proposed that the number of permits should be increased to at least 52 (one a week) per household, not per house. 	<p>building work undertaken, if households in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens become more reliant on the use of visitor scratch-card permits, due to the extended operational hours of the controls, there is scope to increase their availability.</p> <p>A more formal increase in the number of visitor scratch-cards available, either in these specific roads, or more generally, would require changes to the articles of the traffic regulation order, with all the additional consultation and formal advertisement that this would entail. Nevertheless, there may be scope for us to consider this matter as part of a future parking review.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9874	<p>Provided that the whole of Dene Road is for RESIDENTS only and no parking places are reduced then I have no objection</p> <p>I would point out currently cars drive down this road as a through road at dangerous speeds in a narrow confine if cars are parked both sides of the road.</p> <p>This road except for Civic hall entry (No 30 onwards) should be "ACCESS ONLY" with several large speed humps. Indeed why not reduce the carriage way width to single NARROW carriageway with specified parking bays - Do we need 2 foot paths ? -we can then turn the cars through 45 degrees and get more spaces and SLOW the Traffic at the same time?</p> <p>Hope this helps- people always moan as usual</p>	<p>The proposals will extend the prioritisation measures over a longer period, but we do not intend to make all the space permit only. If we were to do so, this would further reduce flexibility for residents and their visitors. Indeed, other have suggested that the proposed measures are too restrictive.</p> <p>The requests for signing, speed humps and other possible engineering measures would be matters for Surrey County Council – Highways to consider outside the scope of the present on-street parking review process.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>Regards Robert Wodehouse Flat 3 28 Dene Road Guildford. Safety First.....</p>	
	<p>1/ Dene Rd is mostly a one way street not a through route like Epsom Rd ,London Rd or Upper High Street so it does not need the type of increased restrictions proposed. Should these be imposed the extra road width up to the entrance to G live carpark will encourage cars to go faster; often cars just carry on the wrong way up Dene Rd endangering people and pets resident here.</p> <p>2/The curtailment proposed will greatly inconvenience local residents, most of these houses are divided up into flats etc with many foreign poeple who do not know how to apply,or realise they could apply for resident parking let alone complain about the coming changes (not that so many people could be issued with resident parking permitts) so they rely on these 6 spaces for evening, and all day Sunday to park have visitors, have deliveries, moving in etc this would be denied to them, placing great strain on the surrounding roads across York Rd as after 6 pm parking. There are often gaps here, it is not over-run by G live goers as G B C would have us believe or shoppers,and retaurant useres.This area is also used by residents with permits particularly on Sundays to load vechicles for the dump ,off load people, dogs etc without the need to get into a resident bay for fear of getting a ticket.All in an area that has had its parking availibilty curtailed by G lives building ;now it is going to be made even more of a non parking area ,intimidating resident permit holders to stay in their bays.</p>	<p>Many of the proposed additional lengths of double yellow line protect points of access and visibility at junctions. Concerns about vehicles proceeding the wrong way within the one way section of Dene Road would be issues for Surrey County Council – Highways and the Police to address outside the scope of the present on-street parking review process.</p> <p>The proposals were developed as a direct result of a petition received from many residents living in the area, who were concerned at the impact that parking by visitors associated with the evening economy and parishioners to the church caused them.</p> <p>During the previous stages of consultation, all residents, businesses and other organisations have been written to. The fact that extending the operational hours of the controls will reduce flexibility, particularly for those that are either ineligible for permits, or on the waiting list for an Area D permit has been highlighted throughout.</p> <p>Despite this, during the first round of consultation, 82% of respondents expressed a preference for extending the operational hours of the controls. When given an opportunity to comment on the specifics of the proposals, 77% of respondents were supportive (42% fully and 35% with amendments). Some of those wanting amendments wanted greater restriction, whilst others wanted less</p>

3/These new restrictions are GBC idea not the residents with permits, all we asked for was to increase the times of residents bays which have been paid for but used by G live goers, restaurant users as laid out in the 27 April 2012 Questionnaire. Not to make no go bays to drive visitors into paying car parks.

4/ Show that it pays to petition the Council, and that you actually do listen to those adversely affected; because my enquiries tell me that rate payers are disillusioned with the whole process, and are convinced they are not being listened to, or taken heed of. For my part I don't care if I'm the only compliant, and when it comes to extra restrictions on parking I say less of it on these yellow lines I will be home before G live goers on the few days a month that the places seem to be full. I'll leave the Church in East Gate gardens to argue their own case, but I would not be happy for my daughter to be married there, or a christening or have my interment service there knowing some warden is hovering for a 2 minute unloading time-- isn't that restraint of trade. I don't think the ordinary staff in Dene Croft will be so keen on these new restrictions when they realise that as soon as they change shifts and move the cars in and out into a road restricted till 9pm that they can be ticketed, still that's up to them, but be sure it will happen if you go ahead with such Draconian restrictions

Please just leave this area of the North side of Dene Rd under its present restrictions; save the rate payer the expenses, and eye-sore of more street signs, and continual confrontation with traffic wardens.

restrictive controls.

The traffic flows associated with the evening economy and on Sundays are such that the issues that parking on the single yellow lines cause at these times are similar to those that would be caused were parking allowed on the single yellow lines during the day. During previous stages of consultation the G-Live venue has suggested that more of the single yellow lines in Dene Road should be converted to double yellow lines. We have not acted upon the latter request, mindful of the fact that we wish to allow parking to continue on the single yellow lines at less busy times.

Another reason for having the single yellow lines operate over the same period as the parking bays is the clarity of the controls for motorists. Motorists should check the sign(s) relating to the restrictions of each specific parking bay. However, having passed controlled boundary signs and several hundred other parking bays which indicate that the controls operate Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm, if a handful of the bays in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens operate Monday-Sunday 8.30am-9pm, there may be a tendency for motorists to assume that the shorter operational hours that apply elsewhere also apply to these spaces. Therefore, to highlight the different operational hours, it is proposed to introduce boundary signs on all routes leading into Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens. The only way to do this is for the single yellow lines beyond to operate over the extended hours. Nevertheless, it should increase the effectiveness of and compliance with the changes to the prioritisation measures.

9886

		<p>The permit only and dual-use spaces can already be used for boarding and alighting and for loading and unloading without the need of a permit or to purchase a ticket. Yellow lines can be similarly used, provided doing so does not cause danger or obstruction.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9886	<p>Just a quick email regarding the formal proposals and some of the changes proposed on Dene Rd.</p> <p>I am pretty much broadly in favour of the proposals but would like to voice my objection to one part of the proposal, namely the converting of the single to double yellow lines on Dene Rd specifically.</p> <p>Having had a conversation with Andy this morning where he voiced an opinion that it would be difficult to have 2 different timings applying on our street, 9pm for residents and standard restrictions on yellow lines, I completely disagree with that viewpoint. If the residents bays are clearly signposted as 9pm, then the driver has no excuse. In my opinion, there should be more signs on the street, or if not more, they should be larger and not obscured by trees, so that people can see clearly from their cars.</p> <p>The single to double will make it very difficult for visitors to residents on Dene Rd, and I do not see any issue with visitors to glive and residents visitors taking these spaces on a first come first basis after 630pm as per standard restrictions on a yellow line. That is a fair balance between needs of residents and resident visitors and glive visitors.</p>	<p>The general support for the proposals is noted.</p> <p>In respect to the proposed additional lengths of double yellow lines, these primarily protect shared points of access and visibility at junctions.</p> <p>With regard to the extended operational hours of the remaining single yellow lines, the traffic flows associated with the evening economy and on Sundays are such that the issues that parking on the single yellow lines cause at these times are similar to those that would be caused were parking allowed on the single yellow lines during the day. During previous stages of consultation the G-Live venue has suggested that more of the single yellow lines in Dene Road should be converted to double yellow lines. We have not acted upon the their request, mindful of the fact that we wish to allow parking to continue on the single yellow lines at less busy times. The single yellow lines will facilitate boarding and alighting and loading an unloading provided danger or obstruction are not being caused. The single yellow lines will also be available for those with mobility issues that hold a Blue Badges to park for up to 3 hours, on the same basis.</p>

Also, it keeps it fair to residents or tenants on Dene Rd who do not have or can not get a zone D permit.

I have been to other areas where a venue such as Glive exists in a residential area with specific parking restrictions in place for resident bays alongside neary yellow lines, and it works ok. I can see from clear signs that resident bays are out of bounds and yellow lines are fine.

To summarise, I would request that the proposals be changed to reflect this, and the single yellow lines on Dene Rd remain single, working alongside new restrictions to stop visitors parking in resident bays.

Hope this makes sense, please confirm receipt.

Another reason for having the single yellow lines operate over the same period as the parking bays is the clarity of the controls for motorists. Motorists should check the sign(s) relating to the restrictions of each specific parking bay. However, having passed controlled boundary signs and several hundred other parking bays which indicate that the controls operate Monday-Saturday 8.30am-6pm, if a handful of the bays in Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens operate Monday-Sunday 8.30am-9pm, there may be a tendency for motorists to assume that the shorter operational hours that apply elsewhere also apply to these spaces. Therefore, to highlight the different operational hours, it is proposed to introduce boundary signs on all routes leading into Dene Road, Denmark Road and Eastgate Gardens. The only way to do this is for the single yellow lines beyond to operate over the extended hours. Nevertheless, it should increase the effectiveness of and compliance with the changes to the prioritisation measures.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

ITEM 7 : ANNEXE 6.3 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Rivermount Gardens		(5 representations)
9718	<p>Thank you for your letter about the proposed parking restrictions in Rivermount Gardens. The only comment I have to make is that I hope you will get on with this just as quickly as possible. the residents of Rivermount Gardens are heartedly sick of the present situation which we have endured now for over two years, unable to provide parking space for our visitors and others who call on business or to make deliveries. It has become quite intolerable. What was originally a quiet residential road has become an offshoot of the Park and Ride, or rather Park and Walk since most of the parkers we believe to be staff who work at the Municipal offices or are civilians employed by the police. I hope we may look forward to some early action.</p>	<p>The support for the proposals is noted, and we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9743	<p>The reason for proposing to include Rivermount Gardens within Area G of the Guildford Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and its permit schemes is to address the issues caused by the displacement of parking from the adjacent area already included within the CPZ.”</p> <p>I am a commuter who currently uses Rivermount Gardens to park during the day and I wish to object to the proposed parking restrictions to this road. My points are,</p>	<p>The parking which presently takes place in Rivermount Gardens close to its junction with Portsmouth Road, the brow of the hill and on the bend causes safety and access issues. Furthermore, the fact that the parking is often unbroken leaves few opportunities for vehicles to pass.</p> <p>The roads width and geometry mean that the only suitable locations for parking are within the specifically constructed lay-bys.</p>

The houses on Rivermount Gardens have both garages and extensive driveways capable of parking at least three cars (one in the garage) and potential a fourth across the drive way. Every day when I have been along the road from the morning through to the evening the majority of the driveways are empty or have only one car on them with the areas currently available for street parking having no cars on them before 7:00am and after 6:00pm, which indicates that the residents do not need the extra available parking in that road and that there is not an over spill of residents parking from streets that are with the existing CPZ.

Rivermount Gardens is a 15 minute walk to the town centre and the majority of commuters who use this road are from the local niche legal and planning agent business which populate Portsmouth road who's own parking is considerably limited to two to three spaces which in itself is inadequate for the office space of these units. Removing this free parking could potential force these small businesses to relocate to areas where there customers and staff can find available parking.

As a council worker who has a flexi time arrangement having available free or cheap parking available very early in the morning before Artington park and ride has opened is an advantage to working longer days for the various projects I am involved with and I'm sure there are other worker at the council office who feel this way.

I would commend double yellow lines at the entrance to Rivermount garden to help prevent over parking to the entrance to this road. I don't see much point in disabled bays on two points there is already plenty of residential parking along this road and for disabled workers there are bays and

Whilst the need for residents of Rivermount Gardens to park on-street may be minimal, there may be occasions when their visitors have to. The lack of parking in Portsmouth Road means that permit holders and short stay visitors of premises in this road may also use the side roads in the vicinity to park. The provision of short stay parking in Rivermount Gardens will assist in this regard.

With regard to the disabled spaces referred to in the representation, this would appear to relate to the proposal to introduce two disabled spaces outside Bury Field Clinic. Both the Access Group and the Clinic are keen for facilities to be improved in the vicinity for those visitors with mobility issues.

The comments about the Park and Ride bus service have been noted, although it is beyond the scope of the present on-street parking review.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

	free parking closer to town than this location.	
9752	As a resident of Rivermount Gardens (15), I very strongly support the proposed parking controls. This road was not designed as a public car park for Council and Police staff, and their persistent use of it as such has made life very difficult for many of the residents in the road.	The support for the proposals is noted, and we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.
9871	<p>I object to the following, River mount gardens becoming private parking. This is due to the fact every resident on the road owns their own drive to park in, so other members of the public are not using space that residents need to use.</p> <p>Other members of the public park on one side of the road. This means that vehicles such as ambulances, fire engines and other large vehicles can pass through.</p> <p>I work full time in Guildford, working different hours each week, often starting in the early hours of the morning. This means I have no other places to park during those shifts. I know that I speak not only for myself and my colleges but other members of the public who also work in the town.</p> <p>I believe this proposal is selfish and not understanding of the</p>	<p>The parking which presently takes place in Rivermount Gardens close to its junction with Portsmouth Road, the brow of the hill and on the bend cause s safety and access issues. Furthermore, the fact that the parking is often unbroken leaves few opportunities for vehicles to pass.</p> <p>The roads width and geometry mean that the only suitable locations for parking are within the specifically constructed lay-bys.</p> <p>Whilst the need for residents of Rivermount Gardens to park on-street may be minimal, there may be occasions when their visitors have to. The lack of parking in Portsmouth Road means that permit holders and short stay visitors of premises in this road may also use the side roads in the vicinity to park. The provision of short stay</p>

9893

	<p>public. I do however understand that strangers parking on someone's residential road may be frustrating, but it does not cause a problem for the residents of River Mount Gardens.</p>	<p>parking in Rivermount Gardens will assist in this regard.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>9893</p>	<p>I wish to object to you putting residential parking on Rivermount Gardens in Guildford.</p> <p>I start work at 7am and this is the closest place for me to park and walk into Guildford to work, and that's a 20 min walk.</p> <p>If your park and ride service was available earlier in the morning then most of us parking in this street would use that service. For me the park n ride would need to start at 6.30am. I am asking you to consider this option if the residential parking is approved.</p>	<p>The parking which presently takes place in Rivermount Gardens close to its junction with Portsmouth Road, the brow of the hill and on the bend causes safety and access issues. Furthermore, the fact that the parking is often unbroken leaves few opportunities for vehicles to pass.</p> <p>The roads width and geometry mean that the only suitable locations for parking are within the specifically constructed lay-bys.</p> <p>Whilst the need for residents of Rivermount Gardens to park on-street may be minimal, there may be occasions when their visitors have to. The lack of parking in Portsmouth Road means that permit holders and short stay visitors of premises in this road may also use the side roads in the vicinity to park. The provision of short stay parking in Rivermount Gardens will assist in this regard.</p> <p>The comments about the Park and Ride bus service have been noted, although it is beyond the scope of the present on-street parking review.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

ITEM 7: ANNEXE 6.4 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
	<p>St Luke's Square (St Luke's Sq, St Bartholomew's Ct, St Catherine's Pk, St Thomas's Mews)</p>	<p>(26 representations)</p>
<p>9717</p>	<p>I refer to the letter I received today yet again about the absurd parking controls you wish to implement in st Luke's. Please see the new reference number above and the emails below we had from last year on the same matter.</p> <p>For the record my thoughts haven't changed and I fully object to your proposals. Please see below for my reasons.</p> <p>To add to this it seems ridiculous that the council are still considering this and it is occupying so much of everyones time - wasting our council tax money. Its a shame there are so many more worthy causes it could be used for.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>As per your letter that I received yesterday I wanted to write to you and object to the parking controls you are once again suggesting.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>As per the meeting earlier this year the parking in St Luke's</p>	<p>Prior to the present review commencing a resident from St Lukes Square presented a summary of a petition from 24 households, which indicated over 90% wanted some form of parking control.</p> <p>Subsequent stages of consultation suggested that within the wider St Luke's Square area 83% of those that responded thought controls were necessary. In the St Luke's Park section of the development a clear majority opposed controls. The proposals were developed taking into account the respective wishes, albeit that the potential for displacement has been highlighted throughout.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the</p>

	<p>square is better since the G Live complex has been finished and the builders are no longer there.</p> <p>Just to re-iterate - I fully object to any parking controls in the St Luke's development.</p>	<p>restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough.</p> <p>Ongoing inconsiderate parking by grammar school pupils, commuters and shoppers are all highlighted as causing the issues within the St Luke's Square section of the development.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9719	<p>I reside at 10 St. Catherine's Park and would like to lodge my objection to the proposed parking restrictions in and around St. Luke's Square on the grounds that the proposed restrictions will dramatically decrease the number of parking spaces available to residents.</p>	<p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

9721	<p>Many thanks for your letter of 12 July 2013 setting out proposals to introduce parking controls in the St Luke's Development.</p> <p>This is just to confirm we thoroughly endorse your proposals which we feel will go a long towards eliminating dangerous and inconsiderate parking at this end of our estate and hopefully make it a safer environment for residents and visitors.</p>	<p>The support of the proposals has been noted, and we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9723	<p>Myself and my Husband are in favour of the proposed parking controls in the Luke's Square development and think that is an excellent idea and will improve road safety which is desperately needed,</p>	<p>The support of the proposals has been noted, and we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9724	<p>I reside at Bloomsbury Court in St Luke's Square. I would like to lodge my objection to the proposed parking restrictions in St Luke's Square. Having looked at the plans on your website I see that virtually everywhere, apart from the designated parking spaces and opposite gates (where it is not possible to park anyway), you are proposing to enforce double yellow lines with no waiting at any time restrictions. This will make it impossible for myself and my partner to park near our flat or even to enjoy the right to invite friends and family over when there is nowhere for them to park.</p> <p>I am sure you can find a more just and flexible way to monitor the safety of these roads, which are very quiet anyway and cars parked by the roads can hardly be considered an hazard, everyone living here is very considerate and drives with the</p>	<p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough.</p>

	<p>utmost respect and at the appropriate speeds.</p> <p>I find it hard to believe that my Council would ignore the basic and simple right of their citizens who are simply requesting the ability to live in and enjoy their street without having to give up what most people take for granted. I look forward to receiving your response and welcome any further discussion.</p>	<p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>Page 124</p> <p>9729</p>	<p>After reading more about the concerns of the residents over inconsiderate parking during the week by workers and students using St Luke's Square as a free car park without any sense of respect for the residents, I would like to add another point to my below comments (which I continue to ask you consider as very valid). I still object to double yellow lines with no waiting at any times as I consider this to be an unnecessarily restrictive measure which will unfairly result in no flexibility for the residents. However, a less aggressive approach would be much more suitable for this quiet, residential and no through traffic area. I would like to support, like many other residents have, a restriction in the periods of Mon-Sat 8:30 to 18:00 to stop this trend of non residents inconsiderately parking wherever they feel. This would ensure that the real issue is tackled without imposing overkill and harsh controls dramatically limiting the freedom of residents. Many thanks for taking my views into account.</p> <hr/> <p>I would like to lodge my objection to the proposed parking restrictions in St Luke's Square. Having looked at the plans on your website I see that virtually everywhere, apart from the designated parking spaces and opposite gates (where it is not possible to park anyway), you are proposing to enforce double yellow lines with no waiting at any time restrictions. This will make it impossible for myself and my partner to park</p>	<p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>near our flat or even to enjoy the right to invite friends and family over when there is nowhere for them to park.</p> <p>I am sure you can find a more just and flexible way to monitor the safety of these roads, which are very quiet anyway and cars parked by the roads can hardly be considered an hazard, everyone living here is very considerate and drives with the utmost respect and at the appropriate speeds.</p> <p>I find it hard to believe that my Council would ignore the basic and simple right of their citizens who are simply requesting the ability to live in and enjoy their street without having to give up what most people take for granted. I look forward to receiving your response and welcome any further discussion,</p>	
9730	<p>We held an informal meeting in the square last Sunday Andy and the purpose of this email is to confirm the endorsement of St Luke's Residents Association to the proposed plans.</p> <p>We are aware that a few individuals have written in response suggesting various 'tweaks' but we have resolved all of those face to face with those individuals. You are reminded that we represent 120 front doors in St Luke's Square and surrounding areas. We support the plans in their entirety and we wish to thank you for the professionalism emanating from your office. We understand we have not yet reached a satisfactory conclusion but we've done our best and we are more than satisfied you and your colleagues have too. So, thank you very much.</p>	<p>The support of the proposals has been noted and we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

As you are aware there have been a large number of complaints about bad parking in the above roads and a recent decision was made by your department to put forward a new proposal to overcome this. This took the form of a proposal for yellow lines which will ensure that cars will only be parked safely and appropriately and will allow emergency vehicles and other large lorries to access the properties in this part of St. Lukes. This cannot happen soon enough. It will also then be patrolled by personnel from the council and also the police will be more empowered to act if required.

However it will also significantly reduce the overall number of parking spaces available.

At the present time this area is consistently used as a car park for people shopping or working in town and also as a "long term" car park for people possibly travelling elsewhere by train or who live in neighbouring streets. Almost without exception these are the vehicles that have been causing the large number of complaints which I am sure you are aware of.

I think the yellow lines concept is excellent but the downside of this, as stated above, does not address the absurd situation of the "long term parkers".

Are you aware that on a daily basis and in term-time there are between 5 and 10 Grammar school boys who use this area as a free car park, all day?

Are you aware that where building work is taking place on town centre properties, work vans are parked here all day?

These are but two examples.

The general support of the proposals has been noted.

Previous stages of consultation suggested that a clear majority of those that responded from the St Luke's Square section of the development would prefer limited controls as opposed to more involved measures, such as the areas inclusion within the adjacent controlled parking zone and the introduction of a residents' parking scheme.

The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Even so, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are too extensive, will reduce the availability of parking and the increase likelihood of displacement elsewhere.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

	<p>Town centre parking is controlled and expensive and the reason for others continuing to use the area around our houses for long-term parking is obvious.....IT IS FREE.</p> <p>If you visit the area at any time outside of working/school hours you will notice that there are NO PROBLEMS. The locals are aware of the problems and park considerately and safely. There is plenty of room for all.</p> <p>This is not a new problem here or elsewhere and recent changes to parking arrangements, say in St. Omer Road, have recently been implemented to the benefit of its residents AND the revenues received by the Council.</p> <p>I would suggest that the problem is re-visited by your department and a combination of yellow lines and "St. Omer road type restrictions" is implemented. BOTH are required.</p>	
<p>9733 & 9765</p>	<p>I would again like to place my objections to double yellow lines being placed in the areas highlighted. A safety issue has been raised of which mostly is for cars parking during the day - workers, school runs etc. I stand by my original request that double yellow lines are too much and single yellow would allow more flexibility to residents (and their visiting guests) in the evening times but prevent non-residents using the square as a car park during the day. This view has also been refelcted in a letter from another resident "If you visit the square at any time outside of working/school hours, you will notice there are NO PROBLEMS".</p> <p>I enquired yesterday how much around the corners the lines</p>	<p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised</p>

are placed and was told 10m! In my opinion this covers well more than just the corners as was previously proposed and I do feel misled. I also do not understand why there are double yellows proposed around the centre communal garden entrances? There is no safety issue here?? There is more than enough room to pass into the square even if a car is there - I have done so many times. By having double yellows here it will again lose another parking space.

I am objecting formally once again to double yellow lines (and permits if this is raised as another option) and having read a letter from another resident in St Catherine's Park (where actually less restrictions have been placed compared to St Luke's square), I have to say I was shocked to read that there is some indication here that these parking restrictions will have "to the benefit of its residents AND the revenues received by the council". With parking fines under scrutiny the recent news I am not impressed that this has even been mentioned as a reason to place parking restrictions when the issue here has supposedly always been put forward as safety?

After discussing my below concerns with the St Luke's Resident Association, a meeting was held over the weekend for further discussions to take place.

I can now say, whilst I am still unsure and slightly worried about how the double yellow lines will prove, my concerns regarding loss of parking spaces for residents were slightly lessened with the idea of a 'car pool' that we will organise amongst ourselves.

proposals are not extensive enough.

Previous stages of consultation suggested that a clear majority of those that responded from the St Luke's Square section of the development would prefer limited controls as opposed to more involved measures, such as the areas inclusion within the adjacent controlled parking zone and the introduction of a residents' parking scheme.

Prior to the present review commencing a resident from St Lukes Square presented a summary of a petition from 24 households, which indicated over 90% wanted some form of parking control. This was the catalyst for the issue's inclusion within the present parking review.

There is a general expectation that local authorities' parking operations are self-financing, so as to avoid placing a burden on the council taxpayer. In the case of Guildford, its on-street parking operation generates a surplus, which is primarily derived from the on-street parking charges levied in the town centre area. Parking controls are not and must not be introduced solely with the intention of generating revenue.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

	<p>I would like to therefore like <u>to retract my formal objections</u> in the email below, dated 16th July 2013.</p> <p>I apologise for any inconvenience this retraction may cause and thank you in advance for your time.</p>	
	<p>I have recently moved in to St Catherine's Park and, in fact, have had an extremely positive experience with the Parking Office. Because of the extensive parking problems in this development Allen Musgrove provided us with cones to block off a reasonable space in front of our new house for the removal van to park. Without these cones parking would have been absolutely impossible. I include this anecdote to firstly demonstrate that I know the parking office is acutely aware of the parking problems in the St Luke's area. Secondly, I wish to address the parking solution which has recently circulated. I have just returned home from dropping off my husband at his office. As usual, during this time a non-resident (who likely is working on the high street) has parked in front of our home. Not only was our space taken but there were no spaces within reasonable distance of our home. As a result, I am now in a space in front of someone else's home, whom I hope does not return during the day. I would hate to cause the same problem for someone else as has been done unto me. Fortunately, today I am without any parcels to carry in and am lucky not to have to wrangle children from the car. However, I have seen neighbours struggle with two small children and many groceries walking an unreasonable distance to her home from her car.</p> <p>I am a proponent of adding the double yellow lines. The current parking situation is unsafe for drivers and pedestrians alike, due to the lack of visibility. However, I suspect this</p>	<p>Previous stages of consultation suggested that a clear majority of those that responded from the St Luke's Square section of the development would prefer limited controls as opposed to more involved measures, such as the areas inclusion within the adjacent controlled parking zone and the introduction of a residents' parking scheme.</p> <p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Even so, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are too extensive, will reduce the availability of parking and the increase likelihood of displacement elsewhere.</p> <p>Ongoing inconsiderate parking by grammar school pupils, commuters and shoppers are all highlighted as causing</p>

problem would be remedied if non-residents were not permitted to park in this area. While writing this email I have seen numerous cars drive up and down the road looking for spaces. I suspect this problem will worsen when the double yellow lines are installed. There are a sufficient number of spaces allocated under this design for residents alone but not when non-residents intrude on the parking to save a few pounds. (And perhaps the council would be motivated by the losses it incurs for such behaviours). I recognize that as this proposal does not include a resident permit plan, it is unlikely to take hold. Regardless, I thought it prudent to alert you to the true nature of the problem. I sincerely appreciate you reading my email and hope that it provokes discussion regarding the parking situation in St Luke's Square.

I would like to challenge the proposed plans with the following points:

1. Why are GBC acting on the behalf of a very small number of vocal residents? These individuals have very personal drivers for this change which are not to the benefit of the majority. Actual residents should not be penalised because a small number of people object to non-residents parking outside of their properties. This 'attitude' is not a reasonable driver for change, and have not considered the greater impact these restrictions will cause to the surrounding roads.
2. Why are the proposed restrictions for 'No Waiting at Any Time'? Surely a more sensible solution would be to impose parking restrictions during, say, the working day only? This would

the issues within the St Luke's Square section of the development.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

- a) Appease the small minority who are opposed to non residents parking in the square during the day, and
- b) Still service us residents who need secondary bays on return from work.

3. Alternatively, rather than decrease the number of parking spaces through restrictions, have you considered the option of:
- a) Imposing Residents Parking Permits only or
 - b) Increasing the number of designated bays for residents.

Again, this would:

- a) Appease the small minority opposed to non residents parking in the square
- b) Enable residents to secure parking within the vicinity of their property
- c) Avoid compounding parking limitations in the surrounding roads.

I understand the council have attended St. Luke's Square during the day and have seen first hand that a number of the Radisson Construction Team were making use of this free parking during the day. As you will be aware this is no longer an issue, so I believe the original cause for concern has been eliminated. I would encourage the Parking Office to review the current parking situation at the square not only during the day, but more importantly in the evening as people return home from work, as this is the time that residents will be impacted most by these changes. I trust you will also see that the current situation is neither hazardous/dangerous, nor needs changing.

I would formally like to lodge my objection to the proposed Parking Restrictions currently being discussed in respect to the St. Luke's Square development. My reasons are as follows: 1. I own property #1 Knightsbridge House. This is a 2 bed property (as are a small number around the square) and hence we have a requirement for up to two vehicles per household at any one time. The property has only a single designated parking bay associated to it. Therefore at all times I need access to a second parking space within the vicinity of my property. 2. Aside from my property I am aware that a large number of one bedroom properties have couples or small families living in them. As a result, many properties have two cars associated to a single property, whilst they only have a single designated parking bay.

Since the proposed restrictions will dramatically decrease the number of available parking spaces in and around the square, where do you propose our second cars should be parked?

3. I purchased my property on the basis that there was parking readily available and that this area was not restricted in any way. I believe this change will impact on the price of my property.

4. My gravest concern is that there is no issue with the parking arrangements as they currently stand. I have always been able to find parking and do not believe parking to be 'hazardous' or 'dangerous' in any way. These are emotive terms that have been used by a small number of residents in an attempt to prohibit non-residents parking in the square during the working day. This is not a good enough reason to prohibit actual residents from parking outside of their properties, on their return from work.

Prior to the present review commencing a resident from St Lukes Square presented a summary of a petition from 24 households, which indicated over 90% wanted some form of parking control.

Subsequent stages of consultation suggested that within the wider St Luke's Square area 83% of those that responded thought controls were necessary. In the St Luke's Park section of the development a clear majority opposed controls. The proposals were developed taking into account the respective wishes, albeit that the potential for displacement has been highlighted throughout.

Nevertheless, the proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

	<p>5. Since the proposed parking restrictions will dramatically decrease the number of spaces, I believe this change will actually create (rather than solve) a parking problem where previously there wasn't any. In addition this change represents an unnecessary cost.</p> <p>6, Whilst I understand the proposed restrictions are a result of a Survey administered last year, it is clear from the results that a small minority of the St. Luke's Square residents were in favour of this change. More importantly I understand that this is being driven by a very small number of individuals who have been very vocal. I do not believe the council should be acting on behalf on the minority, but should represent he majority of the residents in the square who are in fact opposed to this proposal.</p> <p>7. Due to the significant reduction in available spaces, I believe the proposed parking restrictions will create additional issues beyond St. Luke's Square, by encouraging individuals to seek alternative parking in the surrounding roads. We are already aware of an acute parking problem within Charlottesville and do not wish to compound this. Equally I do not believe the St. Luke's Park residents will appreciate us shifting the perceived issue to outside their properties.</p>	
<p>9762</p>	<p>My name is Daniel, I live at 10 Knightsbridge house, St Luke's square with my partner. We are private tenants but have lived here for over a year now and we would like to lend our support to new parking plans.</p> <p>Both myself and my parter have had near misses at the entrance to St Luke's square due to cars parking right on the</p>	<p>The support of the proposals has been noted and we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>junction. It makes it almost impossible to see vehicles coming from either direction and negotiating the square can at times be equally as challenging.</p> <p>The new plans seem logical and fair to both of us. We look forward to them being implemented and being able to drive safely around our home.</p>	
<p>Page 134</p> <p>9763</p>	<p>I would like to lodge my objection to the proposed parking restrictions in St Luke's Square. Having looked at the plans on your website I see that virtually everywhere, apart from the designated parking spaces and opposite gates (where it is not possible to park anyway), you are proposing to enforce double yellow lines with no waiting at any time restrictions. This will make it impossible for myself and my partner to park near our flat or even to enjoy the right to invite friends and family over when there is nowhere for them to park.</p> <p>I am sure you can find a more just and flexible way to monitor the safety of these roads, which are very quiet anyway and cars parked by the roads can hardly be considered an hazard, everyone living here is very considerate and drives with the utmost respect and at the appropriate speeds. I find it hard to believe that my Council would ignore the basic and simple right of their citizens who are simply requesting the ability to live in and enjoy their street without having to give up what most people take for granted.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>After reading more about the concerns of the residents over inconsiderate parking during the week by workers and students using St Luke's Square as a free car park without any sense of respect for the residents, I would like to add another point to my below comments (which I continue to ask</p>	<p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>yo consider as very valid).</p> <p>I still object to double yellow lines with no waiting at any times as I consider this to be an unnecessarily restrictive measure which will unfairly result in no flexibility for the residents. However, a less aggressive approach would be much more suitable for this quiet, residential and no through traffic area. I would like to support, like many other residents have, a restriction in the periods of Mon-Sat 8:30 to 18:00 to stop this trend of non residents inconsiderately parking wherever they feel. This would ensure that the real issue is tackled without imposing overkill and harsh controls dramatically limiting the freedom of residents.</p>	
9764	<p>I write to respond to the consultation on proposed parking restrictions in the St Luke's area. I am very familiar with the area, and recently walked round it with the map of the proposed restrictions.</p> <p>In my view, the restrictions are far tighter than necessary. The standards applied might be appropriate for a busy shopping area such as the centre of Guildford, but they are unnecessarily restrictive for a residential area with only slow-moving traffic. In particular, the double yellow lines are much too long, extending too far from the corners they protect, and would deprive residents and their visitors of perfectly safe parking spaces.</p> <p>There is also a problem with the restrictions at the South East corner where there is a locked barrier. I assume that it is intended that emergency vehicles carry a suitable key and could if necessary unlock the barrier, but unless they do, and the padlocks are regularly checked, there is no point in putting</p>	<p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>down yellow lines. And if it is sensible to put down yellow lines, they should extend beyond the barrier so that emergency vehicles could proceed once the barrier had been unlocked!</p>	
<p>9771</p>	<p>1. we respectfully request that double yellow lines are provided opposite our house - 1 St Catherine's Park - as indicated on the attached sketch to prevent the road being blocked by cars lawfully parking both sides of the road as frequently happens</p> <p>2. again, we state our preference to install controlled parking zones with restrictions (say between 9.00am to 11.00am) to stop commuters, boys from the Royal Grammar School and non-residents working in town from parking all day</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries or require any further information.</p>	<p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Even so, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are too extensive, will reduce the availability of parking and the likelihood of displacement elsewhere.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>9782</p>	<p>Further to your letter inviting us to comment and further to my previous correspondence, (this will be the third time I've had to write to the council about proposed parking restrictions at St Luke's Square), I would like to reiterate the point that I think it is totally unnecessary and a waste of council time and money. As a resident of St Luke's Square, one of the benefits</p>	<p>Prior to the present review commencing a resident from St Lukes Square presented a summary of a petition from 24 households, which indicated over 90% wanted some form of parking control.</p> <p>Subsequent stages of consultation suggested that within</p>

that we pay high rent for is the ease of parking. To have that privilege taken away would be unjust and unfair. I appreciate the annoyance of people, i.e. non St Luke's Square residents, abusing the parking situation, but this occurs mainly during working hours – Monday to Friday 8.30am-5.30pm, outside of these hours in terms of parking the square is quiet and presents no traffic danger. Even during peak hours I don't see how a few cars parked in a quiet residential area pose a danger anyway.

I cannot stress enough how superfluous the parking restrictions are. I fear the whole situation has come about from people who unjustifiably begrudge anyone having a parking space, as I can't see what other hindrance there is? Creating restrictions in St Luke's won't solve any problems, as there isn't a problem in the first place, it will only create problems. Where do you envisage those cars that currently park at St Luke's will go? It will only cause an over-spill to already over populated and restricted nearby areas, surely causing more of a risk? Especially as these nearby areas are actual public roads, not a residential cul-de-sac as St Luke's is.

IF any restrictions at all HAVE to be put in place, may I suggest **FREE** parking permits are given to St Luke's Square residents only, this would curb the issue of non-residents using the area to park. Please note the word '**FREE**' as previously mentioned, we already pay high rental prices – part of the justification for these rental prices being so high is because of the 'perk' of having parking. But permits should be a last resort.

As a busy working professional I don't have time for further stress such as this, and I don't appreciate receiving petty correspondence through the door being force fed opinions

the wider St Luke's Square area 83% of those that responded thought controls were necessary. In the St Luke's Park section of the development a clear majority opposed controls. The proposals were developed taking into account the respective wishes, albeit that the potential for displacement has been highlighted throughout.

The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough.

The previous stages of consultation suggest that a clear majority of those that responded from the St Luke's Square section of the development would prefer limited controls as opposed to more involved measures, such as the areas inclusion within the adjacent controlled parking zone and the introduction of a residents' parking scheme. Within the remainder of the controlled parking zone, the cost of residents' permits covers the administration of the permit scheme and issuing the permits. The charges are set centrally by Surrey County Council and are broadly standardised across the county.

	<p>about the parking in St Luke's Square, I believe this came from St Luke's Square resident's association? Save yourself some time and money and please drop the charade of parking restrictions in St Luke's Square. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I hope the next correspondence we receive from you will be to inform us that it is not going ahead.</p>	<p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
<p>Page 138 9787</p>	<p>Further to your notice regarding the proposed parking restrictions at St Luke's Square, Guildford I write with the following observations: Whilst there is no doubt that parking restrictions in the St. Luke's area are absolutely necessary and all the flats at St. Luke's Square have a dedicated parking space, many of the residents have more than one car. If the double yellow lines are placed around the square to prevent commuter parking, the commuters will use the bays in front of the blocks of flats (originally created for the use of the residents), thus preventing these residents from parking.</p> <p>Would it not be a sensible solution to make these bays limited to permit holders and restricted parking times for non-permit holders for up to a maximum of two hours between 6.00 a.m. and 6.00 p.m.? This would allow the residents more chance of being able to park near their property.</p> <p>Admittedly some of the flats do have 2 spaces each but they too have visitors who would like to park near to the flats. By just introducing a no waiting at any time zone you will penalise the residents of both St. Luke's Square and St. Luke's Park.</p> <p>As a former chairman of the management company the looks after the flats, I had long meetings and discussions with the Council some 10 years ago concerning the parking problem in the area and the yellow line/permits was mooted at that time. So please, when considering the problem, do take into account the residents of the whole area.</p>	<p>The general support for the need for controls has been noted.</p> <p>The previous stages of consultation suggest that a clear majority of those that responded from the St Luke's Square section of the development would prefer limited controls as opposed to more involved measures, such as the areas inclusion within the adjacent controlled parking zone and the introduction of a residents' parking scheme.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>

9792	I write in support of the proposals to introduce parking controls in St Luke's Square as indicated on the recent plan sent to residents: the parking situation with pupils at the local sixth form, workers and shoppers using the square as an unofficial car park has gone on for many years and is both a nuisance to residents and on occasion has actually proved dangerous.	The support of the proposals has been noted and we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.
9794	I Would like to give my support for parking restrictions in St Luke's Square. KM/13/0002 any chance of private parking signs for st Thomas mews & at barthomelews court?	The support of the proposals has been noted. The introduction of signing to highlight private areas would be a matter for the management organisation responsible for those areas. In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

9849	<p>We wish to express our support for the proposals to introduce parking controls in the St Luke's Square development.</p> <p>We support these on grounds of road safety, emergency vehicle access and service vehicle access.</p>	<p>The support of the proposals has been noted and we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9859	<p>We write in relation to the draft order for parking restrictions in St Lukes Square. We had understood that the main reason for the need to introduce such measures, as argued by some residents of St Lukes Square, was to control dangerous parking in this area, and that the Council would operate a "light touch" in ensuring such safety whilst still maintaining the facility for residents and visitors to continue to be able to park responsibly in this area. Whilst we can understand the logic of restricting parking close to junctions or the bends in St Lukes Square, some of the other proposed restricted parking areas seem excessive e.g. south west side of St Lukes Square leading to Bartholomew court- restrictions not needed on both sides of the road as this is not a through route but leads to parking places only; north west side of St Lukes square, other than corners. We do not require a personal reply but hope that the Council will consider our suggestions in their final decision making</p> <p>.</p>	<p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9879	<p>Firstly thank you for undertaking this consultation. I broadly agree with the proposals a detailed in your letter and plan dated 12th July 2013, but have the following observations –</p>	<p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth</p>

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 carriageway. This road was designed and built as a two way road. To achieve this the design of the development specifically incorporated parking bays to these sections of the road so that vehicles do not need to park on the road. The presence of the 90 degree bend, together with the railings and vegetation in the square limits your view (in a car at least). Any obstruction limits site lines and access particularly for commercial vehicles.

Although the pavements are quite adequate due to the presence of the open space north of St Catherine's Park it is quite common for families with young children to walk down the centre of the road (the road surface seems quite good for scooters, bikes and pushchairs!). When cars are parked around the square it does make it very difficult to see other vehicles approaching let alone a child on bike.

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. Last week I watched in admiration as the Council's recycling lorry performed a 16 point turn just to get around the square!

side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Even so, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are too extensive, will reduce the availability of parking and the increase likelihood of displacement elsewhere.

Whilst the introduction of parking controls will allow enforcement action to be taken against footway parking in those specific locations, formalised controls would not be considered specifically to deal with this. Physical measures, such as bollards, tend to be more appropriate and effective in dealing with such issues.

Previous stages of consultation suggested that within the wider St Luke's Square area 83% of those that responded thought controls were necessary. In the St Luke's Park section of the development a clear majority opposed controls. The proposals were developed taking into account the respective wishes, albeit that the potential for displacement has been highlighted throughout.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Despite your best efforts to resolve this issue I suspect that eventually St Luke's and Lancaster Gate will require its own individually tailored residents permit parking system. By that I mean it is set up as a different zone and that every household is entitled to apply for two parking permits irrespective of the off street parking provision they already have. I suspect that such an approach would possibly overcome most (but of course not all.....) objections. Finally I attach a couple of photographs for reference but have little doubt that you have seen the same.</p>	
<p>9884</p>	<p>Firstly, sorry if this email is a bit late. I have just returned from holiday.</p> <p>I do NOT support the proposed parking restrictions on St Luke's Square.</p> <p>Whilst the kids form school parking there is annoying, I feel that this campaign is being spear-headed by residents of the</p>	<p>Prior to the present review commencing a resident from St Lukes Square presented a summary of a petition from 24 households, which indicated over 90% wanted some form of parking control.</p> <p>Subsequent stages of consultation suggested that within the wider St Luke's Square area 83% of those that</p>

	<p>houses that have two allocated parking spaces.</p> <p>As I live in the flat I only have one space, so the square parking is useful if friends want to visit me on the weekends.</p>	<p>responded thought controls were necessary. In the St Luke's Park section of the development a clear majority opposed controls. The proposals were developed taking into account the respective wishes, albeit that the potential for displacement has been highlighted throughout.</p> <p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9887	<p>Parking Controls in St. Luke's - Response of St. Luke's Park Residents Association</p> <p>The St. Luke's Park Residents Association (SLPRA) wish to formally object to the Formal proposal for parking controls in the roads around St. Luke's Square and St. Catherine's Park as detailed in the document sent out by Andy Harkin on 12th July 2013. The latest proposed controls are excessive for the</p>	<p>Prior to the present review commencing a resident from St Lukes Square presented a summary of a petition from 24 households, which indicated over 90% wanted some form of parking control.</p> <p>Subsequent stages of consultation suggested that within the wider St Luke's Square area 83% of those that responded thought controls were necessary. In the St</p>

'problem' they are trying to cure and the reduction in available parking in the St. Luke's Square part of the development will not only cause non-resident parkers to displace into our part of the development, but could even cause their residents to park here too.

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.

Although 48 metres of double yellow lines on the inside of the road around the northeast and southeast sides of St. Luke's Square have been removed in the formal proposals compared to the plan put forward in the informal consultation in December, removal of these lines does not actually add any additional parking spaces. This is because the roads on those sides of the Square are so narrow that no-one has ever parked there. They park in the parking bays on the outside of those roads. This eastern side of the Square is not where the perceived problem is. It is the corner on the western side of the square that some of their residents have been complaining about. I certainly hope that these 48 metres of pointless lines weren't added to the December 2012 proposal in order that they could be removed in the formal proposals in July to create the impression of a compromise. The formal plan dated 2nd July 2013 is the same as the one dated 25th February 2013 that I commented on in my email to you of 23rd April. The addition of lines across two of the four pedestrian entrances to the green in the middle of the Square in the formal proposal just reduces the available parking spaces (that are not near the 'problem corner') on the wider roads on the northwest and southwest sides of the Square. Pedestrians rarely seem to use this green in the middle of the

Luke's Park section of the development a clear majority of those that responded opposed controls. The proposals were developed taking into account the respective wishes, albeit that the potential for displacement has been highlighted throughout.

Throughout the various stages of consultation, concerns have been raised from all the roads in the St Luke's Square part of the development.

The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Indeed, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are not extensive enough, some wanting a residents' parking scheme to be introduced.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

Square anyway so it seems churlish to put lines in the middle of the only two straight parts of the roads that are not obstructing the 'problem corner'.

In the Formal advertisement of proposals it is stated that *'the reason for the proposed introduction of controls in St Bartholomew's Court, St Catherine's Park, St Luke's Square and St Thomas's Mews is to resolve safety, access and traffic movement issues caused by inconsiderate parking in these roads.'* We find it difficult to believe that inconsiderate parking is a safety issue on the roads in question. The nature of the road layout means that vehicle speeds are low around corners and the short straight parts of the square where people could park safely would be restricted unnecessarily by lines painted too far from the corner (as well as the newly propose lines across the pedestrian entrances). This also applies to the lines proposed at the entrances to St. Bartholomew's Court and St. Thomas' Mews.

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 this part 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 western corner in the Square. They will most likely be displaced into our roads in St. Luke's 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 bedroom 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.

The letter I wrote on behalf of the St. Luke's Park Residents Association in response to the second informal stage in January suggested a much more phased approach and also suggested increasing the available (safe) parking on the cobbled double width pavements by removing some of the bollards that currently prevent it.

I should point out that the St. Luke's Square part of the

	<p>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 communications.</p> <p>Please listen to what we are saying and reconsider the extent and severity of the controls that you are proposing.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 ○ Leaving the lay-bys in front of our three blocks with no restrictions ○ Not introducing any form of 'Residents Only' or 'Pay by Meter' regimes in the Square ○ However, we believe you should consider extending the double yellow lines to include both sides of the entrance road into the Square from 	<p>The proposed measures are, in many respects, the minimum that we would recommend introducing. The double yellow line junction protection controls proposed around various junctions within the development extend 10 metres, and have only been introduced on the bellmouth side, rather than opposite the junctions. It would be inadvisable to introduce shorter lengths to allow parking closer to the junctions and bends. The introduction of single yellow lines would allow parking actually on the junctions and bends at times when the restrictions did not operate. However, vehicles parked in these locations would still cause safety, access and traffic flow issues, regardless of the time of day that it occurred. Even so, several representees suggest that the advertised proposals are too extensive, will reduce the availability of parking and the likelihood of displacement elsewhere.</p> <p>The concerns about the replacement of previously damaged bollards has been brought to the attention of Surrey County Council – Highways, as the issue is one of highway maintenance, and as such, falls outside the scope of the present parking review.</p>

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.

- 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 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.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

ITEM 7 : ANNEXE 6.5 : COMMENTS AND OBJECTIONS RAISED TO ADVERTISED ORDER TOGETHER WITH OFFICER COMMENTS

Ref. No.	Representation Comments	Officer Comments & Recommendation
Other Changes – Abbot Road		(1 representation)
9799	<p>The proposed siting is opposite our road's turning bay. The old sign which was located outside No.6, stating that it was 20yds ahead has long since rusted and disappeared. However, most residents, visitors and delivery vans use it on a daily basis. The alternative is driving around a narrow blind corner and driving to the bottom of a steep incline to turn around. The turning bay is marked by metal posts with red reflectors on the south west side of the road.</p> <p>Currently, this turning bay is blocked by a builder's van, Monday to Friday, as a new house is being built, the address of which is 8, Warwick's Bench but the building of it is from Abbot Road side. During this period, all manner of vehicles have been using resident parking bays to turn which has had a marked and detrimental affect on our paving which we maintain at our own expense. Approximately 50 metres down the hill, there are further parking bays that are usually available, but it seems too far for them to walk to.</p> <p>I am aware that many of our neighbours are currently on their summer holidays but am confident that they would be unhappy to lose our turning bay. A new signpost would be most welcome as the steep bend immediately afterwards is</p>	<p>The turning bay referred to is actually a disused vehicle crossover. Other extant vehicle crossovers in the vicinity provide motorists with other opportunities to turn without having to drive to the facility situated at the cul-de-sac end, at the bottom of the steep hill. The proposed parking bay does not conflict with the other opportunities to turn within the road.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

	quite difficult. Should we be able to retain our road's turning bay, parking opposite will make it's use impossible as the road is narrow and would necessitate 5 point turning and not 3.	
Other Changes – Cline Road		(2 representations)
9716	I note the notice advertised in Cline Road for a disabled space outside 103 Cline Road. The tenants of 103 have recently changed (above a month ago) and the next tenants are not needing a disabled space. Parking spaces are already at a premium in the road and object to the space as it is now not necessary.	Given that the Blue Badge holder that requested the space is no longer resident at the address, we recommend that the proposal to introduce a Disabled Only parking space is not progressed.
9774	Just an enquiry, I am resident at 105 Cline road and have just read the notice re providing a 'disabled persons free parking spaces' outside no 103. I am just enquiring as to whether this is still necessary as the resident their who was disabled has now moved and no longer resides at this property.	Given that the Blue Badge holder that requested the space is no longer resident at the address, we recommend that the proposal to introduce a Disabled Only parking space is not progressed.
Other Changes – Curling Vale		(2 representations)

9720	<p>We would like to raise our objections to any change in parking restrictions on Curling Vale GU2 as owners of 25, Curling Vale. Our property has no off street parking so we benefit from being able to park our car on the street with the current restrictions. We do not mind paying to park our car outside our property as the current restrictions stop the spaces being filled by workers at the university and hospital or commuters to the train station. They also allow our friends and family to stop by and visit for up to four hours without worrying about sourcing and paying for parking vouchers.</p> <p>We believe the new proposals would do nothing to reduce the numbers of cars parked on Curling Vale but restrict the ease of which friends and family could visit. We also object to having to pay for them to park on a street that is never full and is so far from town that it will never be used by shoppers or tourists to park on.</p> <p>In addition the only source of parking vouchers in Guildford is the office in the centre of town which is only open 8.30-5.30 Monday to Friday and as we both work in London it is impossible for us to get these vouchers without taking time out of work.</p>	<p>The proposed changes are intended to provide a formalised Disabled Only space outside a Blue Badge holding resident's home and facilitate a recently created vehicle crossover.</p> <p>The cost of permits covers the administration of the permit scheme and issuing the permits. The charges are set centrally by Surrey County Council and are broadly standardised across the county.</p> <p>Parking Services is currently investigating ways to allow residents to acquire residents' and visitor scratch-card permits online, without having to visit the Parking Office. Nevertheless, there remains the need to ensure that those applying for permits are entitled to acquire them. Notwithstanding, residents' and visitor scratch-card permits can be applied for and acquired by post.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>
9778	<p>I am writing to raise objections to the proposed parking changes for Curling Vale. The basis of the objection are four fold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The present scheme operates perfectly except it creates issues for the generation of income from traffic wardens, who must visit at 4 hour intervals to trap offenders. There used to be major parking issues in the road but these have 	<p>The proposed changes are intended to provide a formalised Disabled Only space outside a Blue Badge holding resident's home and facilitate a recently created vehicle crossover.</p> <p>Although it would not influence the County Council's consideration of Disabled Bay applications or the creation of a vehicle crossover associated with a development,</p>

disappeared since the introduction of the current parking scheme (put in place after extensive consultation with residents). Now, only residents and visitors to residents park in the street and rarely, if ever, do parking issues arise in consequence.

2) Planning consent has been given for the creation of six new homes in the south east stretch of Curling Vale since the present parking scheme was introduced and this has INCREASED the need for resident parking on this section of Curling Vale. Four of these homes do not have any provision for off street parking. It is, therefore, unreasonable for the borough council to grant planning permission for new homes (to the detriment of residents who purchased before housing density was increased) and then to reduce parking capacity into the bargain.

3) There are some parking bays in the surrounding area that invite traffic accidents (such as the bays on the southern side of Elmside which create blind spots) which should be the priority concern. Health and safety should take precedence over drawing ripple parking diagrams, and should these dangerous bays be removed, the spaces currently available in Curling Vale would offer viable parking alternatives.

4) There is a danger that the special quality of Onslow Village will be destroyed as more and more residents, faced with unnecessarily restrictive parking regulations, choose to concrete over gardens, removing green space, hedges and soak aways in the process. We already have a problem with rivers of water cascading down Curling Vale during heavy rain fall and this problem will simply be exacerbated if more and more residents replace green front lawns with concreted parking bays.

there are nearly always spare spaces available within the road, and other opportunities in adjacent roads, such as Friars Gate.

The concerns about Elmside have been noted and it may be possible to give consideration to the matter during a future parking review.

Across Area J there are significantly more spaces provided than there are permit holders. This is despite residents being able to acquire one permit irrespective of their off-street parking provision. Given that parking issues rarely, if ever, arise, a small reduction in the availability of space in is unlikely to encourage households to create hardstands.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposals are implemented as advertised.

<p>Other Changes – Joseph’s Road</p>		<p>(1 representation)</p>
<p>9759</p>	<p>I understand that the notice KM/13/0001 includes moving the parking line further back from no.7 for easier access as it is presently only one curb length away from the drive.</p> <p>I live at no.11, the other half of the building which is semidetached (there is no no.9). We suffer the same problem of access to our drive the parking starting one curb length back from the drive. People do not realise difficult access is and regularly overhang the parking line. We cannot pull out in one but rather have to perform a tricky reverse manoeuvre in the middle of the road to avoid hitting the opposite wall. Similarly to get back in we have to be completely on the wrong side of the road dangerously facing on coming traffic and being 90 degrees blind at the same time to traffic pulling out from the dance studio opposite that is very busy after school.</p> <p>Speaking with Andrew Harkin Parking Co - ordinator yesterday he could see the problem on the map. He suggested that it maybe possible to move the parking back by one curb length as it would provide much safer access. To the Stoke rd. side of the parking bay there is a length of double yellow lines four curb lengths before the drop</p>	<p>The representation does not relate to the advertised proposal, but instead requests similar amendments around another vehicular access which has not previously been raised as an issue with Parking Services.</p> <p>Although a similar increase in the setback distance to the east of the access at No.11 would increase the level of restriction, this is more than offset by opportunities to reduce the setback distance to the parking bay to the west of the access. As a result, the overall level of restriction would be reduced.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the advertised proposal in the vicinity of No.7 is implemented, but that a similar additional amendment is also made in the vicinity of the vehicle crossover at No.11, which will not increase the overall level of restriction, or reduce the availability of parking.</p>

	<p>curb to no 7. The bay could be kept the same length by moving it along one curb taking up the double yellow.</p> <p>If this could be actioned at this time with no. 7 we would be sincerely grateful as it is both difficult and dangerous getting in and out of no.11.</p>	
<p>Other Changes –Margaret Road</p>		<p>(1 representation)</p>
<p>Page 154</p> <p>9839</p>	<p>As residents living on Margaret Road in Guildford, we are writing to object to the recent proposals to convert the existing 'No Waiting Mon-Sat 8.30am-6pm Single Yellow Line' restriction to a 'No Waiting At Any Time Double Yellow Line' restriction on both sides of Margaret Road at the cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Our main concern is that the road is going to lose approximately 6 parking spaces between the hours of 6pm-8.30am on weekday nights and from 6pm on Saturday until 8.30am on a Monday. These are the pinch times when parking space availability are at a premium. Indeed, parking on Margaret Road is already extremely congested and we both regularly struggle to find space on Margaret Road, let alone near our house.</p> <p>Parking has become a lot more competitive for residents as Margaret Road is also used as an 'overflow parking facility' by employees of the Police Station (this has become much worse since the Police Station has reduced the amount of onsite parking made available for its employees last year). The proposal would eliminate 6 parking spaces and make the issue of residents finding a parking space even more</p>	<p>At present, those wishing to turn in Margaret Road, when the single yellow lines at the cul-de-sac end are parked upon, either have to reverse a considerable distance, or utilise the Police Station car park to manoeuvre. Parking on the single yellow lines also causes issues for those with off-street parking facilities, albeit that some of the properties at the cul-de-sac end do not appear to have authorised vehicle crossovers.</p> <p>As part of the present parking review, residents of Margaret Road were consulted about whether they wanted the operational hours of the controls to be changed. Those that responded were not supportive of such changes, and indeed many of those that were wanted shorter hours rather than longer ones. Extended controls hours may have helped resolve some of the issues caused by non-residents using the parking bays in the evening.</p> <p>The provision of parking facilities at the Police Station would be a matter for Surrey Police to consider.</p> <p>Surrey County Council – Highways considers applications</p>

heightened between the hours of 6pm-8.30am on weekday nights and from 6pm on Saturday until 8.30am on a Monday - when non-residents are able to park in designated parking bays without restriction.

If a solution could be found by the Police Station to provide onsite parking for their employees and restrict their parking on Margaret Road, that would reduce our objections to the proposal.

On a related point of reducing the demand for parking spaces on Margaret Road, a number of years ago, my wife applied for dropped kerb parking at the front of 25 Margaret Road. This was refused on the grounds of space. A dropped kerb solution would in our view reduce the demand for parking on Margaret Road (we for one would not need to use on street parking - and a number of other properties adjacent could also benefit from dropped kerbs) and is something we would consider.

In summary, we are objecting to the proposals as they are actually going to reduce the availability of parking spaces - directly contrary to one of the stated reasons behind the proposals. It is extremely frustrating for residents that the Council appear to be continually reducing the availability of residential parking rather than making provision for new parking.

The specific proposals for Margaret Road do not support improving the availability of parking for residents of Margaret Road or indeed those with Zone A residential parking permits. It appears the proposals for Margaret Road are being viewed entirely globally as part of the whole Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). As I'm sure you are aware, not each street in the CPZ can be viewed the same way, and some have different

for vehicle crossovers and the suitability of the proposed parking facilities beyond.

As part of previous parking reviews we have increased the number of parking spaces in Area A by around 60. We have also increased the proportion of permit only bays. The present review proposes to further increase the number of formalised parking spaces within Area A, although admittedly, there will be no increase in the Margaret Road area.

The fact that Margaret Road is the primary means of vehicular access to and from the Police station does indeed influence the situation. Perhaps if this were not the case, there might be greater scope to provide additional parking spaces.

The proposal in Margaret Road is one of around 30 relatively minor changes to the parking controls. Although we have consulted directly with several thousand households about some of the more major elements of the parking review, it is not always practicable to write directly to all those that could potentially be affected, either directly, or indirectly about more modest amendments.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposal is implemented as advertised.

	<p>requirements. No more so than Margaret Road, given the proximity of the Police Station.</p> <p>Finally, we found it disappointing not to be communicated with directly by letter regarding the proposals. As the changes directly impact our road and indeed are taking place right outside our house, surely this warrants more targeted communication with the residents affected. For your information, the laminated sign placed on the lamppost on Margaret Road lasted about a week before falling off. We await your comments regarding our objections.</p>	
<p>Other Changes – Walnut Tree Close</p>		<p>(3 representations including a 37-signature petition)</p>
<p>Page 156</p> <p>9804</p>	<p>We were delighted to see the notice to change parking restrictions in lower Walnut Tree Close (nos 6-18) to 'Permit Holders Only'. As previously expressed in a number of letters to Andy Harkin over the years, these 10 parking spaces directly front over 30 properties - so parking is pressured anyway - but the situation is exacerbated further by shoppers, businessmen, tradesmen and commuters for the train station constantly using parking in these spaces during the day, while in the evening people park up to visit the nearby restaurants, theatre and cinema. Residents are constantly and unfairly forced to park in private parking areas or on double yellow lines, making it very difficult to unload shopping/small children. We are among many residents who have had to wait over an hour to park in our road and wasted gallons of petrol driving up and down looking for parking space! The change to 'permit holders only 8.30am-6pm' will significantly help residents to park so this has our full support.</p>	<p>The support for the proposals has been noted, and we recommend that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

9873	<p>Just a quick note to say that I'm in agreement with the proposals in the above notice. They should go some way to improving our chances of getting a parking space during the day. If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	<p>The support for the proposals has been noted, and we recommend that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
9880	<p>PETITION – 37 Signatures – Stonham Home Group</p> <p>I am a project worker at Cyrenian House (18 Walnut Tree Close) – hostel and write on behalf of the 14 residents and staff at the hostel and also our 9 residents who occupy 16, 8 and 6 Walnut Tree Close. Staff provide 24 hour support to homeless men with complex needs who may stay with us for up to 4 years. Residents are either referred by Guildford Borough Council Housing Department or by HOST (Homeless Outreach Service Team). Many of our residents are very vulnerable and are receiving treatment for alcohol and drug addiction. Others may be under a mental health care plan or receiving treatment for a physical and/or a psychological illness. Some residents also have learning difficulties.</p> <p>On a daily basis, vital visits are made to the residents by professionals and non-professionals and I have listed the following as the most common examples:</p> <p>CPN, social worker, psychiatrist, psychologist visit as part of the residents mental health care plan. Nurse to witness a resident takes his necessary medication Chemist delivery of special medication Volunteer collecting a resident to take him to essential appointments Family visiting residents and/or to take them to appointments</p>	<p>The permit scheme already provides for residents with significant care needs. Residents can apply for carer permits to allow for visits from various practitioners. Such permits allow residents' carers to park within permit only and limited waiting shared-use parking bays without restriction.</p> <p>Although there would appear to be a hardstand associated with Cyrenian House, which could perhaps be used for parking, this is situated adjacent to the parking bay which we are proposing to convert from limited waiting to permit only. It is also the case that the hardstand is not serviced by an authorised vehicle crossover.</p> <p>The existing 2-hour limited waiting spaces are not intended to provide all day parking for staff working at non-residential premises within Walnut Tree Close. Nearby long stay car parks are provided for such needs. However, the limited waiting bays that remain within Walnut Tree Close will still be available for shorter visits.</p> <p>Although Guildford is generally considered a safe town with relatively low levels of recorded crime, we have brought the concerns about personal safety of staff to the attention of Surrey Police.</p>

Maintenance engineers carrying our imperative repairs and maintenance
 SADAS visit to provide a counselling session
 (The police, doctors and ambulance service also make frequent visits but park wherever necessary to fulfil their duties)

Also, staff based at Cyrenian House including the HOST team require access to their car to make routine visits to our other residents in Guildford or to support the street homeless. Moreover, there is a late night change of shift between the hours of 10pm and 11pm where staff, especially women, have to walk alone along Walnut Tree Close, sometimes for up to 10 minutes to retrieve their car.

Should the bays outside our properties be changed to Permit Holders Only it would have an adverse impact on essential amenities previously enjoyed by our clients and staff: it would be even more difficult to find a parking bay than it is already due to the proposed reduction in Limited Waiting Bays in Walnut Tree Close. This in turn would have a gradual but definite impact on our client's welfare and ongoing recovery and have an adverse impact on the safety of staff when leaving the hostel late at night. Please find enclosed signatures from our clients and staff.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposal is implemented as advertised.

Other Changes – Warren Road (outside The Spike)

(4 representations)

9732	<p>I previously emailed you about the restricted sightline In Warren Road beyond the Tangier Road turning. this has been a problem since the parking bays in Tangier Road were altered. A few years ago, effectively pushing the problem round the corner. I am forwarding you a photograph taken from the driving seat of my car yesterday as I tried to exit the drive. As you will see the sightline is really compromised, and when vans and lorries park there it is even worse and there have been a few near misses. As you are apparently overhauling on road parking I. Guildford at the moment will you please see if you can address this problem for us.</p>	<p>The representation does not relate to the advertised proposal, but instead requests that the parking controls elsewhere in Warren Road, to the east of Tangier Road, over half a kilometre away, are amended.</p> <p>There may be scope for us to consider the parking situation to the east of Tangier during a future parking review.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>
9758	<p>I understand various existing restrictive parking zones are being amended including parking at the lower end of Warren Road. My husband and I live at the eastern end (Windrush, GU1 2HQ), and believe it is only a matter of time before the restricted site lines we and neighbours have, because of the positioning of the parking zones, causes a significant accident. Immediately outside our property is a single yellow line restriction, which is periodically abused, and could benefit from double yellow lines.</p> <p>BUT of more concern is the parking to our left as we leave our drive way, which obstructs all or most of our view of traffic approaching from the east. The parking zone virtually reaches the edge of our drive, and if vehicles other than low cars park there we are unable to see. We therefore have to push forward exposing the front of the car until able to see, by which time traffic has often arrived from our right (west), and we either have to reverse again, or cause a hold up. Obviously this problem is compounded when vehicles also abuse the restricted (evenings and Sundays) roadway outside</p>	<p>The representation does not relate to the advertised proposal, but instead requests that the parking controls elsewhere in Warren Road, to the east of Tangier Road, over half a kilometre away, are amended.</p> <p>There may be scope for us to consider the parking situation to the east of Tangier during a future parking review.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

	<p>our property, mentioned in the 3rd paragraph.</p> <p>Indeed when consultation about the marking out of the zones took place a few years back, we could already foresee the problems, and made our case clear at the time, especially with the parking bays starting so close to our driveway.</p> <p>A further point is the postbox which is only a few yards east of the drive, and frequently used, therefore 'inviting' cars to use the yellow lined area or in front of our drive because the parking bays are full. We sometimes arrive home and are unable to get into the drive!</p> <p>Yellow lining to the east from our drive and past the postbox would alleviate the problems. We are happy for you or a staff member to call at our home to check out the problems and for us to explain the situation on site. We do hope you can reconsider the parking situation this eastern end of Warren Road.</p>	
9786	<p>I see from your list of revocation of various existing restrictions that you are amending the parking at the bottom of Warren Road, near St Lukes Square. We would like to ask you to look at the top of Warren Road, beyond the Tangier Road turning. As the drive is shared between three houses, it can get busy by the road and we need to give way to incoming/outgoing vehicles. If there are cars parked at the bays it is difficult to pass or give way to incoming vehicles on Warren Road as we can not stop close to the pavement but in the middle of the road next to the parked cars. Also the visibility is very poor as the parking bays are too close to the entrance of the driveway. It would be best if you are able to come and have a look how dangerous the exit can be.</p>	<p>The representation does not relate to the advertised proposal, but instead requests that the parking controls elsewhere in Warren Road, to the east of Tangier Road, over half a kilometre away, are amended.</p> <p>There may be scope for us to consider the parking situation to the east of Tangier during a future parking review.</p> <p>In view of the above, we recommend that the proposal is implemented as advertised.</p>

I see from your list of revocation of various existing restrictions that you are amending the parking at the bottom of Warren Road, near St Lukes Square.

I would like to ask you to look at the top of Warren Road, beyond the Tangier Road turning. A few years ago some parking bays were marked out, one of which is practically level with our drive exit. This makes it difficult for us to safely exit our property on to the road as our sight line is badly compromised and when vans or 4 wheel drive vehicles park there it becomes positively dangerous. I have been prompted to write to you because I had a very close encounter with a cyclist today who I had no chance of seeing (or hearing!) Also in the past I have had two narrow misses with cars, simply because I have to pull out far enough to be able to see.

A trip from one of your patrol staff would prove the point far better than I can on paper. Just get one of them to come into the drive and see how difficult it is to safely exit.

I would also be very grateful if you could consider the parking bays at the top of Warren Road near the junction of Tangier Road. A few years ago new parking bays were marked out under the last parking review. Immediately to the right of our private driveway is a three parking bay - the first bay in this section is virtually level with our drive exit. It has made it difficult for us to safely exit our property onto the road as our sight line is badly compromised - I have attached a couple of photos illustrating the view when at the exit of our driveway and our current sightline down Warren Road. There was only one car parked there at the time but usually there are at least

The representation does not relate to the advertised proposal, but instead requests that the parking controls elsewhere in Warren Road, to the east of Tangier Road, over half a kilometre away, are amended.

There may be scope for us to consider the parking situation to the east of Tangier during a future parking review.

In view of the above, we recommend that the proposal is implemented as advertised.

two or three which makes the problem even worse as you can imagine. When pulling out of the driveway with cars parked in these bays it is extremely difficult to see far enough down the road to judge whether there is oncoming traffic and several times I have cautiously pulled out because I can see no cars coming and had to either pull back sharply or upset oncoming traffic that is unseen behind parked cars. It only seems a matter of time before there is an accident here and I am particularly concerned about cyclists coming up this stretch as it is near impossible to see them until they are in front of the driveway. I do not have an issue with parking being allowed on Warren Road but would like it to be safe for all concerned.