



	<i>want the changes suggested. All the responses he received were positive and agreeable.</i>		
<i>Totteridge Road – introduction of resident parking</i>  <i>SPA issues / plan 10 refers</i>	<i>Standard letters were received from residents who were delighted to hear that residents parking areas were to be implemented in the road and that commuters would no longer be able to park there.</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>Noted.</i>
<i>Wheelers Park - double yellow line restriction.</i>  <i>SPA plan 10 – Issue 27</i>	<i>Resident complains that the suggested restriction of 12 metres into Wheelers Park is insufficient and the lines should be extended further due to access problems that have occurred.</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>The restriction is imposed on safety grounds and to extend it further would only cause further parking difficulties for local residents. It is recommended that it proceeds as advertised.</i>
<i>Dashwood Avenue - No Waiting Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm.</i>  <i>SPA Issue / Plan 13</i>	<i>A furniture company object to this restriction as they consider that it will create parking problems for customers and suppliers and access problems for their delivery vehicles.</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Currently parking takes place on both sides of the road. The south side has residential properties whilst the north side has factory premises. Although most of the parking on the north side is partly on the footway buses on this through route are frequently held up. The single yellow line will allow easier access to the factory entrance, will prevent footway parking and loading and unloading is permitted within the regulations. Recommend implementation as advertised.</i>
<i>Desborough Park Road – double yellow lines.</i>	<i>Three residents object to the double yellow lines</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>The original request for restrictions came from the owners of the small industrial estate that from time to</i>

<p>SPA issue / plan 19</p>	<p><i>being placed across the 4 off road parking places adjacent to their properties. They often park just outside their own entrances under reciprocal arrangements and this has worked well in the past.</i></p>		<p><i>time has access problems due to parking. It appears that when parking takes place outside the accesses it does not restrict access into the industrial estate. It is therefore recommended that the yellow lines are instituted but do not cover the entrances to these parking places.</i></p>
<p>Alexandra Road SPA Issue / plan 28</p>	<p><i>Resident is pleased that the double yellow lines will be removed from outside his house and ease the congestion in the road.</i></p> <p><i>Residents of no. 2 and 2A, "Cresswell", object to removal of double yellow line on the grounds that parking close to their drives and particularly due to a new development on the other side of the road will prevent them accessing their driveways. One of the residents is a disabled driver who fears that he will find it more difficult to cope.</i></p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p>	<p><i>Noted. This was the original requestee for the removal of the lines.</i></p> <p><i>There is a demand for on street parking in this road by residents due to limited off road parking. Opportunity has been taken to formalise the current footway parking that occurs by introducing a partial footway parking TRO. However the original need for the long lengths of double lines no longer exist at the southern end of the road. It is recommended that they should be reduced on the west side to a distance of 10 metres from the junction with Pinions Road. However in view of the objections, the narrowness of the road and intervening grass verge on both sides of the road which will prohibit partial footway parking it is recommended that it is only reduced as far as the driveway of number 2 on the west side.</i></p>
<p>Gordon Road – residents parking, pay and display and yellow lines. SPA issues / plan 31.</p>	<p><i>A resident asks why a section of double yellow line is being introduced in the eastern part of the road rather than a resident parking area.</i></p>	<p>1</p>	<p><i>Residents complained that due to the narrowness of the road and parking all down one side that when vehicles met in the road they would frequently drive up on the footway to pass one another. Two sections of single yellow lines (Mon – Sat 8am to 6pm) is therefore proposed to allow passing in order to</i></p>

	<i>A resident points out that a single yellow line is to be placed near the Volvo garage and wonders what will happen to those drivers using the garage.</i>	1	<i>resolve this problem. This was explained to the resident in a letter and she has not made further comments / objections.</i>  <i>Pay and display areas have been provided near the garage and can be used by those attending the garage. This was explained to the writer with no further comment received.</i>
<i>Coates Lane – double yellow lines.  SPA issues / plan 37</i>	<i>A resident of Hughenden Road usually parks the second family car in Coates Lane and objects to any further parking restrictions within the area due to the lack of on-road parking. Also suggests that restrictions in the area are reduced to allow further parking.</i>	1	<i>The restrictions in Coates Lane are around the junction with Manor Gardens and along the south side of the road. The parking sometimes causes severe traffic congestion and was requested by residents of the road. It is recommended tha the proposal proceeds as advertised.</i>  <i>The A4128 Hughenden Road is a major through route and the reduction of existing restrictions is likely to cause significant traffic congestion.</i>
<i>Bassetsbury Lane – residents parking and pay and display.  SPA issues / plan 34 refers</i>	<i>Cllr Julia Wassell did a residents survey on this issue and although she has lost the responses she has provided a summary of 14 replies received; No change to existing situation Commuter restriction (eg10-11am &amp; 2 to 3pm) Residents parking supported Other requests  2 residents of London</i>	4 7 1 2 2	<i>Whilst residents appear to prefer a commuter type restriction this has been rejected in 3 other roads in the review and in another (Terry Road) it has been reduced to AM only due to the adverse effect on residents and their guests. Only 2 residents originally requested a residents parking scheme in this road so in view of the lack of support from other residents it is recommended that it does not proceed.</i>  <i>Noted – feasible but see the recommendation above.</i>

<p><i>Chestnut Avenue – residents parking and pay and display.</i></p> <p><i>SPA issues / plan 34 refers</i></p>	<p><i>Road who cannot park on the A40 due to double yellow lines and therefore need to be able park in Bassetsbury Lane or Chestnut Avenue have objected to the scheme unless they are also permitted to have resident's permits.</i></p> <p><i>A resident of Stokenchurch considers that there is no evidence of obstruction in Bassetsbury Lane or Keep Hill Road so therefore the reasons for the restriction as stated in the statement of reasons is invalid. He gives similar reasons for objecting to the imposition of restrictions in Bassetsbury Lane and Chestnut Avenue.</i></p> <p><i>The residents survey summary carried out by Cllr Julia Wassell reveals that of 7 replies received; No change to existing situation</i></p> <p><i>Commuter type restriction preferred</i></p> <p><i>Residents parking supported</i></p> <p><i>Resident of Gypsy Lane supported 'No change' option.</i></p>	<p><i>1</i></p> <p><i>3</i></p> <p><i>2</i></p> <p><i>1</i></p> <p><i>1</i></p>	<p><i>The reasons for the restrictions are because of complaints from the public of obstruction in these roads and they are clearly within the statement of reasons issued by BCC which were copied from the relevant section of Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</i></p> <p><i>There was only one initial request for residents parking in this road. Although the result of the survey carried out by Cllr Wassell is small there does not appear to be support for the proposed scheme and in view of this and the objection by the Bowling Club (below) it is recommended that it be withdrawn.</i></p>
--	--	---	---

	<i>HW Bowling Club object to the Pay and Display area outside their club because it will make difficulty for their members particularly as some matches last longer than 4 hours – the bay time limit. It may also cause elderly members to walk greater distances with heavy bowls.</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Noted.</i>
<i>Tennyson Road – 10am to 11am and 2pm to 3pm commuter restriction</i>  <i>SPA issues / plan 38 refers</i>	<i>Residents state that the heavy commuter parking adversely effects this quiet road on Monday to Friday and therefore they strongly support the restriction</i>  <i>The commuter restriction would create a great deal of difficulty for residents who have insufficient car parking spaces for householders, relatives and friends so is strongly resisted.</i>  <i>A residents parking scheme in the road could overcome the problem.</i>	<i>2</i>  <i>5</i>  <i>1</i>	<i>Noted</i>  <i>The restriction was intended to assist the residents but as it is likely to have the opposite effect on most of them – requiring them to remove their cars twice daily - then it is recommended that we withdraw this proposal.</i>  <i>Currently residents parking can only be accommodated in the Central Parking Zone of the SPA and this would mean an extension of the zone. Also where we have been able to offer resident parking in other areas within the SPA it has not always been accepted – see Bassetsbury Lane and Chestnut Avenue.</i>
<i>Wordsworth Road – 10am to</i>	<i>Commuter parking</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Noted.</i>



<p><i>Lady Verney Close – yellow line restrictions.</i></p> <p><i>SPA issues and plan 41</i></p>	<p><i>The southern part of this cul-de-sac contains a house called Christie Court that contains 8 single bedroom flats. There is insufficient off road parking for the residents, several of whom are disabled and their guests. There is no other on-road parking available nearby and no disabled drivers bays. Detailed letter outlines the problems for several of the residents.</i></p>	<p>1</p>	<p><i>This road was built since the parking scheme was introduced in 1997 and although it is geographically inside the CPZ of the SPA no restrictions currently apply there. There has been just one request for restrictions in the road and although double and single line restrictions have been proposed it appears that this will cause difficulty for the residents. It is therefore recommended that only the double yellow lines, which prevent access problems, be implemented with the single yellow lines being abandoned.</i></p>
<p><i>Cedar Terrace – joint pay and display and residents parking Bay.</i></p> <p><i>SPA issues / plan 42</i></p>	<p><i>A resident states that except for the spaces on the east side of the road little has been gained by this review. He envisages parking problems due to the town centre redevelopment. He is disappointed that 4 hour pay and display is being allowed and that there is no residents parking is provided on Sundays.</i></p>	<p>1</p>	<p><i>The initial request came from several residents asking for more resident's parking spaces. Our consultants recommended that the bay should also include pay and display. There are other pay and display bays nearby and an off street car park is only 30 yards away. Therefore it is recommended that this bay is designated for resident s parking only and that we do not proceed with the pay an display aspect.</i></p> <p><i>There are no residents parking bays within the SPA that currently operate on a Sunday – it would mean a change of policy and an expansion of the enforcement hours of our contractor.</i></p>
<p><i>West End Street- extension of resident parking bay.</i></p> <p><i>SPA issues / plan 51</i></p>	<p><i>A resident considers that the two extra parking spaces will cause great danger to people who need the ambulance service. He resides on the opposite side to the</i></p>	<p>1</p>	<p><i>Residents in this road made complaints because a resident was permitted to have a double off road parking bay, the dropped kerb of which removed 2 resident parking spaces. This caused some animosity although perfectly legal. The provision of these bays will restore the original number of spaces without causing any obstruction to the ambulance service.</i></p>



	<i>bays and ambulance station but will have to park in the entrance to the ambulance station before unfastening his gate and parking on his drive. This could obstruct and delay an ambulance.</i>		<i>Details were provided to the Ambulance Service in our consultation and no objection has been received from them. It is therefore recommended that this proposal proceed.</i>
<i>West End Road – changes to resident parking bays.  SPA issue / plan 57</i>	<i>A resident has pointed out that the proposed alteration to the bays will in fact be of no benefit to the residents because the number of parking spaces will diminish.</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>These changes were thought necessary by developers because of the vehicular accesses to newly constructed properties in this road. However, having visited the site with the resident it is apparent that the suggested proposals actually reduce the number of residential parking places by 2. In the circumstances it is recommended that no changes are made to the existing regulations</i>
<i>Station Road – changing motorcycle bay to residents parking.  SPA issue / plan 60</i>	<i>The owner of the Colour Match Centre –formerly a motorcycle garage – wants to convert the bay immediately outside his shop into something his customers can use such as pay and display.</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Residents have requested, via a petition, that more resident parking spaces be provided in this area and this is why this restriction was recommended. The bay will only provide 2 spaces so pay and display is unviable and was not considered. Since this recommendation was made and passed to legal services the new shop owner has made several approaches about the change of use of the bay that does not meet the needs of his business although there is a public car park within 30 yards and pay and display areas within 25 yards. It is recommended that the proposal goes ahead with further consideration given to this issue in the next review.</i>
<i>Holmers Farm Way – double yellow lines  Periphery issue / plan 1 / 2</i>	<i>The Alford Road Action Group support the proposed changes but would like to see the yellow lines extended further into Buckmaster Road and Davenport</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Noted. If migration parking occurs in the side roads it will be looked at in the next review.</i>

	<p><i>Road but reviewed after a period of time.</i></p> <p><i>Residents of Buckmaster Road object to the yellow line restrictions on Holmers Farm Way because it is feared that the displaced parking caused by the proposals will adversely affect their road where most of the residents are elderly or disabled. They only support restrictions near the roundabout.</i></p>	2	<p><i>Although the objectors indicate that most of the parking is by residents there is evidence that both John Lewis staff and customers also use the road for parking particularly at sales times when the area is swamped. Buses and goods vehicles are obstructed near the John Lewis entrance due to the road narrowness and the constant parking there. The road is only wide enough for parking on one side and the restrictions allow this in the wider parts of the road. If parking migrates into Buckmaster Road further restrictions can be considered at the next review.. The restrictions are recommended as advertised.</i></p>
<p><i>Kingsmead Road –no waiting at any time.</i></p> <p><i>Periphery issues / plan 11 / 12.</i></p>	<p><i>Resident does not like the chicanes in Kingsmead Road that do not stop “some vehicles from excessive speed.”</i></p> <p><i>Thinks that they are unnecessary so opposes the proposed restrictions around them.</i></p>	1	<p><i>Parked vehicles near the chicanes frequently obstruct passing traffic so the double yellow lines are essential to prevent this s it is recommended that the the proposals go ahead as advertised.</i></p>
<p><i>Fair Ridge, Foxleigh and The Spinney – 10am –11am and 2-3pm restriction on all days and double yellow lines at junctions.</i></p> <p><i>Periphery issues / plan 19</i></p>	<p><i>A helpful resident carried out a survey of 30 residents on the estate resulting in 15 comment forms and 2 letters.</i></p> <p><i>There was general support for the commuter restriction although many thought it should not apply to residents.</i></p> <p><i>Object to commuter restriction at weekends.</i></p>	<p>12</p> <p>8</p>	<p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>In view of objections it is recommended that this restriction be reduced to Monday to Friday.</i></p>

	<p><i>Objections to the overall scheme.</i></p> <p><i>Objections to the double yellow lines,</i></p> <p><i>Preference for a residents parking area.</i></p> <p><i>Preferred a 1-hour a day restriction.</i></p> <p><i>Opposed to the scheme unless residents were excused and also thought that it should not apply during school holidays.</i></p> <p><i>The FSF Residents Association broadly agree with the proposals but asked for the commuter restriction to apply on week days only.</i></p> <p><i>They asked for double yellow lines on the sharp bend in Shelley Road.</i></p>	<p>3</p> <p>9</p> <p>7</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>Group</p>	<p><i>Noted</i></p> <p><i>Our consultants suggested the double yellow lines near junctions but In view of the objections it is recommended that this proposal be withdrawn.</i></p> <p><i>This can be considered when a District wide SPA is achieved.</i></p> <p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>This should be considered at the next review.</i></p>
<p><i>Wynbury Drive – double yellow lines.</i></p> <p><i>Periphery issues / plan 20</i></p>	<p><i>Whilst agreeing that the lines are needed suggests that they are made shorter to allow more residents parking.</i></p>	<p>1</p>	<p><i>The restriction is only intended to keep the junction clear of parked vehicles to achieve good visibility so in view of the objection it is therefore recommended that the proposal be reduced to a distance of 10 metres into Wynbury Drive from Totteridge Lane.</i></p>
<p><i>Brands hill avenue – double yellow lines.</i></p> <p><i>Periphery issues / plan 21</i></p>	<p><i>A resident thinks that restriction cannot come too soon as he has seen regular incidents at the junction.</i></p>	<p>1</p>	<p><i>Noted.</i></p>
<p><i>General objection.</i></p>	<p><i>A resident of Hazlemere objects to the restrictions that are proposed in the</i></p>	<p>1</p>	<p><i>It appeared that the writer had not looked at the individual proposals or the justification / reasons for them.</i></p>

	<i>town on the grounds that these restrictions are killing the town and milking drivers.</i>		
--	--	--	--