

Appendix B:
Responses to Statutory Consultation
HIGH WYCOMBE PHASE 3

Do you support the proposals	Does this relate to overall scheme or a specific location	Comments
No	Overall scheme	Not been needed up to now. Why need to change now?
No	Bassetsbury Lane (AREA CODE: AE 71)	<p>The yellow lines being extended down Bassetsbury Lane means less parking for residents in their own road. Many of us are thinking of digging up our front gardens to provide more parking which could devalue our property and why should we go to extra expense.</p> <p>The council should consider preventing non-residents of dumping cars for weeks on end or parking and walking into town to avoid high parking prices. Perhaps ask the residents would they prefer residents parking or if yellow lines are implemented ensure that Traffic Wardens patrol down the road before 8am to implement any charges. In particular no 9 has had their parking restricted shouldn't the other line be a single line?</p> <p>With the school/park opposite parking has always been an issue without anyone coming up with a concrete idea on how to solve it and yellow lines isn't a solution.</p>
No	Bassetsbury Lane (AREA CODE: AE 71)	<p>I do not believe this is the only option available to meet the proposed benefits and that a better balance for the local residents can be reached. It will not avoid the worst of the anti-social parking that we already regularly see with school drop off and parents parking on yellow lines around the entrance to the Rye.</p> <p>As the homeowner of Bassetsbury Lane I have seen the yellow line extended twice before over the last 5-7 years and this proposal will remove visitor parking which does not seem reasonable given other options are available. I supported the first for the safety of the Keep hill cross roads. However, the risks in this area are less the parking and more speed. Furthermore, density of traffic has massively increased with the change of use of the Lido (to Gym) and Manor (to school). These have put up the volume of traffic significantly and with it the proportion of anti-social offenders. We have high speeds and poor driving and very inconsiderate parking, especially at school drop-off/pick-up as a result. This includes parking on the yellow lines around the rye entrance and across driveways.</p> <p>Enforcement seems to be very limited, if at all, and so extending the yellow lines inconveniences local residents more than altering behaviours. Extending the yellow lines will not reduce the number of parents dropping off and so will just add further pressure on them parking across driveways and the like. Furthermore, with the resident parking restrictions nearer the station, this is the first road radially moving outwards in this direction without and so we have commuters/workers parking for the day and disgracefully families from other roads storing a number of additional vehicles long-term. Putting parking charges up on the Rye just pushed more people onto the surrounding roads which we are now combating with additional yellow lines.</p> <p>This is the wrong response to changes of use of the Lido and Manor that have been supported by the council and drove the volume of traffic. There needs to be a better consideration of the safety and wellbeing of residents in the area too and a more considered plan and consultation for the Bassetsbury, Chestnut, Keepphill area. Residents parking would greatly reduce the density and over use of the road for parking and improve the passing spaces etc for the road. Traffic calming would improve the speed issue and safety at junctions, one way could be considered to improve the safety at the A40 junctions, reducing the parking fee and enforcement would encourage more people back into parking on the Rye - it is fabulous that the Rye is having such a popular revival but we need appropriate parking.</p> <p>For this particular scheme I want to retain the ability for my visitors to park near my house following the prior 2 extensions. Ideally this would have a residents parking slot (perhaps as part of a wider scheme) or a single yellow line 'timed weekday' slot to avoid the long term parking e.g. 10-11am as used elsewhere. This could be timed to allow for the most dense use of the rye carpark turn, e.g. school drop off pick up if preferred for child safety, would avoid the commuter use and long term storage issues but allow local residents to use the road in the evening for guests. I am not objecting to safety and have supported prior extensions but I am seeking a more balanced response in this instance that addresses the anti-social behaviour and takes into account the local homeowners needs in a more considered way. I am very happy to speak with someone about this further.</p>

No	Bassetsbury Lane (AREA CODE: AE 71)	<p>I am writing to you to formally lodge my disapproval to your new parking scheme and point out its significant flaw. I live locally and often see cars parked outside 9 Bassetsbury Lane during school drop off and pick up times. This happens twice a day when the children are dropped off and picked up from school (Crown House is very close by). There are some continual offenders who park there for up to an hour at a time and are already blatant in their disregard for the legal standing of the double yellow lines.</p> <p>I have two areas where I would like to have more clarity please: Please can you expand on what the safety issue is that these lines are being extended for and how extending the lines further will help further this aim? Please can you confirm how effective the current extensions of the yellow lines have been in improving safety? What evidence do you have for this?</p> <p>Given how often I see people parking on these lines (at least twice daily sometimes more); please can you confirm how many parking tickets have been issued here in the last 12 months, 24 months and in the last 4 years to enforce their effectiveness. I have seen the chipping away of parking places for local residents since I moved here; this combined with the increased activity for the Rye means that local residents are really struggling to park their own vehicles. We have an active school, gym, football club, park run and many other activities which people come to use the Rye for.</p> <p>Many people avoid paying the fee for the car park and choose to park on the streets nearby, thus increasing our difficulties. In addition we have several families who use the road for long term storage of their cars, I know I have had cars checked by the police as they were left unattended for approximately 6 months outside my house.</p>
No	Bassetsbury Lane (AREA CODE: AE 71)	<p>I had hoped to add a comment to this consultation but this is not possible. Please pass on my comments to the person concerned.</p> <p>I live in Bassetsbury Lane and my comments relate to this road and adjacent roads. The stretch of road from the London Road junction should be reclassified as no parking at any time rather than certain hours. Reason: This road is as busy at weekends as during the week due to sporting events on the Rye. Therefore to reduce accident risk and improve visibility no parking should be allowed. No parking restrictions should be extended both sides of the junction with Chestnut Avenue as there has been a fatality here and parked cars reduce visibility and traffic flow.</p> <p>Consideration (and consultation with local residents) should be given to extend resident's parking to Princes Gate and Bassetsbury Lane. The reduction in on road parking is going to impact on local residents who struggle to park due to commuters cars, cars from workers from local garages and parents from Crown House. If there is no parking there would be a considerable reduction in traffic, improving road safety and air quality. This was proposed by Julia Wassell as part of her manifesto.</p>
No	Beech Road / Ford Street / Kings Square (AREA CODE: AG 73)	<p>The proposed scheme is right outside a local, independent convenience store which is used not only by local residents but also customers who arrive by car and use both Ford Street and Beech Road to park while they do their shopping, which in many cases is a short time. This shop has no off street parking and this scheme would potentially affect the business detrimentally leaving customers the option of receiving a parking ticket or not using the shop and visiting a major supermarket express store situated on the London Road which has off street parking.</p> <p>Is BCC in the business of forcing small local businesses to close? Any money set aside for this scheme would be better spent by clearly marking the white lines on the Beech Road, Abbey Barn Road and Ford Street junctions as having observed some people who do not regularly use these roads, they are totally confused as to where they should give way and which side of the road they should drive on.</p> <p>Please rethink this scheme and consider the impact it will have on the business and local residents.</p>
No	Beech Road / Ford Street / Kings Square (AREA CODE: AG 73)	<p>I object as a fair consultation has not been possible I also object at this point as I have not been given enough information by the council to really understand some of the information that is required I have listed questions which require answering before anyone has the information to be able to base opinions on; currently we have been asked to form opinions and objections with very limited information. Questions which need responding to;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) traffic flow and congestion in this area - what was the period this area was check, please supply all information in understandable format. Time of checks, period of checks. How many vehicles - moving or stationary 2) of the vehicles were record how many were residential? or not? 3) Was the evidence a manual count or from a device - if it was a device, when the device was checked and calibrated during the count. From the device, what

		<p>was the average speed?</p> <p>4) how many complains of congestion have their been over the last 3 years? How many of those have been from the emergency services and how many from local residents</p> <p>5) how many road traffic accidents have there been in the road?</p> <p>6) how many residents have raised any concerns?</p> <p>7) how many residential vehicles will be displaced by these new restrictions? 7b) where will these vehicles be parked and how will the council ensure they are safe and how has the council factored in potential crime?</p> <p>8) why has no other consultation with residents taken place?</p>
No	Beech Road / Ford Street / Kings Square (AREA CODE: AG 73)	<p>There are many residents that currently park on this road, the proposed double yellows will reduce the parking space used. I fear that this could lead to dangerous parking that could end up with the road becoming congested and blocked for vehicles e.g. emergency services.</p> <p>Could the parking restriction be reduced to allow more cars to park, or could there be allowance in the form of resident permits to preserve residents parking amenities?</p>
No	Beech Road / Ford Street / Kings Square (AREA CODE: AG 73)	<p>I object to your proposed scheme on the grounds that this is not a true consultation. I have never been asked for my opinion on whether or not the road where I live requires a waiting restriction. This "consultation" does not offer any options, it is just an imposition. The local councillors seem to have met and decided how to spend our money. There has been already action taken towards implementing these restrictions. The road has already been marked with white lines, this was done before we receive your letter. The man painting the lines said that the double yellow lines will be drawn regardless of whatever we the residents have to say, it has been decided already! I have spoken to several of the residents in the street, something that you should have done, and we all agreed that there is no need to have the yellow lines. For one there has never been an accident on the road, there have never been any incidents where this parking restriction would have been required. I moved to this area knowing that there would be street parking for us, this is a very important part of my everyday life and having the ability to park outside my house is a facility that gives me a good standard of living. There have been various planning applications in the area that have been rejected on the grounds that there is not enough parking on the road. With you imposing on us double yellow lines, where are we going to park? My young daughter who works shifts would have to walk various streets in the dark when she comes back from work in the early hours of the morning. Also, I am a women reaching my retirement age, where will I park, how far do you propose I have to walk to find a parking?</p> <p>I was approached by the Councillor who lives a couple of houses near me, he told he wanted double yellow lines because when he comes home he needs more space to drive through. Is that enough reason for all of the residents on these roads to be punished by the needs of one person? The councillor who is meant to be consulting and representing the residents of the area has never asked if that is what the area needs. This is totally outrageous.</p> <p>Ask the residents, ask the people who live here, not just go and tell us what you are going to impose on us. There are so many other options you could take, for instance, parking permits, changing the island on Ford Road, which in our opinion doesn't serve any purpose, support the residents of the local flats to park in their car park and not on the road, they have told me that they don't use their car park because it's too expensive.</p> <p>Did you consider the impact this imposition would have on the business and services on these roads? The double yellow lines would only serve to damage the future of the local shop, as no one would be able to drop-in in the convenience shop. More important it would affect greatly the local community who use of the local nursery, where will the parents be able to park to bring their little children to nursery. Did you talk to them? We also have the school on Abbey Barn Road and parents park their cars here when they drop the children to school.</p> <p>With the introduction of double yellow lines you will make the road a dangerous road for the children going to nursery, the children going to school and all the residents who will be crossing the road looking for a parking space. The cars parked on the roads help to reduce the speed people using Ford Street as a shortcut, with the roads wider people will be racing through. In the 3 years I've been here, I have not witness any accidents, or interruptions to the neither traffic nor people using the road. I have not been informed of any checks or consultations made for you to come to the decision of impose</p> <p>I request that you give me copies of the reports that support this action. I want to see:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Count of traffic flow 2. Period when this count was made 3. Number of vehicles that use the road, how many are from the residents

		<p>4. How was this count made?</p> <p>5. Average speed used by these vehicles</p> <p>6. How many complaints did you receive about congestion in the area</p> <p>7. How many accidents were reported in this area</p> <p>8. Have the emergency services been unable to gain access on these roads</p> <p>9. How many residents have raised any concerns on these roads</p> <p>10. Where will we park once you put yellow lines all around these roads</p> <p>11. Where will the users of the local nursery and local schools park to drop and collect their children</p> <p>12. How will the Council ensure that the residents are safe when they have to find parking very far away from their homes?</p> <p>13. How do you see all these extra cars find a parking</p> <p>14. Are we the residents going to be allowed to have family, friends visit us since there will be no parking near by</p> <p>15. How will the Council ensure my car is safe. I don't see any place near where I can park, how will I be comfortable leaving my car so far away, and me not been able to hear if it is vandalised or stolen</p> <p>WHY WERE WE THE RESIDENTS NOT CONSULTED ON THIS MATTER THAT WILL AFFECT US SO DRAMATICALLY?</p>
No	Healey Avenue / St George's Close (AREA CODE: AE 68)	<p>I believe that the original request for restriction was made when tenants from multi-occupancy dwellings and taxi drivers were parking ON the actual southern corner and out onto Healey Avenue. Also, occupying the wider pavements on either side provided to help drivers vision. The main offenders have since moved away, thus obviating the original problem.</p> <p>Previously, during the day, without parking near the corners, there were a number of collisions and near misses with drivers cutting corners and racing up and down St. George's Close access. I suggest reducing the length of the 'arcs' to standard. This will allow five parking spaces that the current proposal will preclude. Many of the houses are now let to multi-occupancy, but only one parking space, if any, for up to five vehicles! With commercial vehicles and at least eight taxi cabs parked on the road for extended periods parking is problematical and the proposal will undoubtedly exacerbate the situation. Please reconsider.</p>
Yes	Healey Avenue / St George's Close (AREA CODE: AE 68)	<p>We live in Number Healey Avenue We welcome the Proposed Waiting Restrictions but are concerned as to whether the proposed plans go far enough and how efficiently the restrictions will be monitored. Currently there are vehicles parked permanently on the left hand side coming down the hill from St Georges. On a number of occasions we have experienced vehicles also being parked on the right hand side (which is not restricted at all) thus making it very difficult to actually drive down the street at all. Frequently we are encountering vehicles parked entirely on the pavement obstructing the way for pedestrians and forcing them to walk in the road.</p> <p>In view of the fact there is a school in very close proximity we feel parking on the pavement should be completely prohibited as forcing children to walk in the road clearly should be a safety priority. Also when vehicles are parked entirely on the pavement on the actual corner it is impossible to view the oncoming traffic - this is made more dangerous due to the fact the traffic has already been forced onto the other side of the road due to the parked cars previously mentioned on the left hand side of St George's Close.</p> <p>Ideally we would like to see the proposed No Waiting At Any Time restrictions to continue up St Georges Close on both sides of the road. Since the development of the flats around the back of St George's Close this road is increasingly busy. However we also need to see the presence of regular traffic wardens to ensure these regulations are being applied to. We welcome your thoughts on this in due course.</p>
Yes	Micklefield Road / Herbert Road (AREA CODE: AH 67 / AH 69)	<p>Hello. I think this is a very good idea. I live on Herbert road and find it hard to get a buggy round the corner to the shops when cars are parked there. My concern is that no one will police it and nothing will change. People also park on the grass space on the corner or Herbert road and micklefield road which defeats the object of having the no parking zone. If it is policed properly, then good. If not, then we'll just have some lovely new yellow lines that mean nothing. Thanks for your time</p>
No	Hillary Road / Everest Road (AREA CODE:)	<p>There is no need for the parking restrictions, it doesn't cause traffic problems or accidents but what does need to be stopped is people parking on the grass triangle in the same area and along the houses which have parking behind but choose to park on the grass out the front instead</p>

AF 68)		
No	Princes Gate (AREA CODE: AE 70)	We suffer from non Princes Gate residents parking (some indefinitely) along the main entrance road to Princes Gate. The current proposals reduces available resident parking, but without addressing the non resident use of the area. I welcome the intent of the changes but feel they need the addition of Resident Parking Only facilities for those resident adjacent to the new parking restrictions. In addition, the recent approval for the development of flats along the same road (main entrance to Princes Gate) will put further pressure on parking facilities. Please take a more holistic view.
Yes	Princes Gate (AREA CODE: AE 70)	We write to support strongly the idea of introducing parking restrictions in Princes Gate, in particular the junction at the top of the hill which is constantly clogged both sides by cars and large vans which park there and obstruct both the road and the pavement. As pedestrians, we often find it difficult to walk along the pavement there, and it must be even harder for disabled people and those with children in buggies. It can also make it difficult for traffic to get through, and could be a problem for delivery vehicles and emergency services.
Yes	Princes Gate (AREA CODE: AE 70)	I am writing to voice my support in favour of the proposals. In Princes Gate, there are so many cars parked on some pavements that one is forced to walk in the road. This is hazardous and of course unacceptable for children and those with mobility issues. I look forward to the introduction of restrictions.
No	Coates Lane / Tancred Road (AREA CODE: AB 63)	Double yellow lines need to extend further up Tancred Road on both sides. At least to the first house in Tancred Road.
No	Coates Lane / Tancred Road (AREA CODE: AB 63)	<p>1. The proposed change to the junction of Tancred Road / Coates Lane of adding double yellow lines to the south west corner of junction whilst necessary is totally inadequate in its extent of cover.</p> <p>The proposal should extend a minimum of 1.5 car lengths from the junction up Tancred and should also include for the existing lines on the southeast side of the junction to be extended by an equal distance. Vehicles at peak times park right up to the existing lines and on occasions cause gridlock as vehicles coming down Tancred are unable to see those entering from Coates until they are on the wrong carriageway and in their direct line; an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>2. In a recent exchange of ideas with our local councillors and a representative of Transport for Bucks, it was mentioned that within these consultations would be the extension of existing double yellows on the north-side of Coates Lane from the playground around the corner to the access gate into the park at the rear of said playground. This is missing.</p> <p>This section of Coates Lane is regularly obstructed with the parked vehicles of dog walkers and playground users. Many near misses have occurred due to reduced / non-existent visibility around this bend. This very afternoon, 25.10.18, vehicles are even parked totally on the road margins to avoid the yellow lines. This action has extended around the corner mentioned and beyond. Additional for your consideration is the need for bollards be inserted on this section of Coates to prevent this type of abuse. Furthermore consideration could be given to the provision of a car park in the field at the rear of the playground via existing access gate thus taking away the need for any street parking in this locality. This in no way would impact on the amenity and I'm sure would encourage a greater use of this beautiful park and the safety of its users.</p>
Yes	Coates Lane / Tancred Road (AREA CODE: AB 63)	<p>I am broadly I support of your proposals to introduce double yellow lines as detailed online under the heading. However I do have the following comments with regards to Map Area code AB63. Firstly - This map is not up to date! Hughenden Boulevard has been missed off and there is now a T junction with this road and Coates Lane in place of the near 90 degree bend shown on the map.</p> <p>The yellow lines should (in my opinion) extend further down from the junction than they currently do. Often there are vehicles parked and visibility is limited when pulling out of Coates Lane at this new junction. Also, I think the section of yellow lines along Coates Lane towards Hughenden Road should be extended further than shown. There are parking bays on the South side of Coates lane close to the junction with Manor Gardens already. When people also park on the North side of the road it causes a bottle neck for traffic and difficulties for large vehicles such as emergency services and refuse lorries to pass. I have often witnessed large vehicles trying to get through this section. Lastly, it would seem that many people are unaware that there is a public carpark on Coates Lane for users of the park.</p> <p>Several people I have spoken to in the park have either thought that the car park was for the newly built houses or been unaware of its existence. Perhaps a sign might be a good idea?</p>

No	Totteridge Drive (AREA CODE: AF 64)	<p>The scheme will not achieve either stated objective.</p> <p>Objective (1) It will not prevent danger to users as the only times there are serious issues with parking in these areas are during mosque changeover times. At these times the cars have drivers in attendance and so double yellows will not prevent this type of chaotic parking</p> <p>Objective 2, There are less issues with passage through this road than through the adjoining roads eg Kingston where no restrictions are proposed. The scheme will not therefore achieve its objective. Further the scheme will encourage more parking behind lines (fully on paths) and on the green. This will still block the view of drivers and will damage the ability of pedestrians to access the footpaths.</p> <p>The issues in Totteridge drive would be better served by resident only and short term parking (to remove the long term parking of commercial vehicles) and enforcement of accessible pathway clearances under the current laws</p>
Yes	West Wycombe Road / Temple Side Gardens (AREA CODE: Y 65 / Z 65)	<p>I received the letter regarding proposed double yellow lines in the High Wycombe area yesterday. I've already been online to confirm my support for this on the poll; however, I would like to know how I can voice my opinion and concern that it actually doesn't go far enough specifically on the road where I live.</p> <p>Suffice to say West Wycombe Road is extremely busy is an understatement. My house comes under the map pdf Y65 My concern is that currently multiple cars park up on the kerb not only in the easterly direction, but in both directions. This makes coming out of my driveway extremely dangerous as the vision is completely impeded, there are a number of large white vans which make it impossible to see out. Combined with the fact it is such a busy road I am unable to have enough space or time to safely stop and reverse onto my drive due to the traffic flow, I am forced to drive in head first. This therefore means I have to reverse out onto a busy main road essentially blind to both directions of traffic.</p> <p>I propose the double yellow lines are continued further up the road ... I am in no doubt many of my neighbours will also agree with this too. If there is any way I am able to put this opinion across further I would appreciate your advice. I also appreciate writing this down sounds dramatic and difficult to fully understand without witnessing it, I am more than happy to let an official come and see what we have to deal with on a daily basis due to the amount of parked cars on the kerbs.</p>
Yes	Deeds Grove (AREA CODE: Z 71)	<p>I live at Deeds Grove. I welcome the above restrictions. However I believe we are fighting a losing battle. The people in High Wycombe would never agree to it, because they are happy to park outside people's houses and when you do complain you are confronted with verbal aggression. At one point I was being laughed and mocked at. I would like to speak to someone in your office or make an appointment with the view of getting double yellow line outside both my properties number and ... Deeds Grove. Is this possible? I do not mind paying a fee. I also have lots of pictures to share with your office as to how drivers park outside my properties.</p>

In addition to the above

- 3 online responses were received **objecting** to the proposals. However, no particular roads were specified and no comments left.
- 28 online responses were received **supporting** the proposals. However, no particular roads were specified and no comments left.