

APPENDIX B

Responses to Statutory Consultation

Chesham Town Parking Review

Phase 2

Do you support the advertised proposals ?	Does this relate to overall scheme or a specific location?	Comments
No	Chartridge Lane j/w Lowndes Avenue / Chartridge Lane j/w Penn Avenue	Regarding the proposed installation of double yellow lines. As a resident of Faithorn Close I do recognise the problem that you outline, but I would also like to add that by preventing parking here this will encourage people even more to use Faithorn Close to park. Already this is a problem with people parking inappropriately on verges and in positions making it difficult and dangerous for residents to arrive and depart from the close, and even to get off their driveways. Yellow lines on the junction of Faithorn and Chartridge would prevent the dangerous parking close to the junction.
Yes	Chartridge Lane j/w Lowndes Avenue	We are writing to express our concerns about the parking proposals for the junction of Lowndes Avenue and Chartridge Lane. Whilst we feel that the restrictions to parking around the junction are justified in terms of safety, we believe that parking in the area between the top half of Lowndes Avenue and the section of Chartridge Lane from the junction down to Stanley Road should also be restricted to two hours maximum except for local residents. This is because the restrictions that were recently imposed in the area of Stanley Avenue have forced commuters to start to park in this area and it causes a nuisance to local residents both in terms of the additional congestion it causes (because of the consequent reduction in space for manoeuvring) and because there is now less space for the residents to park themselves. As stated above, we would suggest that parking in this area be restricted to local residents only or two hours of parking maximum. This would prevent commuters from parking for a whole day whilst allowing access for people who want to use Lowndes Park. We would appreciate a response to our concerns and our proposal. Many thanks for your help in this matter.

Yes	Chartridge Lane j/w Lowndes Avenue / Chartridge Lane j/w Penn Avenue	<p>I am writing to express concern that the current phase of parking restrictions earmarked for Chesham do not go far enough.</p> <p>Focusing on Chartridge Lane; the proposed work to the junctions with Lowndes Ave and Penn Ave will certainly be a step in the right direction but they do not address the problem with cars parked all day from the bottom of Chartridge Lane to up near the Chiltern Hills Academy.</p> <p>The increase in cars parked in the area above [presumably commuters from out of town] has increased significantly over the last few years. This seems to be a result of the previous parking restriction phases having been implemented.</p> <p>The result is a narrow width of road that is dangerous for cyclists to use when going uphill [some cyclists have stopped using this section and ceased cycling home from work]. Today I watched two cyclists cycling up this section, one got off before the cars and struggled up the slope to the pavement the other carried on until a small gap appeared and pulled over, both were aware of the pressure from a motorist who was in front of me and directly behind them trying to get past through this narrow section of road with cars parked on one side.</p> <p>Another result of the cars parked in this area is that the available area during drop off and pick up times outside the Chiltern Hills Academy is even more congested and again potentially dangerous. A fact that the Headteacher is very much aware of.</p> <p>I'm not suggesting double yellow lines but instead a restricted parking scheme for an hour during the middle of the day [as seen in other nearby towns in similar situations] along the area above which would help to alleviate some of the problems but still allow parking at other times.</p> <p>I would welcome your thoughts on the above and the chance to meet on site to discuss my concerns.</p>
No	Chartridge Lane j/w Lowndes Avenue	<p>The proposed double yellow lines on Chartridge Lane will only end up forcing more people to park outside and opposite our property which makes reversing and getting out of our drive very dangerous, particularly during school drop off and collection hours, and at the weekends when the road gets used by people using the school fields. To that end we propose that you extend the double yellow lines to include the houses that are severely affected by this issue such as ours. Presently we cannot safely reverse or drive out of our property during the busy school hours or at weekends when cars are parked on both sides of Chartridge Lane opposite our property which will significantly heighten the risk of an accident when residents have to drive or reverse out of their driveways. We strongly propose that the double yellow lines are extended to cover Chartridge Lane from Lowndes Avenue to</p>

		<p>where the school main entrance is. Currently this area is a death trap, specifically in the mornings and afternoons when cars are parked opposite our house thereby making it very difficult and unsafe for residents such as us to enter and exit our driveways. We have photographic evidence to proof this as do many people who have come very close to accidents, some involving children.</p>
Yes	Chartridge Lane j/w Lowndes Avenue	<p>As a regular and daily user of Chartridge Lane I would highly recommend that the Council stops parking in front of the Chiltern Academy just to the left of the exit road as you come out of the main gate by painting double yellow lines at this place. There is a traffic island just to the right of the exit that narrows the main road and many parents selfishly and regularly park on the zig zag line just after the junction of Chartridge Lane with the exit from main gate of the school which makes it very difficult to see the oncoming traffic from the other side heading towards the Sainsbury roundabout, and often at great speed. This is a spot where one day a major accident will happen and I think this can be prevented easily by my proposal being implemented. There should also be a ban on Big coaches being parked to take students on trips etc every so often.</p>
Yes	Chartridge Lane j/w Penn Avenue	<p>You are proposing to introduce double yellow lines to stop people blocking this junction. I support this and would like to know how far up Penn Avenue they will go. I ask, as parents collecting their children from Chiltern Hills Academy regularly park across the top of my drive, making access/exit either impossible or dangerous, and having double yellow lines extending across my drive should stop this.</p>
Yes	Chartridge Lane j/w Lowndes Avenue	<p>I refer to the information regarding the increasing accomodation at the Chiltern Hills Academy and Parking. I note the comments regarding the proposals to increase double yellow line areas which is very welcome. However this will no doubt mean vehicles will park further along Chartridge Lane to where there is only a footpath on one side of the road. Parked cars make it dangerous for residents and services where there is no footpath. The uncontrolled crossing outside the school is also dangerous and the proposed increase could increase the risk. The pavement opposite the Academy is also very narrow and students move into the road in groups (some on Mobile phones) Some very serious consideration needs to be given to parking available at the Academy and the Sports ground and especially at weekends when parking in Chartridge Lane becomes a bottle neck and dangerous. Although there are speed limit signs showing speed limit reductions at the Academy Area these appear to have little affect. Perhaps the only speed limiting factors in Chartridge Lane are the pot holes.</p>

Yes	Chartridge Lane j/w Lowndes Avenue	In addition you need to implement permit parking for Chartridge Lane junction with Lowndes Avenue continuing down Lowndes Avenue past Hampden Avenue junction. Also some traffic calming measures, such as speed bumps need to be introduced for safety of residents and children crossing these roads. Whilst I welcome some of the measures, additional line painting will not be sufficient unless policed. With the plans for Chiltern Hills expansion the quantity of traffic at school times will increase (already to high at present). Road calming is an absolute must, before someone gets injured. The proposed double yellow lines need to extend a wider area as described in the earlier answer.
Yes	Chartridge Lane j/w Lowndes Avenue	I support no waiting at the junctions but if you are proposing to have no waiting / parking further up Park Road you will push the current parking of cars even further up, with them starting to park nearer to the school and overflowing of parking into the side roads such as Lowndes Avenue and Penn. You introduced restrictions of parking near Stanley Road earlier this year / last and these cars have now moved up Chartridge, so you are just pushing up the parking, which has been proved will happen.
No	Kirtle Road	This is ridiculous, where do you expect the residents of Kirtle Road to park? This proposal could result in over 60 cars being displaced and forced to park elsewhere in Chesham. I understand that there are concerns about a fire engine being able to access the road and therefore would understand if this proposal suggested restrictions on the left bend as you access the road that backs on to Victoria Road. I do not stand by the argument that commuters are parking in the road all day. During the day there are plenty of spaces. If this is a concern parking permits for local residents, or one car per household would be more of a compromise.
No	Kirtle Road	Specifically, the area on the bend of Kirtle Road shortly after the junction with White Hill, currently indicated as "Parking Permitted" (see Area Code W.29 map), should NOT be permitted. All of the west side of the Road should be designated "No Parking At Any Time" by the positioning of double yellow lines along the full length of the west side of Kirtle Road.
No	Broad Street	Making these spots shared will result in them being occupied by permit holders, preventing their use by shoppers / other users of the local facilities / nursery etc.
No	Broad Street / Wesley Hill	Shared use of current "1 hour waiting" bays with permit holders is likely to result in these being used mostly by permit holders with people needing to park for an hour to visit local businesses & services unable to do so. Broad street Already has a large number of vehicles parked on the single yellow lines / curbs outside of the hours allowed and this is a very busy road with a lot of small businesses on it. I use the bays almost on a daily basis to drop my child at the nursery and on a number of occasions have been full. For Wesley hill there are only 3 spaces available as the rest of the road is for permit holders only already. Is that really going to make a significant difference to permit holders? There is a real risk that

		<p>if more of the spaces in Chesham are shared with permit holders there will be then no available free parking for people who drive into Chesham & need it, reducing people coming & spending money in the town.</p>
Yes	Broad Street / Wesley Hill	<p>I write in response to the consultation about further changes to Zone C.</p> <p>In simple terms, there is justice in opening up Zone C to people in Broad St.</p> <p>However, to increase demand, without increasing supply in any meaningful way, will I put those of us in Zone C - especially Bellingdon Road, where the yellow line remains, back to where we were a year ago - and for many years before that - namely - too many people chasing a shrinking supply of spaces to park, especially in the evenings.</p> <p>Bellingdon Road could take spaces, for example.</p> <p>This at a time when available spaces in Lowndes Avenue are set to reduce by at least 4, when the Bowling Club houses are completed.</p>
Yes	Broad Street / Wesley Hill	<p>I object to permit being issued to an additional 30 applicants living in the proposed extension of the present Zone C. This is too many. I will accept no more than 15. This is, bearing in mind the location and nature of the additional parking spaces it is proposed to create (ie. shared use of them with non Zone 2 motorists and being on a very busy A road).</p> <p>Hopefully, if a lower additional number of new permits are issued, I will still find a parking place for my car during the day in my own street or in nearby ones. But I will resign myself to still being unable to drive out at night, outside of zone hours, or have visitors to my home by car in the evening unless they are able to walk a long distance away in order to be able to park their vehicles.</p> <p>Others, in this zone whose work and other duties necessitate their returning home in the evening or at night, are far less fortunate than I am.</p> <p>Night time Parking in Zone C and the need for 24 hour permits: This is still a serious issue and its disappointing that the Phase 2 proposals do not reflect it. If, in outside hours, traffic wardens can come and issue parking offence notices, as they regularly do, to our residents for parking illegally on the yellow lines, one questions the degree of additional cost for them to 'light touch' monitor a newly created 24 hour zone, just across the A416 where they will be monitoring roads granted 24 hour permit parking (with whom we share similar problems but only have the weekday daytime permits).</p>

No	Broad Street	<p>I therefore object to this part of the paragraph in the Proposed changes to parking in Chesham - phase 2 proposal as it stands: Broad Street: Broad Street residents between the Elgiva Theatre roundabout and Sunnyside Road without off street parking will be issued Zone C permits.</p> <p>I object as the Zone C area is already fairly full in the daytime and has totally full and insufficient parking capacity out of the permit zone hours with people regularly illegally parking on corners and double yellow lines in the evenings due to lack of parking availability. Many of these extra cars using the parking spaces are from Broad Street residents and other surrounding non zoned roads. This clearly shows that Zone C would therefore not have sufficient parking availability to accommodate many extra cars throughout the day as well.</p> <p>I accept that there are some parking spaces available during the daytime at the moment in Zone C. May I point out this was the whole point of creating the parking zones so resident did actually have available parking space!</p> <p>Therefore, my only concession to my objection would be: I would accept a maximum of 10 more cars from Broad Street residents in the Zone C area if Zone C were turned into a 24 hour zone (see below). Gladstone/Queens/Victoria/Franchise St residents would then have a better chance of finding parking available day and night as there wouldn't be a huge influx of additional cars from other roads out of the permit zone in the evenings removing the available spaces.</p> <p>Personal proposal: Please may I add to the proposed changes that Zone C become a 24 hour zoned area as is Sunnyside Road. Zone C is hugely overly congested in the evenings and at weekends due to other Chesham residents outside the Zone C area parking in the Zone C area after 6pm and at weekends. It defeats the object of having a zone for Zone C residents who need to park in the evening as they never have any available parking space at that time.</p>
No	Broad Street / Wesley Hill	<p>I object to the extra number of applicants being included in Zone C.</p> <p>On the grounds that: The extra number, some people are saying, will mean 30 more homes included, but I assume they can each apply for 2/3 permits if there are 2/3 cars owners at the property.</p> <p>And although there are some parking places not being used during the morning and early part of the afternoon, some non permit holder vehicles are parked as early as 4PM. So it can be awkward for us to park, if we arrive home any later.</p> <p>I am an OAP, and although I consider myself fairly fit, for my age, It can be very difficult to carry things to my house if I have to park too far away.</p>

Yes	White Hill j/w White Hill Service Road and White Hill j/w Cheyne Walk	In connection with parking on service road of White Hill at bottom of Cheyne Walk, suggest no parking allowed opposite exit to Cheyne Walk as this is a very dangerous exit with the problems of school parking.
Yes	White Hill j/w White Hill Service Road	The proposed no waiting at any time in area x28 Cheyne Walk and White Hill we believe will reduce the risk of accidents to pedestrians (School Children) and the incidents of cars driving on the wrong side of the road at the junctions to avoid parked cars in these areas.
No	White Hill j/w Cheyne Walk	<p>Any areas around Chesham Grammar School must not preclude parking at school pick up as a) this would just move cars to somewhere else making it more congested there and therefore more dangerous and cause more children to have to walk across busy roads b) if there had not been so many cuts to school transport there would be no need to take and pick up my children from school. I would gladly put them on a bus if I had a choice! If residents are complaining, they should just accept they live near a school and that, especially with the case of a grammar school, people are going to have to travel there beyond what can be walked.</p> <p>As I said before, I realise that the situation is not ideal. Chesham itself was not built to deal with so much traffic, but if you restrict sixth formers parking during the day and parents picking up in the evening, then what do you expect them to do? There is insufficient school transport - none for sixth formers - and none from the smaller villages and the children have to get to and from school. Stop being so reactive to a few residents complaining and deal with the wider picture. You will just push the problem somewhere else, make it more dangerous for the students to make it in and out of school and just annoy a lot of other residents.</p>
No	White Hill j/w White Hill Service Road / White Hill j/w Cheyne Walk	Whilst I feel that some parking restrictions are needed, I do not think that it is necessary to have double yellow lines. Single should suffice.
Yes	White Hill j/w White Hill Service Road / White Hill j/w Cheyne Walk	<p>Your proposals are a good start. To be effective the No Waiting area at the Cheyne Walk/ White Hill service road junction should extend across the junction to the northwest (Green) side of the service road.</p> <p>Reason</p> <p>Residents normally park on the southeast (houses) side of the service road to allow access to driveways and to provide a straight through-path for other road users (this is a narrow road). Parking opposite Cheyne Walk on the Green side (usually by non-residents, school users, etc) results in vehicles having to move to the opposite lane to enter or cross Cheyne Walk. This is a problem for larger vehicles as often insufficient space is left between</p>

		parked vehicles. There have been many occasions when larger vehicles such as dustcarts or delivery trucks have been unable to access Cheyne Walk.
No	Wesley Hill	We continue to experience problems regarding the Wesley Hill parking bay, which is adjacent ... properties. ..driveways to the rear of property.. is in daily use. Since moving in a year ago we continue to experience problems. Vehicles regularly block ... driveways completely. Further, large vans regularly 'overhang' the top end of the bay and prevent access to and from the driveways. We would propose The Wesley Hill parking is moved further south as there is plenty of room to do so. At the very least, this would allow the number of vehicles to remain the same and allow us to have proper access to and from the properties.
No	Harding Road	I do not support no waiting in Harding Road which is a road off Eskdale Avenue. Parking is a nightmare in Eskdale Avenue; too many cars not enough spaces. No idea how to solve that but I do know that restricting parking spaces anywhere on Eskdale or joining roads is not the answer. There are double yellows on Eskdale which are regularly parked on "out of hours". Restricting the little space there is available in the area will mean more out of hours parking on the double yellows which will result in more dangerous situations. In areas like Eskdale impact has to be considered. In the majority yes but there are too many cars and not enough spaces. A different approach is needed. For example I know of households with more cars than people and this has to stop. More often now children remain at their parents well into adulthood and they are independent and need their own transport, but controls have to exist for the home owners in the roads to ensure they have a right to park in the road they invested in.
Yes	Overall Scheme	Chiltern and South Bucks District Councils have no formal comments to make on the schemes.
Yes	Overall Scheme	Thames Valley Police - Thanks for the e-mail in relation to the above, I have consulted together with local officers who cover this area and they have no further comments to make in respect of these proposals. I can therefore confirm that Thames valley police have no objection to these proposals.
Yes	Not Specified	Yes I support any changes to ease traffic congestion, the only thing is that your proposals for Chartridge Lane J/O Lowndes Avenue. The proposed No Waiting at any time area needs to be extended into Lowndes Avenue further than proposed. The issue of double parked vehicles affects the junction uptown Hampden Avenue. Not helped by commuters parking and a family run business of car dealers running out of the corner house at the junction affected.
Yes	Not Specified	Yes it's about time the council are doing something about the parking of commuter cars especially on Lowndes Avenue

Yes	Not Specified	But I have serious concerns about the impact on Broadlands Avenue - there are ample car parks in Chesham but people will use our local roads to park on, instead of paying - several people have already admitted to doing this and parking in our road to avoid paying charges. Waitrose staff included.
Yes	Not Specified	I think this is a great proposal and I hope it will help stop irresponsible driving / parking in and around town. It would be really good if restrictions on junctions were extended to disable badge holder too: their cars cause as much havoc as abled people's cars.
No	Overall Scheme	Residents parking scheme causes problems for tradespeople whilst working nearby. No enough done to stop commuter parking, should be 1hr restrictions on more streets.
Yes	Not Specified	We support the advertised proposals but have concerns regarding the parking associated with Chesham Grammar School. The areas of particular concern are the top of Eskdale Avenue from the mini roundabout down to Manor Way. This is currently an unrestricted area but cars routinely park in such a manner that they obstruct the vision getting in and out of driveways. This is a very busy area at during school hours with the addition of school buses stopping at the top of Eskdale Avenue. It is often dangerous for motorists and pedestrians alike.
Yes	Not Specified	But there are other issues. People with permits often can't park near their house if they get home after 7pm. It doesn't help people with long commutes of those who work shifts. Some roads are very empty during the day, it's not really working
Yes	Not Specified	However, concerned the changes to Kirtle Road may have a knock on effect to surrounding roads such as Kirtle Avenue
Yes	Not Specified	Please can we have permit parking in our road the roads around the grammar school
Yes	Not Specified	The plan looks good. But, as always, unless restrictions are going to be enforced there is very little point in doing it.
Yes	Not Specified	They need to be extended to include [parking not between certain time period] the section of road from the beginning of Chartridge Lane [heading away from Chesham] to up to past the school [Chiltern Hills]
Yes	Not Specified	Strategic Environment, Chiltern District Council - The proposals to not discourage the free movement of traffic and cause congestion
Yes	Not Specified	As long as there is no deviation from this proposal for example residents of Bellingdon road being given extensions to their parking permits in to Zone 'C' which would flood Treachers Close. (This was skimmed across on an earlier proposal and not talked about since.)
Yes	Not Specified	Yes, but this only goes a tiny way to sorting the key issues around parking in Lowndes Avenue. Primary issues are cars being parked up for extended periods of time by residents living in other parts of Chesham and local car dealers at both ends "resting" their stock on the road. Living on a hill, these cars are often parked right up against .. drives entrance creating total blind-spots to other road users and have nearly caused accidents on a number of occasions. I would like to see permit holder parking in Lowndes Avenue, one

		per house.
No	Not Specified	There is little space to drop off children or pick up from local shops as it is. If some of parking becomes permit holders this will be worse and there will be more people larking on pavements
Yes	Not Specified	Generally, I support the changes. I would like to see some enforcement of the law when vehicles are parked illegally.
Yes	Not specified	7 people said Yes with no further comments.
N/A	Eskdale Avenue	This is just an email to say I strongly support the idea of residential parking on Eskdale Avenue, Chesham. The road has become unmanageable and many of us have health problems/small children and often have to carry said small children and large amounts of shopping down the hill if we need to park on Harding Road or further up the hill. This also creates chaos for residents of those roads who shouldn't have to put up with us using their streets simply because individuals block up the limited parking spaces we have available. I urge you to consider whether any individuals objecting have driveways - I understand that you may have to consider their views but they cannot spoke for those us that experience daily stress as a result of the outdated parking conditions.