

Which road would you like to comment on?	Do you support the proposals?	Comments	Further comments
Acres End (Y45/Y46)	Yes	<p>The proposed restrictions will make such a difference in the safety of this road.</p> <p>The road is clearly used all day Monday-Friday by commuters and during lockdown the road has been clearer and no problems have arisen. When busy (normal times) there is no break in the parked cars and it is extremely dangerous as cars often mount the pavement to get past. My son was nearly knocked over as he innocently tried to use the pavement for purpose and a car was coming towards him.</p> <p>The pavements are also in a bad state of repair because of this. There is also a bus stop which often cannot stop safely as cars are parked in the road or over the bus stop itself.</p>	
Acres End (Y45/Y46)	Yes	<p>The residents of Acres End have long been campaigning for parking restrictions due to an extremely dangerous situation at present whereby cars consistently mount the pavement to avoid a row of parked cars. Martin Tett is fully aware of our long campaign.</p> <p>I was fully in agreement with the proposed parking restrictions for our road ie no waiting for one hour but am now very concerned to note that our close neighbours may get double yellow lines! It is proposed that First Avenue, Quarrendon Road, Sheepfold Lane and The Meadows have no waiting at any time! If this were to happen this parking review would be in the ironic position of making our situation even worse as no doubt it would push more parked cars in our direction outside the single hour of restrictions proposed for our road. We will end up in an even more dangerous place than we already are even with the single yellow line.</p> <p>If the roads stated above are definitely to have double yellows then I now think we should too, especially as we are a busier road with a bus route and the bend in the road makes it even more dangerous as cars approach at speed and then mount the pavement to avoid the constant line of sometimes up to 10 cars.</p> <p>Therefore - one hour restriction would be great BUT if the other roads named above do get no parking whatsoever then I believe we should too to be in line with our neighbours otherwise we will end up in a worse position than we were in the first place!</p>	
Acres End (Y45/Y46)	No	<p>Restrictions from 11 - 12 as other surroundings roads i agree, however providing selective permits only will only push the problem into the surrounding roads that have different restrictions.</p> <p>Residents have family & friends over which now will be unable to park legally.</p> <p>A small minority mustn't dictate for the majority.</p>	
Acres End (Y45/Y46)	No	<p>I feel that the resections being proposed are of zero/no benefit and limits residential parking.</p> <p>There is no daily issue with over parking on Acres End and therefore this proposal adds no benefit, yet restricts residents from parking and any visitors.</p> <p>I am NOT in support of this proposal.</p>	<p>I feel that the resections being proposed are of no benefit and limits residential parking.</p> <p>There is no daily issue with over parking on Acres End and therefore this proposal adds no benefit, yet restricts residents from parking and any visitors.</p> <p>I am NOT in support of this proposal.</p>
Acres End (Y45/Y46)	No	<p>This is unnecessary restrictions being put forward with no benefit to the residents.</p> <p>There is no heavy commuter parking and nor is there many vehicles parked on Acres End.</p> <p>The proposal risks residents parking on the road as well as visitors that maybe visiting.</p> <p>I would be opposed to the proposal.</p>	<p>This is unnecessary restrictions being put forward with no benefit to the residents. There is no heavy commuter parking and nor is there many vehicles parked on Acres End.</p> <p>The proposal risks residents parking on the road as well as visitors that maybe visiting.</p> <p>I would be opposed to the proposal.</p>
Acres End (Y45/Y46)	Yes	<p>The proposed action should considerably improve the current situation and reduce the risk of accidents and potential injury from cars mounting the pavement.</p>	
Acres End (Y45/Y46)	I'm not sure	<p>Entry from and to Stanley Hill Avenue is hazard from a long line of parked cars on Acres End</p> <p>Proposals not reported to estate residences</p>	
Acres End (Y45/Y46)	Yes	<p>What you are proposing is better than nothing though what you are proposing to be done to surrounding roads means Acres end the busier access road will become even more congested. It does not like you have thought through the proposals at all.</p> <p>Why is Quarrendon road getting no waiting at any time yet the busier through road of acres end is only between certain times - I can't believe we the tax payer have paid for such a poor quality survey to be done including on roads where their is limited access and limited parking meaning they will all then need to park in acres end defeating the point why the restrictions are required!</p> <p>Please re look and make another proposal as this will make Acres end even busier and more dangerous for pedestrians and other road users!</p>	

Acres End (Y45/Y46)	No	<p>No waiting between 11am-12noon is certainly an improvement, however I believe quite strongly that this should be No waiting at anytime. Rarely do residents park their cars on road, and if they do, along with commuters leaving their cars all day long, it is always by the entrance from Stanley Hill Avenue.</p> <p>The parking along that straight stretch, is ridiculous, cars turning into Acres End often come face to face with an oncoming car, which has been forced onto the other side of the road. Cars turning into Acres End, are forced to break and stop in the road, as they are faced with either the back of a stationery car, or an oncoming car on your side of the road!</p> <p>The commuters cars are parked there early in the morning. By the time school children walk along Acres End into Stanley Hill, many parents with pushchairs, and young children on their own. EVERY school morning it is chaos in Acres End, with a stream of cars trying to pass through a single lane, OFTEN with many impatient and irate motorists mounting their cars onto the kerb, where the school pedestrians are trying to walk.</p>	
Acres End (Y45/Y46)	No	<p>The restriction of no parking between 11 am and 12pm, should be upgraded to NO PARKING AT ANYTIME. The junction where you drive into Acres End from Stanley Hill Avenue is often inaccessible, with cars ending up on my side of the road, as they pass a long stream of parked cars. One day there will be a car accident, and I have seen cars on the pavement when school kids were there too.</p>	
Acres End (Y45/Y46)	No	<p>When I leave for work the road is regularly gridlocked with cars, beside the parked cars in Acres End near the Stanley Hill Avenue junction.</p> <p>Vehicles often drive partly on the pavement, at the time when there are lots of school children, prams and parents walking by. It is unsafe for motorists and pedestrians.</p> <p>On one occasion I saw road rage as two cars had met head on and neither car could back up as the traffic has build up behind them both. One van had to drive onto the pavement for about 50m to get by.</p> <p>I really hope you can make sure Acres End is a no waiting at anytime zone to keep everyone safe.</p>	
Batchelors Way (X44)	No	<p>Mon - Sat why car users will just park in Highland road, West Stanley Hill Avenue Maybe resolving one issue though causing another.</p>	
Batchelors Way (X44)	Yes	<p>I live in Westanley Avenue and wonder why we have been omitted from the proposed new Parking Restrictions. Our road is close to Amersham Station and would be clogged with traffic if all other surrounding roads have the new restriction.</p>	
Batchelors Way (X44)	No	<p>There is no point putting in Saturday parking restrictions in Batchelors Way, The Green and The Drive only to push the problem on to the next nearest roads ie Highlands, Westanley and Stankey Hill Avenue....makes absolutely no sense. Either all have Saturday restriction or none do.</p>	
Batchelors Way (X44)	No	<p>If the proposed Saturday parking restriction is applied to Batchelors Way, as well as to The Rise, The Drive, The Copse and The Green, then there is a strong likelihood that Saturday parkers will simply choose to park a little further out, namely in Stanley Hill Avenue, Westanley Avenue and Highland Road. I am therefore opposed to the Batchelors Way proposal, unless the same restrictions are applied to Stanley Hill Avenue, Westanley Avenue and Highland Road.</p>	<p>In view of the risk of the proposed parking restrictions having a knock-on effect to adjacent roads which are not included in the review, I would be in favour of Stanley Hill Avenue being treated in the same way as Batchelors Way.</p>
Batchelors Way (X44)	Yes	<p>Batchelors Way needs to be looked at in conjunction with The Copse, The Drive and The Green, all near the station, or it will get displacement parking. In addition, Batchelors Way is potentially going to be affected by displacement parking if you implement further restrictions in Orchard Lane. When Bucks Council starts reimposing its parking charges after the pandemic, I believe Batchelors Way is going to be further impacted with the opening of the new Chiltern Lifestyle Centre. Where are people meant to park for the children's play area, which has just opened? Orchard Lane is a minute's walk away and Batchelors Way three minutes?' It is also noted that the residents of Batchelors Way did not receive any correspondence about this review</p>	
Batchelors Way (X44)	No	<p>I do not agree because I think it will just result in people parking in other nearby roads such as Stanley Hill Avenue and Westanley Avenue, and walking to the station from there.</p>	

Batchelors Way (X44)	No	<p>I have looked at the notes on the informal consultation (from Dec2019/Jan2020). On page 54 (related to Batchelors Way) it appears that you received 12 comments all of which were in support. I'm afraid this is untrue as I am a resident of Batchelors Way (number 21) and I wrote to you to express my reservations about the plans to extend the parking restriction to Saturdays as well.</p> <p>My reasons for this were the following:</p> <p>1) these restrictions are in place on bank holidays (including Christmas) meaning that we would be unable to host relatives or friends on these days as we wouldn't have enough off street parking to accommodate them. There is also no option of parking on a nearby street as we all have the same 11-12 restriction.</p> <p>2) the reason for these restrictions is intended to prevent commuters using the local streets rather than the car parks. BUT actually it also impacts on the residents too. I would have absolutely no issue with these restrictions IF you gave residents parking permits (for our own cars) or the ability to apply for permits for our visitors. I know that people worry that this could be abused but all you have to do it make the permit for the specific car itself (by registration number).</p> <p>3) I have on a number of occasions been irritated by the 11-12 restriction. I really do think that resident permits would make the whole process work better. We, as residents, are penalised for living near the station which is (in my opinion) extremely unfair. We should be able to park on our own road without these issues. I have young children and on a number of occasions we have been unable to have visitors/play dates as the 11-12 restriction is over a toddler's lunchtime. If only we had a residents permit it would solve so many issues for local residents but still prevent commuters from parking on our roads - which is the whole reason for having the restriction in the first place!</p> <p>I would like my objection to any extension to the parking restriction on Batchelors Way noted please. I am quite concerned that the consultation paper doesn't show any rejections to this proposal when I did make an objection. ☹</p>
Black Acres Close (Y46)	I'm not sure	<p>I agree with what is currently proposed for Black Acre Close, but feel that additional restrictions should be included to prevent parking issues in turning areas and in front of residents' driveways.</p> <p>As I had responded in the 2 rounds of informal consultation, there is a turning area outside of numbers 30-37 where people are currently able to park, which often makes turning unsafe and difficult as well as leaves driveways partially blocked. There is no need for parking here as all of the houses have driveways and garages, so I believe that there should be additional no waiting restrictions on this part of the road as well. This will allow the turning area to be protected and ensure safe access to properties for all residents.</p> <p>I am happy to talk this through with somebody, if that would be helpful.</p>
Hillside Gardens	Yes	<p>I actually live in Hillside Gardens, and I'm rather puzzled as to why our street isn't available for me to make comments upon? As Black Acre Close is the 'sister' close adjacent to us, I thought I'd give comments here.</p> <p>I was objecting to any kind of parking restrictions, however we have recently had issues with car owners from Drakes Road feeling it is acceptable to dump their cars for many weeks in our close. I believe this is due to their road having parking permits. What I would hate would be for even more cars from neighbouring roads being dumped in our Close due to new restrictions being added.</p> <p>I've now come round to the idea that 'No Parking 11am to midday', might be the best solution. If the resident's permits were free, then this would also get my support. A 'paid for permit' just feels like it's a council money-making scheme, when we already pay very high council taxes.</p>

Black Acres Close (Y46)	Yes	<p>Firstly I would like to say that I am in full agreement of only placing double yellow lines on the access road of Black Acre Close which leads into the rest of the close whilst not applying any other parking restrictions to the rest of the road. It is good that you have listened and decided to leave our road as it currently is, it is so very narrow that anyone parking will need to put 2 wheel on the pavement/grass verges so it is out of the question to apply any restrictions.</p> <p>Secondly, your report keeps misspelling the road - it has written Black Acres Close !</p>
Black Acres Close (Y46)	Yes	<p>In addition to my online response to the parking review (reference below), I wanted to add a couple of photos to illustrate the issue I describe with people frequently parking in the turning area at the end of Black Acre Close. This often makes turning impossible, it is sometimes dangerous/impossible for larger vehicles to access properties and it is also a safety issue when the pavement is blocked with parked cars. This is the additional area that I believe should also have parking restrictions applied for safety reasons and to allow the area to be used for turning as it is intended.</p>
Bois Lane (X39/X40)	No	<p>Not all the houses have off-street parking and the proposed yellow lines would mean that homeowners will not be able to park their cars near their homes. This penalises those houses without off-street parking.</p>
Bois Lane (X39/X40)	No	<p>The proposal is unfair as it targets the houses that don't have a drive making it difficult for householders and their visitors. It also impacts on tradesmen who attend to the properties along the road, as they will not have anywhere to park.</p>
Bois Lane (X39/X40)	I'm not sure	<p>I would like confirmation that the parking restrictions outside my house are not changing. Currently there is a parking space with a 30 minute waiting time. The map, though, implies that all of the parking outside my house and the houses next to mine will now have 30 minute waiting times. Currently we have a white line preventing that. We would not be able to leave our homes if people parked in front of our drives. Thank you.</p>
Bois Lane (X39/X40)	No	<p>As it is very unclear as to what is proposed in Bois lane, I object to increasing the restrictions that exist. there is no real problem with the current arrangements; traffic flows freely and the needs of residents and the village shop (Londis) appear to be met with the current arrangements, especially at the North road end of Bois Lane</p>
Bois Lane (X39/X40)	No	<p>We wish to comment on the area of Bois Lane between Chestnut Lane and North Road. You are proposing to restrict all day parking in Glebe Way, Chestnut Lane and the Bois Lane end of North Road. we welcome and support this. despite both ours and the parish council's representations, you have not included the part of Bois Lane between no2 and no16. by displacing parking elsewhere, there will be all day parking on this stretch, where not all of the houses have off street parking. this will cause serious problems an we ask yet again that this part of Bois Lane have the same restrictions as all the other roads nearby.</p>
Bois Lane (X39/X40)	Yes	<p>We pay our road tax and parking on Bois lane is very difficult on the left hand side. Parking from there down is a nightmare and we need to park there all day not just evening hours. We shouldn't have to pay for a permit or have limited timed parking. The right side all have driveways so they are okay. A lot of people on the left of Bois lane where we only have limited parking and not enough means we have to park in green lane and Woodside close. If you go ahead with this we'll have no were to park. What are we supposed to do!!!! You need to leave our parking as it is and most houses have two cars. What do you achieve by changing it apart from charging us for a permit. This is so wrong and it obviously won't affect you and I object to it.</p>
Bois Lane (X39/X40)	No	<p>Disagree with working group's decision. Support the original proposal and proceed to formal consultation. See Glebe Way comments below.</p>

Bois Lane (X39/X40)	Yes	<p>I hope that you are well – thank you for all you are doing for us in this most difficult times. I apologise for harassing you about the parking review, but your officers have totally ignored representations regarding our stretch of Bois Lane. This is my response , filed today –</p> <p>We wish to comment on the area of Bois Lane between Chestnut Lane and North Road. You are proposing to restrict all day parking in Glebe Way, Chestnut Lane and the Bois Lane end of North Road. we welcome and support this. despite both ours and the parish council's representations, you have not included the part of Bois Lane between no2 and no16. by displacing parking elsewhere, there will be all day parking on this stretch, where not all of the houses have off street parking. this will cause serious problems an we ask yet again that this part of Bois Lane have the same restrictions as all the other roads nearby.</p> <p>It is obvious that by restricting all day parking elsewhere, you just shift it elsewhere. We already have issues with commuter parking, and even people leaving their cars while they go on holiday. Some of our neighbours do not have any off street parking and they already find it hard to park near their houses. Why can't we have the same restrictions as Glebe Way and North Road? No one has actually explained that to me.</p> <p>I hope that you can do something about this oversight.</p>	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	<p>Absolute disaster for us as residents. I can't afford to pay for permits. I have family and friends who visit frequently. It would cost me alot to see my friends and family who I rely on for various reasons. What happens if I have a gathering of friends, where are they supposed to park? How can I ever have a workmen to the house? Im devastated at the prospect of having to pay for permits. My income will be effected. It's going to change everything for me. Why punish the residents for the school parking. My sister lived in an area with permits and it was awful causing so many headaches and income loss.</p>	Please reconsider this disastrous decision
Briery Way (Y42)	No	<p>The results of the informal consultation quite clearly state that the overwhelming majority are opposed to the proposals because most residents would have nowhere to park. We suggested parking permits instead. However it appears that you are in fact making it even more restrictive by stating that we cannot park there at anytime rather than the originally planned within certain hours. There is no mention of permit parking. Where should residents without driveways (of which there are many) especially those with babies and young children park??</p> <p>You have completely ignored the majority of residents so why bother going to consultation in the first place? We need parking permits at the very least.</p>	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	<p>Many residents do not have off road parking so where are they to park? Especially as all surrounding roads also have restrictions. This seems completely unfair and I strongly oppose. I do not see why it cannot be permit parking for residents at least</p>	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	<p>With the initially proposed parking restrictions in place, my partner and I would not be able to live on Briery Way as we both require cars for work due to the nature of our work (public transport is not an option for us). We have often struggled with parking when returning from work and have had to use Green Lane. With the implementation of no parking available at all on Green Lane, we will have severe parking problems and likely have to move house ASAP as a consequence. We would be open to a permit provided this was only given to residents without driveways, and not used to accommodate additional parking for those with driveways.</p> <p>Even during lockdown, I have had to organise going grocery shopping around the parking restriction on Green Lane as I can't guarantee being able to get a parking space when I return on Briery Way. The section of Briery Way where I live would need to accommodate 6 cars to my knowledge, which is feasible if appropriate households being given permits for their vehicles. The restrictions implemented at 11-12pm and 1.30-2.30pm would make my working from home extremely difficult and stressful if I have to go out for an hour twice during the day. An application has previously been made for our property to have a driveway and was declined on safety grounds, despite having the same set up at the front of the property as many with driveways. A permit is surely the only reasonable way forward to not severely disrupt the lives of residence without driveways. Any other restriction would cause great upheaval for our household and I'm sure others.</p>	

Briery Way (Y42)	Yes	In your letter dated 19 th June there is no mention of parking permits being available for residents in briery way as there are in other streets . Not all residents in briery way have off street parking so I hope permits will be available	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	Please dont change briery way , to restricted parking. Its hard enough to find parking down our road at the moment and restrictions will make it near impossible. I do understand the need for change and strongly recommend going for resident parking permits to ensure people that live here can park their car without fear of parking tickets. This will affect so many residents in a negative way.	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	There needs to be residents parking, not enough parking for the houses	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	People living on this road have no driveways. I live in one of the nearest road with no parking restrictions (still 10 mins walk) I expect this to have a negative impact on my road where people with no driveways already struggle to park. I am at a loss as to why you view these restrictions as necessary?	
Briery Way (Y42)	Yes	Hello, We don't have a drive way and we park on the road. My proposal is obviously parking to be allowed for residents during the whole day and not just from 17:00-9:00.	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	Both myself and my partner have cars needed to fulfil our occupation, public transport is not an option and thus regularly both our cars are not at the property during the day. We have limited on street parking in our area as it is and thus further restrictions would cause us serious disruption. Our property has previously had an off street parking application turned down due to safety reasons and thus limiting restrictions to virtually nothing would mean we would have to park miles from home everyday. Not to mention the headaches with our cars when we are on annual leave from work. We would be open to a permit holders system and feel this is the only way forward to prevent great upheaval to our household and many others. WE ARE NOT IN FAVOUR OF ANY PARKING CHANGES TO EITHER BRIERY WAY OR GREEN LANE	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	This road is totally unsuited to no waiting at any time, the vast majority of houses do not have their own driveways and residents have no option other than to park on the road. A permit scheme would be a much better solution	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	You intend to have no waiting or parking 9am to 5pm: where are visitors, repair people etc supposed to park, our children especially my daughter visitors during daytime not evening where does she park???	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	This is not acceptable for no parking all day? You need to give consideration to us residents who have to put our cars on the road during those hours, thank you	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	Not everyone who lives on Briery Way have driveways, they don't have space for parking their cars. Visitors will not have opportunity to park cars there. We are really disappointed by this proposal.	School lane - people who want to walk on a playground there or to walk near river, play fields will not have opportunity to park their cars around. Town car park will be overflowed during pick time school hours. This proposal is the worst idea ever.
Briery Way (Y42)	No	Yet another poorly thought out plan from buckinghamshire council ,no difference from cdc happy to waste tax payers money . This plan completely discriminates the residents in the road who have no off Street parking or access to any form of driveway . We are being encouraged to walk/cycle to work and take more exerise where do you suggest we leave our vehicles when we do this . We are now working from home and will be for the considerable future which will help the environment and save it from pollution which is great ,we have a car which we will use for domestic purpose where do you suggest we park if there are no waiting restrictions enforced . When we have a day off or are sick how would you suggest we go about moving the vehicle and to where ? . We will have to park somewhere so will have no choice but to find another road which will just cause problems elsewhere because you the council are victimizing us residents who DON'T have any other options . I would really like to hear your thoughts on the plus side of having a empty road all day , while you're happy to discriminate somebody who should own a vehicle for pleasure use , but has no access to off Street parking . Buckinghamshire council I urge you to rethink this not only for the sanity but the whole well-being of all the residents who have no other choice .	Please rethink your proposal

Briery Way (Y42)	No	The council are proposing putting double yellow lines across most of Briery Way despite majority opposition to this as noted in the informal consultation report. There are at least 17 houses on Briery Way that do not have a driveway and will be unable to park. Not only will this be a nightmare for these residents, their visitors and tradesmen, but it will substantially decrease the value of our houses. The area near from the road by a green is a soakaway. We are therefore unable to put in a driveway even if we wanted to. Free residents permits is a far more logical solution, again this was noted in the results of the informal parking survey and seems to have been ignored.	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	The council are proposing putting double yellow lines across most of Briery Way despite majority opposition to this as noted in the informal consultation report. There are at least 17 houses on Briery Way that do not have a driveway and will be unable to park. Not only will this be a nightmare for these residents, their visitors and tradesmen, but it will substantially decrease the value of our houses. Free residents permits is a far more logical solution, again this was noted in the results of the informal parking survey and seems to have been ignored.	Please take a moment to consider the issues this will cause for great many residents on our road.
Briery Way (Y42)	No	There are at least 17 houses on Briery Way that do not have a driveway and will be unable to park. Not only will this be a nightmare for these residents, their visitors and tradesmen, but it will substantially decrease the value of the houses. It is absurd to even imagine that there will be no parking available for residents on a quiet residential road of Amersham. Many residents on Briery Way have young families and indeed tiny babies. Please do take please take a moment to consider the issues this will cause for a great many families on our road and perhaps think how you would feel if you could only afford to buy a house with street parking and that street parking was suddenly taken away from you. Most families have at least one car. Where will they park? Free residents permits is a far more logical solution This was noted in the results of the informal parking survey and seems to have been ignored.	I urge you to please reconsider removing the parking from residents on Briery Way. This will be a terrible outcome for families and elderly people living there, some of which who struggle to get to their cars as there is not adequate parking now.
Briery Way (Y42)	Yes	Hi , thank you so much for being so prompt. If only that was made clear in the letter we got through the letter box yesterday. Its not at all clear. That does make sense and I feel it's at least sensible. Its not what my neighbours understand. I don't think there was any mention of it being on one side at all. Thank you again	
Briery Way (Y42)	No	Hello, Please dont change briery way , amersham to restricted parking. Its hard enough to find parking down our road at the moment and restrictions will make it near impossible. I do u understand the need for change and strongly recommend going for resident parking permits to ensure people that live here can park their car without fear of parking tickets. This will affect so many residents in a nefivtive way.	
Centenary Way, Quill Hall Lane	Yes	Dear Parking You have not put these roads into the consultation process. It has not been widely advertised so I do not believe residents affected ill be aware. Centenary Way and Quill Hall Lane are used for parking by the industrial estate along Raans Road, in particular the new development by IQ Glass and associated companies. They employ over 100 staff who require parking. This means that they are using surrounding roads to park. This can cause restrictions but also means that you are not always able to park outside or near your own property and the same if you have visitors. I would like to know who to contact to arrange a visit so you can understand the situation. I also think changing how you advertise these consultations needs to be considered as they are not widely known about.	

Chestnut Close	Yes	<p>Thank you for your letter of 19th June last advising us of the above Statutory Consultation.</p> <p>Near the school in Chestnut Lane where the parking is already congested before and after school. Cars are parked on both sides of the road, completely obstructing the use of the pavement on one side in Chestnut Close. On occasions we are not able to get our car out of the drive at School delivery/collection times.</p> <p>Without parking restriction in Chestnut Close as well as Chestnut Lane, the situation will become far worse, and positively dangerous, especially to the school children.</p>
Chestnut Close	Yes	<p>With regards to the plans for parking restrictions on Chestnut Lane we must stress that any parking restrictions on Chestnut Lane will have a negative impact on Chestnut Close as this road is already congestion with school traffic and often the double parking is dangerous as the width of the road is restricted and cars regularly drive onto the pavement to park blocking access for pedestrians. If you restrict parking on the roads adjacent to Chestnut Close you will also have to carry these restrictions onto Chestnut Close itself as this is a multi-residential street with many drives that are often compromised by the school parking.</p>
Chestnut Lane (X40,X41,Y41,Z41)	No	<p>I consider a no waiting period of one hour in the middle of the day would solve the problem. I do not think no waiting at any time is necessary.</p>
Chestnut Lane (X40,X41,Y41,Z41)	I'm not sure	<p>I think extending the double yellow lines on both sides to the bus stop from the junction with Bois Lane is an excellent idea. However, I do not understand why in this stretch of road, (up to the double yellow line before the Parkfield Ave junction), that single yellow lines on each side preventing parking between 11:00 -12:00 to prevent non resident all day parking is not being applied. In the consultation document it states there is not enough off road parking for residents but in the this stretch there are only a few house all with ample off road parking and from my observations in the last 3-4 years most people parking here all day are either London commuters or people working in Amersham who should surely use the public parking areas available. It makes no logic to me why Parkfield Ave which is long straight road with greater visibility and less use of cars has single yellow lines and yet just round the corner where more cars travel and visibility worse if cars are parked all day no single yellow lines exist preventing all day parking.</p>
Chestnut Lane (X40,X41,Y41,Z41)	No	<p>I park on the main road or the side roads. I always keep in mind that I don't park near the school, fir children's safety. There's not enough parking spaces on the school site, so where am I suppose to park? I feel this is not taken into consideration when drawing up a parking plan. I'm not parking miles away from school. What if other members of staff are unable to walk that far due to any disability.</p>

Chestnut Lane (X40,X41,Y41,Z41)	I'm not sure	I was fully supportive of the first phase of the proposals where no waiting 11am-12pm was to be introduced along the whole of Chestnut Lane, however these have been significantly watered down in the latest proposal. Whilst I agree with the proposals being made, they do not address in any way the significant issue of commuters parking on Chestnut Lane and walking to the station. Parking restrictions between 11am and 12pm should be introduced all the way along Chestnut lane from Sycamore Road until the Gowers (in addition to the proposed restrictions) to prevent the road from being clogged throughout during the week.	It is a shame to see the opportunity to clear a significant amount of commuter parking from the road missed in this review. The objections to the original proposals were in the main made by non-residents whose views seem to have been disproportionately taken into account. There should be a daytime restriction of some kind along the whole length of Chestnut Lane.
Chestnut Lane (X40,X41,Y41,Z41)	Yes	Agree with the working group's decision to proceed to formal consultation, in particular to restrict commuter parking and support visibility and secure the bus stop clearway near Bois Lane (X40), promote safety near Chestnut Lane school, whilst providing some on-street parking that will be valued by residents and teachers.	
Chestnut Lane (X40,X41,Y41,Z41)	No	<p>I wish to register our comments on the latest proposed parking restrictions on the stretch of Chestnut Lane between Sycamore Road and Parkfield Avenue. Whilst we welcome the additional double yellow lines and bus stop bay between Sycamore Road and 124 Chestnut Lane we remain concerned that there is no apparent restriction from the West of the drive to Nr 124 up to the current double yellow lines near to Parkfield Avenue. In the last few years this stretch of road is constantly used for commuter parking from 7am until 7pm every weekday and to a slightly lesser extent on Saturdays with cars frequently parking beyond the splayed kerbs to the drives which severely restricts vision when attempting to pull out of our drives (cars passing the parked cars frequently accelerate from the junction of Parkfield Avenue towards Sycamore Rd and vice versa). This restricted vision is exasperated when such parked vehicles are large SUV/4x4 cars – a common vehicle of choice seemingly!</p> <p>To discourage such commuter parking (which at present has been limited purely due to Covid-19 lockdown) we would favour / support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Limited waiting / parking 1 hour maximum – no return 2 hours restrictions as proposed for Glebe Way on map X40 – I am sorry I cannot recall the exact proposal here as no longer able to access X40 from your website however from what I recall when my wife and I briefly looked at the proposals when we first received your letter this seemed very suitable for this section of Chestnut Lane as well as it would allow, for example, parents of pupils at Chestnut Lane school additional parking at pick up / drop off times which they cannot do currently due to commuter parking) or No parking / waiting for one hour between say 11-12 Monday to Saturday as is currently the case in Parkfield Avenue (this would still allow parents parking to pick up pupils from Chestnut Lane school or White lines across and beyond each drive to their full width including splayed kerbs (such as are installed in South Road) – this is our least favoured option but better than current situation. <p>Without one of the above, it will only be a matter of time before there is an accident which may be just bent metal but could be worse.</p>	

Chestnut Lane (X40,X41,Y41,Z41)	No	<p>We have the following comments on the Final Proposals:</p> <p>1.) We do not find the detailed response in the Final Proposals to the comments made by all parties on the Original Proposals terribly helpful in our case, as they refer to Chestnut Lane as a whole, which you note covers Tiles X40 and 41, and Y40 and 41, each of which areas exhibit markedly different traffic characteristics. Our comments, by contrast, refer only to that section of Chestnut Lane between Bois Lane and Parkfield Avenue - part of Tile X40 (henceforth "Tile X40") on your enclosed maps.</p> <p>2.) We endorse the proposal to use double yellow lines along the whole of the north side of this stretch. We do not however believe it will make any material difference, as we have never seen any cars parked on that side of the road as long as we have been living here.</p> <p>3.) We find the note contained in the Summary of feedback section in the Final Proposals as applied to Chestnut Lane disingenuous at best, insofar as the assertion that there is little support for the originally proposed single - yellow line restrictions "as the residents do not have off - street parking" (which, strangely, appears to be the view not only of "households in the road" but also of "others"), may apply to other parts of the road, but cannot apply to that covered in Tile X40, where all residents have off - street parking.</p> <p>4.) We note that, of the 39 objections to the Original Proposals, 34 are from "others", as opposed to residents. We assume that these would have included some (or many) of those car users who regularly clog up the parking across this section of road, between around 0800 and 1800, Monday to Friday; by contrast, evenings and weekends leave this stretch nearly empty. By observation (and, on occasions, conversations with the drivers) we are satisfied that these relate overwhelmingly to commuters and workers in Amersham town centre, who use this section of Chestnut Lane as a free car park.</p>
Chiltern Road	Yes	Agree with working group's decision to protect junctions, extend to The Leys and proceed to formal consultation.
Clifton Road	Yes	Agree with working group's decision to proceed to formal consultation.
Clifton Road	Yes	<p>AMERSHAM PARKING REVIEW 2020</p> <p>As you will see from above my address which is opposite "The Beacon School" and although the school has greatly improved parking in the last year parents still park in Clifton Road - I presume for ease of "get away"?</p> <p>I have no problem with that, but what concerns us is that with the proposed "Yellow Line" the parking will be more concentrated outside our "gate" - actually just a gap in the hedge!</p> <p>The point is that to preserve the drive and for ease of exit we prefer to "Back in" so that we can "Exit" forward - not least for visibility!</p> <p>What concerns us is the likelihood of parked cars on the opposite of the road (As now.) but will increase with fewer gaps to poke ones nose into to facilitate maneuvering in reverse for ent,ry</p> <p>Just for clarity, the hedge is a double hedge of both Privet and Laurel which is over 6 feet tall and equally "Thick" so sight through or over it is out of the question.</p> <p>What we would ask therefore is if the proposed yellow line on the SOUTH SIDE of the of the road could be extended by some 3-4 Meters beyond the point of our entry on the North Side.</p>
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	<p>The parking around affects traffic flow from both ends of Copperkins Lane . This is not just at the school pick up and drop off times but all throughout the day due to parked cars (possibly commuter) outside the school. It means traffic cannot turn easily left causing the traffic to build back on the main Chesham/Amersham road in both directions. I am also very concerned that currently there are no parking restrictions on the blind corner by Copperkins Grove - this is an serious accident waiting to happen. Cars approaching , often very fast, from Hyde Heath end cannot see around the bend due to a large tree and are therefore unaware there could be traffic on their side of the road due to the need to pass parked cars here.</p>

Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	blind corner awful something needs to be there to protect drivers in both directions from parked cars on this bend
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	The parking around Heatherton House affects traffic flow from both ends of Copperkins Lane . This is not just at the school pick up and drop off times but all throughout the day due to parked cars (possibly commuter) outside the school. It means traffic cannot turn easily left causing the traffic to build back on the main Chesham/Amersham road in both directions. I am also very concerned that currently there are no parking restrictions on the blind corner by Copperkins Grove - this is an serious accident waiting to happen. Cars approaching , often very fast, from Hyde Heath end cannot see around the bend due to a large tree and are therefore unaware there could be traffic on their side of the road due to the need to pass parked cars here.
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	I am also commenting on W40 (and V40 which is not included in the list?). Thank you for listening and taking into account our comments and proposals. I think your final proposals are sensible. 1) School - the proposals allow a sensible and safer system for Heatherton parents to do child drop off and pickup. 2) Corner - they prevent dangerous parking around the corner and opposite the junction with Copperkins Grove 3) Commuters 1 - they prevent commuters from all day parking and blocking up the road 4) Commuters 2 - they encourage commuters to use the station car park (you will need to price this parking fairly to ensure full take up) 5) Residents parking - they continue to permit residents to park temporarily on the road (tradesmen etc)
Copperkins Lane (W40)	I'm not sure	I feel that the proposal does not address the danger to children crossing the road opposite Heatherton House with cars parked opposite the school "no stopping" area. There is significant risk where people cannot see due to parked cars at school drop off time and it is only time before there is a significant accident. I believe that there should be no stopping at any time (or at least at school drop off and pick up) in this area. In addition this does not address the traffic issue at this time with back up frequently to the main road as there are so many parked cars blocking the traffic. I know that children may have to walk a few more metres if the no stopping is extended at this time but compared with the safety risk this seems a sensible compromise
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	I'm in full agreement with the proposals
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	I fully support the proposal and would like it implemented as soon as possible, preferably before Heatherton House resumes on 7 September.
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	There should be no parking allowed around the first bend near the school. At the moment cars are forced to overtake parked cars at the sharp bend near a large tree.

Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	<p>I fully support the parking proposals issued and wish to stop the combination of commuter and parent parking which leads to awful congestion and poses safety issues to the residents of Copperkins Lane.</p> <p>However, I strongly feel that the proposals must go further to protect the safety of residents, particularly children, crossing from the North side of Copperkins Lane where there is no pavement.</p> <p>Specifically , the proposal for a single yellow line with No Waiting Mon-Fri 10.30-11.30 is planned to commence outside the end of number 23. As parents of Heatherton House will then park from this point towards Woodfield Park at school drop off and pick up times, this will force traffic leaving Amersham towards Hyde Heath onto the wrong side of the road. This will increase the danger to children crossing from the north side of the lane where there is no pavement. They will have to cross into the road from numbers 16/18 onwards, into a road with parked cars on the south side, with cars oncoming around a bend, on the wrong side of the road. Given that vehicles routinely speed around this corner, once they clear the congestion around the school, this is a very risky combination.</p> <p>The risk to the children's safety is significant, highly concerning and potentially of fatal consequence.</p> <p>The statement of reason that is enclosed with the parking review states that the proposals have been made to</p> <p>"For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising. For facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians)"</p> <p>To protect pedestrians and avoid further danger, the parking proposal must go further than it does.</p> <p>The "No Waiting at Any Time" should be extended until the road is straight. Preferably all the way to Woodfield Park. If this is not possible, then it should be extended at least to number 29 when the road is straight and</p>	<p>Please consider the consequences to children walking to and from school at times when cars will be parked outside or opposite their houses. The bus stop at the junction of Copperkins Lane and Bois Avenue for Challoners Girls and Challoners Grammar School can only be reached by using the pavement on the south side of Copperkins and then crossing to the north side again. For children living on the North side of Copperkins lane there is no pavement at any point on that side. Therefore they have to cross the road to access the pavement on the south side.</p> <p>Please extend the proposed single yellow "No Waiting at any Time" to beyond number 25, ideally to the junction of Woodfield Park, so that children have a clear line of sight to cross the road. If they have to cross into a road lined with parked cars, the moving traffic will be forced onto the wrong side of the road, increasing the risk to pedestrians crossing.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	<p>The current proposal now makes sense. Specifically, the extended zone which runs to Woodfield park is a much more sensible balance between parking requirements and the safety and well-being of children who live on the lane.</p>	
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	<p>I fully support the extension of restrictions from the Amersham Rd end of the Lane to the junction with Woodfield Park. I am concerned about parking still being permitted opposite Heatherton House School since school parents' parking causes much of the safety and traffic issues on that end of the Lane. I would propose that there should be no parking outside the school at all (double-yellows) with the understanding that any blue badge holders can of course park there in any event. Parents will be able to park on Devonshire Avenue and walk the footpath through to the school. Devonshire is not a through-road, so this is a safer option. To be clear, however, I fully support Bucks CC's proposals and would simply advocate going further if possible.</p>	
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	<p>Overall the No parking at any time restrictions are to be welcomed - particularly on the two bends past Heatherton School. I trust the Police will enforce this when the time comes!</p> <p>However my remaining serious reservation is the light restriction opposite the School 10.30 - 11.30. It may dissuade Commuters but will only encourage more shambolic parking by parents (primarily mothers!). I have repeatedly lobbied for use of part of the (Common) hideous, overgrown and untended scrubland adjacent to the School and the main road: a simple pick up / drop off area monitored by the School and parents with access/ exit in Copperkins Lane AND by the traffic lights which are rarely used by parent pedestrians, would solve the whole issue once and for all.</p> <p>Like others I remain greatly concerned that indiscriminate parking can and will obstruct and delay Emergency vehicles on a ' blue light ' at key School times.</p>	
Copperkins Lane (W40)	No	<p>The proposals will stop my visitors being able to park in the road 7 days a week, 24 hours a day which is unacceptable and prevents me from enjoying the use of my home.</p> <p>Additionally the proposals are just going to push the problem to further down the lane.</p>	<p>No waiting at any time outside my home is not acceptable. This is an ill thought through plan. There should be a one hour no parking zone and Heatherton should provide on site parking for parents.</p>
Copperkins Lane (W40)	I'm not sure	<p>Concerned that Commuter parking will extend up the lane past Woodfield Park as there are no limits beyond that</p>	

Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	To help reduce the traffic congestion at busy time in Copperkins Lane it would be beneficial to restore the priorities at the roundabout at the end of Copperkins Lane and Amersham Road A416. Copperkins lane has priority but all the "Give Way" road markings on Amersham Road are worn away and the Give Way sign is not visible as drivers approach the roundabout.	
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	I support the proposals, but feel that a complete ban on all parking outside of Heatherton School. Parents could park on nearby streets and walk over to the school.	I would like to thank the Council for taking an interest. Parking and speeding are significant problems on Copperkins Lane. Between the older residents that have lived here for many years, and a new group of young children that are becoming more numerous on the Lane, there is a large constituency of residents at risk from traffic-related misbehaviour. Increased restrictions to parking is the first step in responding to this risk.
Copperkins Lane (W40)	I'm not sure	All except one of the proposals put forward by the Council have my full support. The exception relates to the proposed restriction on all day parking on the south side of Copperkins Lane, heading west, which is scheduled to terminate just before the junction with Woodfield Park. This approach seems likely to result in existing parking being displaced to the vicinity of the junction, where it would create a safety risk to traffic and pedestrians, and especially to school children who board school buses there. May I suggest that the parking restriction is extended for a reasonable distance beyond the junction with Woodfield Park.	
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	Copperkins lane As a resident of copperkins lane, I fully support the measures to stop parking for one hour per weekday in order to prevent commuters parking on the road for the entire day. Council-run car parks To encourage town centre shopping I support two hours of free parking at the council run car parks at weekends	
Copperkins Lane (W40)	Yes	Agree with working group's decision to proceed to second informal consultation. This scheme is crucial to address safety problems of parking, access and visibility, particularly at beginning and end of the Heatherton House school day.	
Coppice Farm Road (K58)	No	There has been no problem with parking whatsoever on this road. We have no driveway and no parking apart from on Coppice Farm Road. The proposed no parking restrictions will leave us not enough space to park our cars on this small stretch of road that is being left for parking. We will be forced to park our cars outside peoples houses on a dangerous bend on Coppice Farm Road or alternatively right outside our house on the busy Hazlemere road, causing dangerous traffic build up. Parents regularly drop off their children this will leave them no where to park except on the Hazlemere road which would cause a very serious danger issue for the children on such a busy fast road. Also the nursery school needs parents to be able to park their cars for drop off and pick up times so again where are they going to park? This parking restriction will be a total waste of money as the police do not have the time or resources to police this, a prime example of this is the double yellow lines that have been put opposite Tyler's green middle school - parents park all along these yellow lines and no one comes along to issue parking fines. The only reason that this parking restrictions have been attempted is purely because of a man who doesn't like people parking outside his house, how ridiculous that this has even gone this far!	
Coppice Farm Road (K58)	No	This parking restriction is totally unnecessary, there has never been an issue with parking in the 10 years I have lived here. I park on Coppice Farm Road where you are proposing parking restrictions, these restrictions will not leave enough room for the vehicles we own in my household. We park along side the green area which is not in front of any houses. If these restrictions come into place we will be forced to park our vehicles outside peoples properties causing danger to these residents when they try to come out of their driveways also lots of the places we will be parking is on a sharp bend on Coppice Farm Road. Alternatively we will have to park on Hazlemere road causing no end of traffic build up and very dangerous situation when cars try to go round our vehicles.	

Coppice Farm Road (K58)	Yes	I fully support the proposed parking restrictions, and would welcome double yellow lines to be applied due to extreme safety reasons and at present very dangerous parking	
Coppice Farm Road (K58)	Not Sure	Per the letter dated 19th June 2020 Ref: Amersham Parking - Statutory the proposed restriction for Coppice Farm Road is: No waiting at any time and Resident Permit Holders Only Monday to Sunday 10am-4pm. Do these proposed restrictions apply from the entrance to Coppice Farm Road to the Methodist church?	
Coppice Farm Road (K58)	Yes	I am pleased to see that in the interests of safety that double yellow lines will be installed at the junction with the B474 and at the junction of Coppice Farm Road with Chilton Close. In accordance with the request, reasoning and photographic evidence given in my letter of 13th January on the earlier consultation, also in the interests of safety, I again request that the double yellow lines outside my property should be extended a car's length to the Eastern side of the driveway. This will not prevent sufficient on-street parking for local inhabitants which I wish to see continue. Thank you.	
Coppice Farm Road (K58)	No	Please paint double yellow lines for the first three car lengths from the junction. Double yellow lines for any further distance will mean cars permanently parked further along Coppice Farm Road on the blind bend which is danger to traffic and children crossing the road to the nursery.	
Coppice Farm Road (K58)	No	I cannot understand why the council would want to waste valuable money and resources painting pointless double yellow line along Coppice Farm Road, there has never been an issue nor an accident before. Why would double yellow lines be put going halfway along the green where there are no houses or any issue for people parking. In my household we have no driveway, so if double yellow lines are put so far down the road we would all have to park our vehicles further up Coppice F Rd in front of people houses and also on a dangerous bend in the road or alternatively along the busy Hazlemere road. People park considerably and do not park on the corner in accordance with the law. Why not just leave the road how it's been for years and years with no problem to anyone. The yellow lines do certainly not need to go so far up the road maybe if anything just round the corner.	
Coppice Farm Road (K58)	No	The proposals do not go far enough and should not be accepted in their current state as they are not suitable for the road or location. Double Yellow lines should be extended on both side further along Coppice Farm Road from where Coppice Farm Road joins Hazlemere Road along past Chiltern Close and the church and all the way along to 46 Coppice farm road. Rule 242 of the Highway Code states that vehicle owners should not park in a dangerous position or where they cause obstruction to a road which is currently being ignored all along Coppice Farm Road. If double yellow lines are not extended along Coppice Farm Road any parking restrictions at the end of Coppice Farm Road where it joins Hazlemere Road will force the cars that park there to park further back along Coppice Farm Road. This will cause a serious hazard to the home owners on Coppice Farm Road (from opposite Chiltern Close up to 46 Coppice Farm Road) when they come out of their driveways in their cars due to the bend in the road. Any parked cars on either side of the driveways of the houses on Coppice Farm Road (starting from the houses opposite Chiltern Close and the church up to 46 Coppice Farm Road) severely restrict visibility up and down the road. These parked cars will also force the cars blindly coming out of their driveways onto the opposite side of the road and potentially into traffic and this will cause accidents. Furthermore there are young children living in the houses on Coppice Farm road and cars parked along this road will increase the danger to them as they cannot be seen by cars coming along the road when the children are crossing the road between cars. Equally the parked cars make it difficult for children and parents to see cars coming along the Coppice Farm Road. This is even more serious given that there is a pre-school at the church and any cars parked around this area could increase the danger to them also.	Transport for Buckinghamshire needs to ensure the safety of the children living on Coppice Farm Road and using the pre-school at the church on Coppice Farm Road. Additionally the road is used as a parking area for many people who do not even live in the close vicinity to Coppice Farm Road creating a danger to the residents. The current proposals are not enough to address the parking situation along the Coppice Farm Road and it is felt that they could actually cause the parking issue and dangers to increase for the residents along this Coppice Farm Road as well as the pre-school.

Coppice Farm Road (K58)	No	<p>I am writing in respect to the above review and Parking restrictions in Coppice Farm Road(K58).</p> <p>The issue I have impacts residents who live in my Ward on Hazelmere Road, and currently have no off road parking and use Coppice Farm Road to park. The first section of which runs next to the rear gardens in Haszelmere Road, and with no houses or drives fronting this straight section of road it is an appropriate place for parking.</p> <p>The current proposal is to not just have lines at the junction but sweep back further from the junction, thus removing most of the parking.</p> <p>If these restrictions go ahead as planned the current parking that is much needed, due to the restrictions will be pushed further back into Coppice Farm Road, outside of residents houses and obscuring vision from driveways.</p> <p>I recognise some restriction on the corner of the road between Coppice Farm Road, and Hazelmere Road could be helpful. The current plan should be reduced to the minimum at the road junction, and not unnecessarily reduce the parking which is required in this location for residents.</p> <p>Could you please send these views for consideration as part of this consultation.</p> <p>I would like to make a formal comment on the Elm Road, Penn proposed parking restrictions as part of the formal consultation process.</p> <p>I don't believe that the proposal deals with the residents parking concerns. The main issue is weekend parking, with very limited parking taking place during normal weekdays. It also does not provide a long term parking requirements for the local Football Club. It will just move the current issue to other local roads, and a new process start to deal with it. The proposal is not a solution for local residents or for the Football Club.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	I'm not sure	I agree with proposals for Monday to Friday. Not agree for weekend as parking needed for sports clubs
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>These restrictions are not a good idea and fail to see why they are necessary. Where will people park, parents with children or the elderly visiting the Surgery and Pharmacy and even the Breakspear Osteopath (we cannot assume that everyone can walk). The car park is already too small for the surgery alone. Cars need to Park on Elm Road to visit these places. Also car which are parked force drivers to slow down when they have to give way. By clearing all the parking it will only help the already antisocial driving behaviours in the village.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>Please do not put any parking restrictions on Elm Road at any time. The traffic self regulates. If parking restrictions are applied all the cars will park in nearby roads, New Road, School Road, Church Lane, Coppice Farm and the Village Hall area, which will interrupt cars driving through the village. and cause much greater disruptions.</p> <p>I am aware when the football is operating, more people park on School Road and blocking peoples drives and around the school markings.</p> <p>Please reconsider and not apply restrictions to Elm Road.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	Yes	<p>Thank you so much for your proposed "No Waiting at Any Time" restrictions on Elm Road. We are frequently blocked into our drive by people from other villages traveling to the Penn and Tylers Green Football club for training and matches on Saturdays and Sundays. It has become a very real problem as the club has outgrown its facilities.</p> <p>We have had a number of near miss accidents as we have attempted to reverse from our drive through a tight gap in cars parked on the pavement.</p> <p>We are very relieved that this action is being taken and thank you sincerely for the proposed remedy.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>By putting these restrictions in place it will make it even more problematic and more dangerous for school pick up and drop offs. Not to mention the effect it will have on local businesses in the area. Car park in the surgery is limited if you have young sick children you want to get to the surgery straight away not have to park miles away and walk. Generally the locals are sensible about parking in the village, please do not make this more of an issue by putting in these restrictions. It's not necessary</p>

Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	I'm not sure	<p>It would seem that the objection to only residents' parking in the lay-by outside Victoria Cottages has been overruled, although the reason has been given that the residents have their own parking at the back, so it would make sense for the lay-by to be used for others to use.</p> <p>I agree that some parking should be permitted along Elm Road (from Victoria House until The Old Bakehouse) as this would slow the (often very fast) traffic down BUT ONLY AS LONG AS RESIDENTS CAN SAFELY EXIT THEIR DRIVES ON BOTH SIDES OF THE ROAD, which includes being able to see oncoming traffic.</p>	<p>I feel strongly that The Surgery and Pharmacy STAFF should park in either the Sports Club car park, the Village Hall car park (if outside school drop off/pick up times) or the car park off Nursery Lane backing onto the Back Common, thereby leaving more space for patients. Also that the SURGERY CAR PARK should be used for visitors to football/cricket matches and coaching at the weekends - but it would need to be properly signposted as such, or made public knowledge by email etc.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>I object to the proposed use of double yellow lines on both the east and the west sides of Elm Road, Penn because the village voted against street lights, this means that the only speed management available to the residents of Elm Road are cars parked on the road, slowing traffic down. The speed camera has not to be in operation in a long time.</p> <p>Due to lock down, the Doctor's surgery is closed to physical visits, thus cars have not been parked on Elm Road in the vicinity of the surgery. The very same effect that the yellow lines will produce. The problem with the road devoid of parked cars, is that cars are now free to speed along the clear road at 50/60 mph in this 30mph zone, this has become more frequent with the potential for serious injury.</p> <p>I object to the proposed "residents only parking" proposal in the lay by on Elm Road, outside Victoria Cottages.</p> <p>Having completed a periodic 3 month survey, taking photographs of the Victoria Cottage's resident's car park and the lay-by, simultaneously and at different times of the day, I am providing photographic evidence (see below) that the residents do not use and do not need the exclusive use of the lay-by. Evidence, as opposed to hearsay and word of mouth consultation that I understand has taken place with the residents of Victoria Cottages.</p> <p>The lay-by is constantly used by patients of the doctor's surgery, facilitating dozens of people each day.</p> <p>The lay-by is also used by tradesmen, Openreach engineers, window cleaners, (the list is endless) facilitating the immediate residents of Elm Road, including a newly set up business.</p> <p>The loss of use of the lay-by would be an unnecessary inconvenience to residents of this end of Elm Road, the doctor's surgery, the estate agent Jackson Howe and MJB entertainment group.</p>	<p>I object to the proposed "residents only parking" proposal in the lay by on Elm Road, outside Victoria Cottages.</p> <p>Having completed a periodic 3 month survey, taking photographs of the Victoria Cottage's resident's car park and the lay-by, simultaneously and at different times of the day, I am providing photographic evidence (see below) that the residents do not use and do not need the exclusive use of the lay-by. As opposed to hearsay and word of mouth consultation that I understand has taken place with the residents of Victoria Cottages.</p> <p>The lay-by is constantly used by patients of the doctor's surgery, facilitating dozens of people each day.</p> <p>The lay-by is also used by tradesmen, Openreach engineers, window cleaners, (the list is endless) facilitating the immediate residents of Elm Road, including a newly set up business.</p> <p>The loss of use of the lay-by would be an unnecessary inconvenience to residents of this end of Elm Road, the doctor's surgery, the estate agent Jackson Howe and MJB entertainment group.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	I'm not sure	<p>If the Police would stop the parking on the road/pavement that blocks the pavement, then yellow lines would be unnecessary. If they can't/won't, then I reluctantly support the proposals, which will just push the problem elsewhere. Let the sports club build a bigger car park in their grounds and then the problem will go away.</p>	

Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>Problem parking on the stretch of Elm Road between The Red Lion Pub and the entrance to Penn & Tylers Green Sports Club is a problem ONLY when Penn & Tylers Green Football Club have large numbers of people attending their events - ie (in "normal" times, Saturday mornings and Sunday Mornings.</p> <p>The problem is mostly restricted to the residential side of the road, rarely is there a problem on the common side of the road.</p> <p>The proposal to put permanent lines on the road in a CONSERVATION AREA is a TERRIBLE IDEA.</p> <p>Such lines will be a BLIGHT on a village location that is presently largely free of road markings.</p> <p>Bear in mind that the residents of Penn and Tylers Green have consistently voted AGAINST street lighting. We like the way our village looks and do not want to change it in a way that will make it look like any number of sub-urban locations.</p> <p>Please look at the responses you have received from residents. WE DO NOT WANT THE ROAD MARKINGS you have proposed.</p> <p>My suggestions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raise the curb on the common side of the road, to prevent parking on the common. In this regard, no one ever parks on the road on the common side, only directly on the common when the all parking spaces on the residential side of the road have been taken. 2. DO NOT PUT LINES ALL ALONG THE RESIDENTIAL SIDE OF ELM ROAD, INCLUDING ACROSS DRIVEWAYS. NO ONE EVER PARKS ACROSS DRIVEWAYS, SO IF YOU PUT LINES ACROSS THEM ALL THAT WILL DO IS LEAVE UNSIGHTLY MARKINGS ON THE ROAD WHILE STILL ALLOWING PEOPLE TO PARK
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>The proposed yellow lines would be ugly and unnecessary, currently speeding is a real issue on this piece of road, parked cars are a nuisance but do slow the traffic and make it a generally safer place</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>The proposals to install parking restrictions on Elm Road seem not to understand the issues faced by those living in the village.</p> <p>Rarely does anyone park inconsiderately or directly on the common during the week. The issue is only on holiday weekends and when football training is taking place (Sunday mornings). It therefore seems excessive to restrict parking with bright lines and resident only parking for something which happens about three hours a week. Without parking on Elm Road local residents would find it more difficult to use the pharmacy, pubs and shops. Surely we don't want to impact their businesses? Parked cars also stop the speeding that tends to happen in the later evening. Maybe a mobile speeding camera would help?</p> <p>I really don't think we need any changes to parking in the roads in the village. The proposal is excessive and not helpful to the majority of residents.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>Painting these lines in will NOT help, the cars create a natural slowing down of the traffic which works very well, the lines will look awful in what is a beautiful conservation area and you'll simply push the cars further along the road, probably towards Beaconsfield. At what point therefore do you stop painting unsightly (for the area) bright yellow lines. I must object to this proposal. It is totally unnecessary and a waste of time and money.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>Most importantly- entirely unnecessary. Also, unsightly in a picturesque village.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>Sensible parking restrictions which address a specific local problem can be helpful, but this proposal completely misses the point. It would create a permanent visual blight in the heart of the Penn & Tylers Green Conservation Area. In addition cars that are parked on the road act as a traffic calming measure.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>This is wholly unnecessary to have yellow lines on roads spoiling this lovely village It is not a town - it is a very beautiful village.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>Will cause traffic in other areas of Penn.</p>

Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>I oppose this measure on the grounds that it will blight our conservation area and is an inappropriately extensive measure to deal with a periodic problem.</p> <p>Parking in the vicinity is only rarely an issue (when the football club has large events) and these yellow lines won't stop people parking; they will just push the parking into even less suitable spots on the village.</p> <p>There is strong neighbour objection to the proposal, but that seems to have been overlooked in previous stages of plan development and consultation.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	I'm not sure	<p>I would like to see some parking restrictions at the weekends when lots of people park along the pavement when they are using the football club. They can park on either side of our drive and make it very difficult to see oncoming traffic and therefore very dangerous. I do feel we need to allow some parking as I don't know where else they can park. But it would be great to have some kind of lines outside my house that keep the parked cars at a safe distance from our driveway entrance.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>Would support double yellow lines close to the Doctors Surgery area and close to the entrance to the Sports Club but otherwise not in favour of the proposal.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>During 21 years of living in Penn, we have never heard of serious complaints about the parking in Elm Road. The green side is rarely used for parking and opposite residents have off road parking' I understand the residents have objected to this proposal so why is it even being considered.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>Cars are currently able to park on Elm road which slows the traffic down considerably on what is a very fast straight stretch of road. Many of the driveways are very tricky to get out from and if traffic is allowed to speed up this will be even more dangerous.</p> <p>The accessibility to easy parking currently supports local services, shops, cafes and pubs, restricting this will put these services at further risk and will intrude upon a strong local community. These services have become such an important part of the community, especially over the last few months when they have supported the locals.</p>

Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	Yes	<p>Firstly thank you so much for this consultation- greatly appreciated!!</p> <p>Please see an example of the problems we face on elm road at the weekends.</p> <p>We welcome the recommended no waiting at any time as long as the double yellow lines are on both sides of the street. We think that these should be clearly marked individual bays that are sufficient for all vehicle sizes and few in number. The map is a little ambiguous and people will cram in as many cars as possible without the clarity of bays.</p> <p>There is a small parking bay marked between snowdrop cottage (not marked on the map but it is the other part of the chestnuts) which we believe is not viable and would force people to block our drive. We would ask that this is reviewed and that the parking bay is removed.</p> <p>We also agree that further speed restrictions are needed on elm road. There are a series of families living on elm road with children needing to cross the road to go to the primary and middle school - cars drive too quickly and this is unsafe.</p> <p>I recommend either a 20 mph limit, children crossing warning signs or road bumps to mitigate this risk.</p> <p>Adding to the risk of speed on this stretch is that a lot of children play on the green in close proximity to the street and we have seen numerous near misses when a ball, child or dog runs onto elm road.</p> <p>If the football club was for the children in the village parking would not be an issue, however the football club attracts children from miles around - hence requiring driving and not walking. The club need to find a parking solution on their own grounds or to relocate training to an alternate location.</p> <p>We are very happy to host a visit so that we can show you the issues first hand and help to find a suitable solution</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>I do agree – there is a parking problem on Elm Road, largely due to football on a Sunday and the Doctors Surgery.</p> <p>These are really the only two reasons that people park on Elm Road. So if this were to go ahead we would then have very little on street parking in Penn. Where are people going to park for football and the Sports Club and where are they going to park for the Doctors Surgery as there is not enough parking in the car park.</p> <p>We do have double yellow lines on the proposed area around the common and opposite the shops and outside the majority of the house next door to the shops, but people still park there. It doesn't seem so much a parking restriction as the fact it isn't enforced that is more the problem.</p> <p>The shops are popular and people want to park to go to them but they don't want to walk too far and so they park wherever they can – legal or not.</p> <p>The portion of School Road that connects to Church Lane is a speed slip way and cars then speed around the corner towards the school. This is un-restricted parking on this section of School Road and cars will do anything to get a parking space here, even if there isn't enough room. They will park in front of driveways and often inhibit access to properties along the stretch. This is going to become an even bigger problem than it is now if cars are unable to park anywhere else. There will be a huge risk of cars blocking driveways and parking too close to the drive access which limits the view onto the main road in both directions, causing an issue with visibility. The speed of cars coming from Church road and the visibility issues at this point in School Road is an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>I see these cars parked in this part of the village a bigger issue than the cars parked on Elm Road – as Elm Road has a wider carriageway and has very clear visibility.</p>

Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>Objection to proposals to yellow lines and “residents parking only” in Elm Road, Penn</p> <p>I object to the proposed use of double yellow lines on both the east and the west sides of Elm Road, Penn because the village voted against street lights, this means that the only speed management available to the residents of Elm Road are cars parked on the road, slowing traffic down. The speed camera has not to be in operation in a long time.</p> <p>Due to lock down, the Doctor’s surgery is closed to physical visits, thus cars have not been parked on Elm Road in the vicinity of the surgery. The very same effect that the yellow lines will produce. The problem with the road devoid of parked cars, is that cars are now free to speed along the clear road at 50/60 mph in this 30mph zone, this has become more frequent with the potential for serious injury.</p> <p>I object to the proposed "residents only parking"proposal in the lay by on Elm Road, outside Victoria Cottages.</p> <p>Having completed a periodic 3 month survey, taking photographs of the Victoria Cottage’s resident’s car park and the lay-by, simultaneously and at different times of the day, I am providing photographic evidence (see below) that the residents do not use and do not need the exclusive use of the lay-by. Evidence, as opposed to hearsay and word of mouth consultation that I understand has taken place with the residents of Victoria Cottages.</p> <p>The lay-by is constantly used by patients of the doctor’s surgery, facilitating dozens of people each day. The lay-by is also used by tradesmen, Openreach engineers, window cleaners, (the list is endless) facilitating the immediate residents of Elm Road, including a newly set up business.</p> <p>The loss of use of the lay-by would be an unnecessary inconvenience to residents of this end of Elm Road, the doctor’s surgery, the estate agent Jackson Howe and MJB entertainment group.</p> <p>These photos clearly show that the private parking provided for the eight, one bedroomed Victoria Cottages are sufficient for eight cars, as demonstrated in image 2653.</p> <p>On inspection you will see that in 9 out of 10 photos there are spaces available for parking in the residents private parking and also in the lay-by. ☹</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	Yes	<p>I have already sent message awhile back, i am in favour of there being a NO parking along ELM ROAD.</p> <p>I have put up with people parking across my driveway for years and this has been getting worse and worse every year . So please ensure double yellow lines are installed and then maybe my life will be agreeable again ☹</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>I am shocked that the double yellow lines (etc) proposals are to be forced through, despite overwhelming opposition by residents. In what is supposed to be a conservation area, the proposals amount to sheer vandalism.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>I would like to give my reasons as to why I disagree with the proposal to put parking restrictions on parts of Elm Road.:</p> <p>I agree that there are parking issues on the road but the proposed measures do not address the problem.</p> <p>The road becomes congested mainly at weekends .</p> <p>Cars park half on the pavement on the residential side of road opposite the common. This makes it difficult for residents to safely drive out as vision of road is impaired.This is were restrictions should be put in place.</p> <p>Cars rarely park on common side of road.</p> <p>Cars do park opposite the bus stop by the common right up to both ends of road making it difficult for oncoming traffic and dangerous for pedestrians to cross road.</p> <p>Your proposed measures will not alleviate the problem and will be a waste of public money.</p>

Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>I am writing to emphasise the views I have submitted already regarding the Parking Restrictions proposed for Penn, prior to the Consultation closing date of Friday,</p> <p>The problem that must be addressed is on street parking, partly on the pedestrian pavement, resulting from the number of vehicles attending the increasing volume of local sporting activities that take place, at weekends behind the residences in Elm Road.</p> <p>This creates fundamental and significant safety issues –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduced visual splay at the point of residents' driveways. 2. Greatly Increased danger from speeding traffic, on a local bus route, made doubly unsafe when the carriageway is reduced to one lane by parked vehicles <p>The proposal under consideration does not work:</p> <p>Piecemeal Yellow Line restrictions on the residents' side of Elm Road:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Serve no purpose whatsoever as there has never been a problem with visitors to the area parking across residents' driveways. 2. They do not solve the significant danger of visual splay 3. They do nothing to maintain a safe flow of traffic. <p>The proposal suggests a continuous Yellow Line on The Common side of Elm Road.</p> <p>There are three obvious alternatives that would address the safety and traffic flow problems, at the same time as having a far less disjointed visual impact on the area</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A continuous Yellow Line along the Residents' side of Elm Road restricting parking between the hours of 0830 and 1700 on Saturdays and Sundays for all or part of the time. 2. Creation of a Restricted Parking Zone covering the same restrictions 3. Provision of sufficient and / or alternative off street parking to support local, weekend sporting activities
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>I write to object to the proposals on three grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They are ineffective in addressing the perceived problem. <p>It appears to be common ground that parking on the East side of Elm Road presents the residents with a difficult and dangerous problem in exiting their driveways as parked cars obscure any view they can have of cars approaching, often at speed, from either direction. This problem is acute if there are many cars so parked (as there often are at weekends), but in reality it is a problem at any time.</p> <p>The current plan will damage the amenity of the area by introducing yellow paint and accompanying signage and will have ABSOLUTELY NO IMPACT on the problem it purports to address. If we cannot have something that addresses the real problem, then we would be better to have no change at all.</p> <p>In addition, we should not be contemplating a 'solution' which encourages parking on the pavement/verge at a time when the Government is considering outlawing such parking. And parking entirely on the road will turn the relatively busy B474 into a one-way system.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. They are clearly unpopular with those most affected. <p>You will have seen that an overwhelming proportion of local residents oppose these proposals and I would hope full and proper account will be taken of their views.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. They are not a good use of scarce public funds. <p>The proposal will cost money to implement and to enforce. If the proposals are not to be properly enforced they should not be enacted and, if they are, the cost of enforcement is likely greatly to exceed the revenue generated. I feel sure there are other projects</p>

Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>The Parish Council partially supported the measures proposed for Elm Road, as follows:- Map L60 in favour (lower end of Elm Road from Yonder Lodge to just beyond the Surgery) Map L61 On Elm Road, the double yellow lines to cease after the entrance to French Meadow, while ensuring the vision splay of French Meadow. The lines to cease on the opposite side of Elm Road at the corner of Bank Road with Elm Road (the house name is Burntwood). Residents only parking at Victoria Cottages Council found in favour. Lines must be fine primrose yellow in colour suitable for the Conservation Area. Map L62 is not required as Council was not in favour of the running the lines up beyond French Meadow and Burntwood. We would be grateful for an amended map L61 showing these proposals, if possible.</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>We were amazed to hear of the proposal to introduce parking restrictions on Elm Road, Penn.</p> <p>We have lived here for nearly 22 years and have never seen a problem of parked cars at any time of day. In particular we cannot remember seeing cars parked on the green side of the road ie the pond side, apart from a few occasions when there are sports events on the Green at the weekend, and the residents opposite the green side have off road parking. What is the problem and how has this been decided?</p> <p>We understand that the majority of residents objected to this plan at the initial consultation phase and hope that this plan may still be halted.</p> <p>☒</p>
Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>have previously contributed to the initial consultation on the proposed parking controls in Penn, specifically for the stretch from French Meadow to the Red Lion. My submission from 10/1/20 is appended below.</p> <p>Given the results of the initial consultation conducted by Transport for Bucks, I find it very difficult to understand how due process has actually been followed. A clear majority of respondents objected to the proposal, and gave their detailed reasons as to why. Rather importantly, a number of workable solutions were put forward – therefore, I would very much like to know why the views of these particular respondents appear to have been ignored.</p> <p>This is a very sensitive location in the heart of the Conservation Area, bordered as it is by mostly listed buildings on one side and the Common and pond on the other. Unfortunately, most weekend, it is now visually blighted by a large number of parked cars.</p> <p>I do not see how this current proposal enhances or protects the character of the Conservation Area, in which I live - the local authority has a specific duty in this regard.</p> <p>At the council meeting on Wednesday 15/7/2020, Penn Parish Council were asked to reconsider their position on this issue, for this section of the proposal, and accurately represent the views of their local residents to Transport for Bucks in this important statutory consultation. The Council subsequently agreed not to support the use of double yellow lines in this section of Elm Road; I trust this has been communicated to Tfb.</p> <p>It was clear from the meeting that a key argument in favour of this proposal was the improvement of vision splays. I maintain, from my own experience, that any improvement would be minimal given the number of cars parked here.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposal does not adequately address the issue of road safety at weekends, which</p>

Elm Road (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>I hereby wish to record that I most strongly object to the proposal for the implementation of 'yellow line', 'restrictive parking' in Elm Road. My grounds for objection are based on witnessed events that directly relate to the vitally important subject of 'Health and safety' within this village's most public of 'Public Spaces.</p> <p>Vehicular Movement and Speed</p> <p>I have spent many of the past eighteen years on Elm Road, during which myself and several staff have had a panoramic outlook being pertinently along both the northerly and southerly directions of Elm Road. Over this period, no week has ever been allowed to pass without myself or staff being startled into the anticipation of events by the sound of vehicle tyres-screeching through rapid deceleration on Elm Road. At one time, a number of accidents were caused when vehicles driving from the Hazelmere direction towards Beaconsfield were then attempting to turn right - being west, into Church Road to then link-up with Hammersley Lane. Within this turn, the manoeuvring vehicle invariably succeeded in beating the oncoming vehicle from the Beaconsfield direction, but for those that could not correctly anticipate the approaching vehicles speed, it would result in the inevitable impact/collision. Such accidents - turning right into Church Road, ceased to occur several years ago when 'Highways' prohibited vehicles from making the right-turn into Church Road at this junction, so credit where credit due etc, for that particular implementation. Before the turn-restriction implementation, myself or staff felt the need to telephone the local constabulary to handle the aftermath of particularly serious collisions</p>	
Glebe Way (X40)	No	<p>In the Amersham Parking Review summary, regarding page 22, Glebe Way, it states that there were 28 responses from houses in the road. Since there is only one household in Glebe way, why has that incorrect statement been made? In my view it is completely wrong to treat residents of North Road or Bois Lane or any other road as being "households in Glebe Way".</p> <p>If one is to assume that neighbouring roads abutting Glebe Way are to be treated as if they were in Glebe Way, which they are not, have all of the houses in the section of Bois Lane nearest to Glebe Way also been given the same treatment as those in nearby North Road? Additionally, have houses in Long Park and all Long Park offshoot roads been given equal weight to North Road and Bois Lane, since those households use Glebe Way on their route to the Amersham Shopping Centre? If No Waiting rules (double yellow Lines) are to be applied in Glebe Way, this may well push commuters into North Road, who will also want No Waiting rules (double yellow lines). This may in turn push commuters into Long Park and its offshoot roads, thus passing on the problem.</p> <p>To be specific, how many of the Households in North Road have been treated as "Households in Glebe Way"</p> <p>How many households in Bois Lane have been treated as "Households in Glebe Way?"</p> <p>The fact is that Glebe Way is used by a great many local households, including Long Park and many offshoots of that road.</p> <p>How many households that are in long Park and its offshoots have been treated as "Households in Glebe Way"</p> <p>As these factors have a direct impact upon what is decided regarding Glebe Way, it is vital that all users of that road are given a say in parking decisions, especially since any parking restrictions will very likely have a knock-on effect and drive parked cars even further out and into North Road and Long Park. Therefore the feedback so far should be put to one side and a fresh consultation regarding Glebe Way should take place treating the one household in Glebe Way as important and then treating all other households in all nearby roads, including North Road, Bois Lane, Long Park and all roads off Long Park as</p>	<p>My view is that it is completely wrong to have gone ahead with this Formal and Final Parking Review during the Lockdown, especially this final process which started on 19th June, right in the middle of the Lockdown. Common sense would indicate that it should have been postponed until normal life is fully resumed. There is nothing in this review that, having waited for years, could not have waited a few more months.</p> <p>Additionally the results of the second formal review in Feb/March have not been published in a timely manner, meaning that the public do not have full information to make decisions on this final review. They cannot be found on the main Bucks Council Parking Review Website here: https://www.buckscc.gov.uk/services/transport-and-roads/parking/amersham-parking-review/</p> <p>If those results have been published but cannot be easily found, that surely invalidates this final review. Also, if published, the question is: were they published prior to the start of this final consultation on 19th June, so that they were freely available throughout the four weeks of this review? If not members of the public who commented prior to publication were not in possession of the full facts.</p>

Glebe Way (X40)	Yes	<p>Reference proposed parking restrictions in Glebe Way and North Road Chesham Bois. Area Code X40</p> <p>I fully support making bays with proposed parking restrictions regarding 'Waiting limited to 1 hour with no return for 2 hours' in both Glebe Way and North Road.</p> <p>However, the parking bay at the southern end of Glebe Way extends too far towards the junction with Bois Lane. The Highway Code recommends a minimum requirement of 10 metres. The junctions at both ends of Glebe Way are dangerously blind and with traffic allowed to park to the full extent of the road, as was the case before the Covid pandemic reduced the numbers of commuters, we have experienced several near misses.</p> <p>The safety of these junctions is further compromised as people frequently park across both ends of Glebe Way in North Road and Bois Lane making access even more difficult. Again, no one should park within 10 metres of a junction.</p> <p>Please put double yellow lines at these junctions to a safe distance in Glebe Way and on North Road and Bois Lane. In addition shorten the restricted parking bay at the southern end of Glebe Way.</p>
Glebe Way (X40)	Yes	<p>Glebe Way forms one side of a triangle with North Road and Bois Lane. Glebe Way is a critical traffic bottleneck caused by commuter parking and dangerous parking too close to the junction of Bois Lane. Glebe Way restrictions should be considered alongside potential restrictions proposed for North Road between Glebe Way and Bois Lane and those proposed for Bois Lane. The junction of Glebe Way and North Road should also be protected with yellow lines. North Road is a conservation area and we would ask for any yellow lines to be aesthetically appropriate. We agree with a second consultation. See North Road comments below</p>
Green Lane (X39)	I'm not sure	<p>I support the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Yellow lines to be added to the intersection of Green Lane and Long Park, as cars are often parked right to the very edge of Green Lane at this junction at all times of day. 2 Yellow lines to be added from the disabled park space to the intersection of Green Lane and Bois Lane, as cars often parked too close to the end of this very busy junction.
Green Lane (X39)	Yes	<p>I have lived in the area for years and witnessed the confusion at the junction many, many times, The cross roads at X39 can be very dangerous; unlike other road junctions towards Amersham, the junction has a very sharp turning and with adjacent hedging, pedestrians etc. it can be difficult to get a clear view of traffic on Bois Lane. Approaching the cross roads at Bois Lane, Green Lane is very narrow. Often vehicles park right up to Bois Lane causing traffic wishing to exit Green Lane to drive on the wrong side of the road and thus come up head on to traffic turning into Green Lane. The result can cause jams trailing back into both Bois Lane and Green Lane.....a potential accident area, close to a pedestrian crossing, a bus stop and local school where traffic is often busy on this 'ratrun' towards Chesham. Suggest double yellow lines on both sides of Green Lane entry/exit area would make the junction much safer.</p>
Green Lane (X39)	No	<p>My self and my partner both have vehicles and need to drive to work as public transport is not an option. Our property has also been turned down for off street parking previously for safety reasons and therefore having on street parking Available to us close to the house is vital. We both work long hours and often the Limited street parking On briery way is taken when we get home and thus we have to use green lane temporarily over night. To restrict our area to virtually no parking would force us to have to look for new residence. We would be open to a permit holder system and I feel this has to be the only way forward to prevent great upheaval to our household and many others.</p>
Green Lane (X39)	I'm not sure	<p>Is this Green Lane Amersham? What has happened to Green Lane Chesham Bois? We desperately need double yellow lines at both ends of the road as people regularly park dangerously on blind corners. This whole consultation has been a farce and totally uncoordinated. It is unfair to charge people to park outside their own homes. Surely it would be better to give two free resident permits and then charge for guests?</p>
		<p>This is all totally unclear</p>

Green Lane (X39)	No	<p>It is VERY unclear as to what the precise proposals are. If they are to restrict waiting at any time in Green Lane, Chesham Bois then I strongly oppose that proposal. There can be NO justification for such a proposal as Green Lane, Chesham Bois is a VERY long way from Amersham Station and there is very little on-road parking.</p> <p>If the proposal is only to put double yellow lines for say the section of Green lane immediately after leaving Long Park, no further than the gate of the first property on the left, then I might possibly support those; however the recent parking problem at that point is temporary and caused by builders building new houses at the bottom end of Long park, so it is reasonable to suppose that these are short term.</p>
Green Lane (X39)	Green Lane	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 19-6-2020</p> <p>I did not receive your second letter so was unable to comment. The first plan was for restricted parking for 1 or 2 hours now you are proposing no parking at all 7 days a week. How did you come to that idea. Where are residents supposed to park and dont say its not your problem as it is because you are the ones causing the problem. Not everyone has or is able to have a driveway so this would be impossible. What happens if people have workmen - remember a lot of the properties are owned by Paradigm and hardly a week goes past when there isnt a van parked down the road. Are people not entitled to have visitors or medical people calling. This has not been thought through at all. As I said at the start I have lived here many years and am not aware of any problems. The dustcart gets down here every week no problem and we are not on a bus route. You could give us permits as long as they dont cost too much. I have just been awarded a Blue Badge so dont want to be moving my car all day. Please think very carefully before you make a decision.</p>
Green Lane (X39)	Yes	<p>Agree with working group's decision to include junction with Long Park and Green Lane and proceed to formal consultation</p>
High Street and The Broadway (V47,U46,U47)	Yes	<p>I support the revised proposals following the informal consultation - 4 disabled bays - and the conclusion of the informal consultation that there is no overall call for change.</p> <p>I did not support the initial proposals at all.</p>
High Street and The Broadway (V47,U46,U47)	No	<p>High Street (as opposed to the Broadway) has always appropriately been an uncontrolled parking zone, free of revenue hungry parking inspectors looking to fill their quotas by ticketing cars for the most marginal misplacements. It should remain so.</p> <p>I can see the need in the Broadway for disabled bays, but in Amersham High street there is already too few places already for all residents to park, reducing the number of spaces to add disabled bays which will rarely be used is inappropriate in my opinion.</p> <p>Particularly as these will bring with them the several times daily swarm of avaricious inspectors.</p>
High Street and The Broadway (V47,U46,U47)	No	<p>Where do residents of the old town park.</p> <p>The local public car park is insufficient in nos, made worse by the recent new over 55's development. Tesco's are now leasing 100 spaces to the developer to assist in the under car parking.</p> <p>With residents in the future having no other option of parking on the High Street, Broadway these nos will be impacted further.</p> <p>How are we helping the small businesses in the old town that pay there rates ?</p> <p>We need to grow the old town not kill it further.</p>

High Street and The Broadway (V47,U46,U47)	I'm not sure	<p>Good Morning - it doesn't look like all the proposals are proceeding. I would have personally preferred residents permits in the old town, these proposals do not stop all the spaces being filled by commuters or workers. The main issue I still see is the large car park near the memorial gardens is expensive. Are there not options to provide Broadway residents a regular priced resident permit, not a near 600gbp annual fee, and also a cheaper rate for workers? I previously lived in Hammersmith in central London and residents permit was 70 pounds, for me to use the car park is x8 more. I'm not clear on the logic on the 1 v 2 hour waiting times, seems random - would it not be best to make all 1 hour and encourage the use of proper car park? There are many deliver lorries coming to the town for restaurants etc, and there are no loading bays. If you encourage more people to the car park, maybe you can free up a couple of spaces as a loading bay, otherwise the lorries just stop on the main road, and it becomes unsafe. Finally, and my most important point I wanted to leave, while not strictly parking, please please please please can we make the Broadway and High Street 20 mph, I really appreciate you trying to help make the town a dynamic place for visitors with parking, but all time often cars drive way too fast through, and there are no bumps (or other alternatives) to slow cars, and with so many children and families, it seems an obvious and easy positive impact you can make on the town by making it 20. Please.</p>	I said enough already :)
High Street and The Broadway (V47,U46,U47)	I'm not sure	<p>I want to be absolutely clear that I support only the working group decision to take forward the 4 disabled parking bays as recommended by the working group (though I'm not sure 4 are needed in terms of usage here).</p> <p>There is no way that any other parking controls should be introduced, as I commented originally. The survey seems to have been devised by people who do not know the community. We want to keep local business and that means employees and employers have to be able to park all day without extra costs. Also, as a resident it would be very irksome (and costly) to have parking controls, totally unnecessary. I think it was dreamed up by 4 residents in the total population of Old Amersham, one of whom was leaving the area.</p> <p>I'm not familiar with the multi-storey car park but the suggestion made on page 24 seems reasonable.</p>	Please stop spending my council tax (at a high rate) on these kinds of surveys and changes. I want the money to go to essential services.
High Street and The Broadway (V47,U46,U47)	No	<p>I am writing to you with regards to the recent Amersham Parking Review 2020.</p> <p>I did write in on the earlier consultation agreeing that the High Street needs to have some kind of parking restrictions, i.e. residential parking.</p> <p>Only yesterday I saw a lady park outside my house, get out of her car and get into another car which then drove off.</p> <p>We continuously have people park and leave their cars in the High Street, not only employees of businesses and parents for the primary school in School Lane, but for other reasons. Their cars are left for a number of hours to a week or two! We have even had a car abandoned and did not get towed away until a year later! It is becoming a free car park for non residential vehicle users.</p> <p>I am unable to see anything except for a disabled bay in the High Street. I strongly believe that if surrounding roads and areas have parking restrictions it will just push more vehicles into the High Street. Something needs to be done about the High Street.</p> <p>I would be willing to pay for residential parking in the High Street, Amersham.</p>	
High Street and The Broadway (V47,U46,U47)	No	<p>I have major concerns about the limiting of parking in Old Amersham. Our children attend St Mary's school in School Lane, and my wife and I live in Amersham-on-the-hill, which isn't walking distance. My wife and I both go straight from school drop-off to our jobs by car. If the parking is restricted as heavily as is being proposed, then this will cause major issues for many working parents, which simply isn't needed right now.</p> <p>If School Lane is heavily restricted, then the problem will just be pushed to other areas.</p>	I live in Hillside Gardens, and unsure why our street isn't available for me to make comments upon?

High Street and The Broadway (V47,U46,U47)	No	<p>At a time when Amersham High Street, and other small towns are struggling to survive we need more parking. A plan to attract visitors, most who arrive by motor vehicle. A plan to make it easy to park and visit the amenities of the town.</p> <p>You propose more restrictions and will likely make it far less attractive to visitors the more you meddle, the more restrictions, the few parking places available, the quicker you guarantee the 'death' of Amersham Old Town.</p> <p>The parking and current road layouts work as well as it can do. It's not ideal, but it has worked on a flexible consensus of all for the past 30 years or longer.</p> <p>A regulator from Aylesbury should not be involved. Regulations want to restrict and regulate to justify their existence. We need people who want to create more visitors, make it easy to park and not create a 'parking warden' nightmare. Without visitors the High Street and Old Town has no commercial future and it's heartbeat will be lost.</p> <p>Please leave well alone. Save the vast cost you want to spend adding restrictions and think about investing in a creative rejuvenation package for the town.</p>
High Street and The Broadway (V47,U46,U47)	No	<p>Following my phone call earlier this week, herewith my suggestion to facilitate parking for residents and visitors to Old Amersham High Street.</p> <p>If residents and their visitors had permits displayed in their cars and could park wherever there were spaces, this would free up timed parking spaces for other visitors who would then display purchased timed ticket from a machine.</p> <p>This would also remove the need for painting a lot of white lines on the High Street, facilitate better and much needed free flow of parking and also avoid the danger as has happened in the past that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) not enough residents parking when needed and b) residents parking spaces not being used when residents not using them
High Street and The Broadway (V47,U46,U47)	No	<p>I am writing to you with regards to the recent Amersham Parking Review 2020.</p> <p>I did write in on the earlier consultation agreeing that the High Street needs to have some kind of parking restrictions, i.e. residential parking.</p> <p>Only yesterday I saw a lady park outside my house, get out of her car and got into another car which then drove off.</p> <p>We continuously have people park and leave their cars in the High Street, not only employees of businesses but for other reasons. Their cars are left for a number of hours to a week or two! We have even had a car abandoned and did not get towed away until a year later! It is becoming a free car park for non residential vehicle users.</p> <p>I am unable to see anything except for a disabled bay in the High Street. I strongly believe that if surrounding roads and areas have parking restrictions it will just push more vehicles into the High Street. Something needs to be done about the High Street.</p> <p>I would be willing to pay for residential parking in the High Street, Amersham.</p>
Hundred Acres Lane (X46,X47,X48,Y46)	No	<p>Restrictions from 11 - 12 as other surroundings roads i agree, however providing selective permits only will only push the problem into the surrounding roads that have different restrictions.</p> <p>Residents have family & friends over which now will be unable to park legally.</p> <p>A small minority mustn't dictate for the majority.</p>

Hundred Acres Lane (X46,X47,X48,Y46)	Yes	<p>If parking is continually more restricted, where are people supposed to leave their cars? Cars aren't going to go away. I believe most people parking on Hundred Acres Lane actually live there. PARKING HAS TO BE PROVIDED SOMEWHERE ELSE</p>
Hundred Acres Lane (X46,X47,X48,Y46)	No	<p>My comments are the main cut through between Station Road and Stanley Hill is First Avenue leading into Hundred Acres into Acres End. You are proposing no waiting at any time in First Avenue, 1 hour no parking in Acres End but in Hundred Acres no waiting at junctions, all other side roads are to have no waiting at any time. Surely this will encourage parking in Hundred Acres which is a bus route and extremely busy.</p>
Hundred Acres Lane (X46,X47,X48,Y46)	Yes	<p>I have received your letter regarding the Amersham Parking Review and would be most grateful if you would clarify whether or not I would be able to park outside my house if the changes go ahead. From the map it looks as though the 'no waiting at any time' parking restrictions will be across the road from me rather than outside my house, which would be lovely when the window cleaner/decorator etc are working here. Hundred Acres Lane is quite wide at this point and normally parking outside my house doesn't cause a problem.</p> <p>Kindly confirm whether the 'no waiting' area is suggested immediately outside my house (or just opposite where there is already a dotted white line).</p> <p>☒</p>
Mill Lane	Yes	<p>Good afternoon</p> <p>Following receipt of the letter dated 19th June, regarding the above, I'd like to comment as follows:</p> <p>Regarding the proposal for Mill Lane (U46) - I'd like to give full support for no waiting at any time please.</p>
Mitchell Walk (Y43)	Yes	<p>Hello I am making an official response on behalf of Woodside Junior School. We agree with the proposals outlined in the interests of safety of Woodside Junior School pupils and also for the nursery (Henry Allen) next door to us. As previously stated Woodside School as well as the nursery have doubled in numbers over the last 6 years adding a significant amount more traffic at school pick up and drop off times. The road is one of the closest roads due to the short cut across King George V to the station without parking restrictions and by 7.30am the road is already full of commuter cars.</p>
Mitchell Walk (Y43)	No	<p>You are penalising parents and children Who attend Woodside School. If, like myself, both parents work in our household and we have 3 children, who are all at different schools then you are going to make it impossible for us to achieve this logistical conundrum!! What about after school clubs - in the middle of winter when parents have to collect children from after school clubs? How are parents supposed to collect children then??</p> <p>There is no sense behind implementing these restrictions & I urge you to see sense and consider the wider view of the Woodside school constituency, and not just the narrow will of residents.</p>

Mitchell Walk (Y43)	No	<p>I understand that you wish to restrict the volume of traffic in Mitchell Walk, and am encouraged that the plans are to still provide some parking in the road. It's the no return within 4 hours part that I find strange. It will mean many parents who send their children to Henry Allen on regular half days will only be able to either drop-off or collect their children but not both. I would have thought that a no return within 2 hours would have been more appropriate parking restriction to facilitate school pick-up and drop-off times.</p> <p>I'm also glad to see that the idea of parking permits in Quarrendon Road has been rejected. I originally had no comments on my own road as there is not currently an issue with excessive numbers of vehicles in the street. However the potential for parking permits in Quarrendon Road would have resulted in the vast numbers of vehicles from Drakes Road (already permitted parking) that park in Quarrendon Road, no doubt relocating to the top of Sheepfold Lane where there is a short footpath down from Drakes Road. We already a good handful of vehicles from Drakes Road in Sheepfold Lane as it is.</p> <p>Finally I don't think this is necessarily the right place to raise this idea, however I hope that just one of you reading this may take this next comment away with you and potentially be able to use your influence in some way. I think we need to think about other methods of reducing the number of parked vehicles on our highways, and I just wonder whether we can increase the amount of off-street parking that we demand is provided when considering planning applications for both residential and commercial developments.</p>	
Mortens Wood (X46,X47)	No	<p>While Mortens Wood is directly affected, people with small drives on Quarrendon Road (most houses are terraced, so this is a face), may feel they have no choice but to park on Mortens Wood, making it dangerously overcrowded. I would like to know why this is being done, it will make life very hard for mobile workers, eg, cleaners, hairdressers, handymen, plumbers, electricians, or people working from home who sometimes need meetings. At a time when many of us have been furloughed, or on reduced hours and pay, and no guarantee of a job after October. it is an extra financial burden and stress on council tax payers. What is the reason for a proposal of double yellow lines? I have called an ambulance once, and seen them on Quarrendon Road too, having no problem arriving at the specified address. Some of us with space in front of our house may have to concrete it completely to park off the road, losing any greenery which absorbs CO2, and then drainage becomes a problem. It will also cost each householder a lot of money, when they may lose all earnings.</p>	<p>Originally the council said that there could be a time limit on parking, eg, not between 10 and 11, rather than no parking at any time, why the change? If it is because of people parking at the end of Acres End, why not just address that. Also, the station parking is more expensive than at the car park off Woodside Road, would it not be more sensible to lower the costs at the aforementioned facility, more people would use it, so you would gain more money back! Cheaper parking would encourage commuters who don't live in walking distance of the station to use a car park, rather than park for free where they can, all extras really add up over a year.</p> <p>Sensitivity and cooperation with residents' legitimate concerns is always appreciated. I am grateful for the waiving of parking charges during the Covid 19 crisis, but think the proposed extra restrictions are counter productive, they will cost the council money in implementing and monitoring, and if more people concrete the front of their houses, you won't get the money back, as happened with the metres, people just went elsewhere, causing hardship to retailers.</p>
Mortens Wood (X46,X47)	Yes		<p>It was a shame that the letter could not have been sent to all residents in Mortens Wood, as many were not aware of the proposals and the sign on the lamppost was not immediately obvious.</p> <p>Also the links in the letter simply did not work.</p>

New Road	Yes	<p>Good evening</p> <p>I really hope you can help, we have an on going dangerous issue with parking on New Road Amersham (HP6 6LH) I would have put this request in earlier but I have only just seen your parking review signage.</p> <p>I do not have an issue with small vehicles parking but New Road has become a commercial vehicle parking area for over night parking. While I sympathise with the drivers of the vehicles trying to find parking spaces, when they are parking so close to drive ways and junctions this causes serious safety issues. Also the pathway are quite narrow and with the large wing mirrors over hanging the paths, this is another cause for concern.</p> <p>I attached photos of parking photos showing my concerns, these photos were taken evening of the 24th June. As you can see, I now have to pull out of my drive blindly to any traffic that might be coming up or down new road. This is not a one of issue this is most evening and the only way I can stop this happening is to park my family cars out on the road.</p> <p>Please can you consider putting vehicles weight restrictions on our road which are enforceable, permit holders only, or yellow lines. (But it is really only large commercial vehicles we want restricted, due to the dangers)</p> <p>We have over the last few years tried other avenues to resolve this problem without avail.</p> <p>Please can you help us, before a serious accident happens, as there have been so many near misses already.</p>
North Road	No	<p>Thanks for your June 25th note on the latest Bucks CC Parking Proposals for North Road (link below) which Bucks Highway have stated exclude the potential future increases in Traffic movements should the new Church Planning Application be approved.</p> <p>1. In my view the latest Proposals still fail to address the risk of accidents at the junction of Glebe Way and North Road. We continue to see car parking on the north-side verge opposite Glebe Way, resulting in North Rd Traffic approaching Glebe Way in a confined blind spot that I experienced myself last week. Then thankfully drivers approached the challenge slowly but this doesn't always happen especially at rush-hour time. The Proposed Restrictions in Glebe Way will result, in my view, in further Car-Parking on North Road as traffic searches for a place to park. We need residents and our Councillors to raise their concerns on the Parking Proposals with Bucks CC (see the link below) - look at Paper X40 Glebe Way - there is no specific North Road paper. I see no alternative but Double Yellow lines being put in place on North Road opposite the Glebe Way Tee-Junction up and up beyond the bend in the road.</p> <p>2. We have yet to see any Bucks CC views on the additional North Road Parking Restrictions that would be needed in the worse case of the new Church Planning Proposal being approved. With 100/150 cars searching for parking, and only @70 on the Proposed Church site, we would all experience significant car-parking on North Road alo with increased noise and pollution, real concerns that many of us have already registered with Bucks Council.</p>
North Road (X40)	I'm not sure	<p>While any restriction to parking on North Road especially near the junction with Glebe Way is welcomed your proposals do not take the "No Waiting" restriction far enough west along the road. The restriction should at least include the bend in front of Little Mead and The Briars. There have been two recent accidents involving cars parking near this junction which push east travelling cars onto the wrong side which then meet cars exiting Glebe Way blind (because of the bend).</p>

North Road (X40)	Yes	<p>Reference proposed parking restrictions in Glebe Way and North Road Chesham Bois. Area Code X40</p> <p>I fully support making bays with proposed parking restrictions regarding 'Waiting limited to 1 hour with no return for 2 hours' in both Glebe Way and North Road.</p> <p>However, the parking bay at the southern end of Glebe Way extends too far towards the junction with Bois Lane. The Highway Code recommends a minimum requirement of 10 metres. The junctions at both ends of Glebe Way are dangerously blind and with traffic allowed to park to the full extent of the road, as was the case before the Covid pandemic reduced the numbers of commuters, we have experienced several near misses.</p> <p>The safety of these junctions is further compromised as people frequently park across both ends of Glebe Way in North Road and Bois Lane making access even more difficult. Again, no one should park within 10 metres of a junction.</p> <p>Please put double yellow lines at these junctions to a safe distance in Glebe Way and on North Road and Bois Lane. In addition shorten the restricted parking bay at the southern end of Glebe Way.</p>	
North Road (X40)	Yes	<p>Support the working group's decision to proceed to second informal consultation and seek views on limited waiting parking bays 1 hour no return within 2 hours to support local businesses. These restrictions would be applied to the area between Glebe way and Bois Lane. The junction of North Road and Glebe way must also be protected with yellow lines. Proposals to be kept modest as there is a possible new development at the nearby Parish Centre and the parking is better reviewed separately when the possible impacts are better understood. See Glebe Way comments above.</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	Yes	<p>We would be more in favour of an all day restriction (8am to 6pm) as we suffer greatly from vehicles owned by nearby workers who can move their vehicles in out of the street quickly. We already have people sitting in their cars at 11.55, waiting for Noon. We can see that these people will move in an out of the street to avoid the new times rather than find an alternative place.</p> <p>Police staff use the street regularly, which would mean that later shift workers would still be able to clutter the street after 2.30.</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	Yes	<p>I strongly support all of the proposals for Orchard Lane, particularly the double yellow lines on the junction of Orchard Lane with Hyrons Lane and King George V Rd. I am very keen to be involved in the discussion as to the extent of those double yellow lines, given the proximity of my house to that junction and the impact parked cars have on both safety and traffic flow at that junction.</p>	<p>This would affect all the community. Clients whom use the clinic suffer with physical pain therefore need access to clinic. Also the Police park on the road when working late or early shifts.</p>
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>This would hugely affect my access to the Orchard Clinic, 4 Orchard Lane. If I had to use a public car park then this would increase my monthly outgoings so much that I would have to consider changing jobs if a further parking restriction of no parking between 1.30 pm and 2.30 pm was implemented.</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>On street parking for patients at the Orchard clinic is needed and the compromise of having an appointment after 11.30 worked well. Extending this to the afternoon seems unfair to those who have mobility problems</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>It is most important that parking is available for patients attending Orchard Clinic/Walk this Way Podiatry, as often these patients are in pain, disabled or in some way physically incapacitated - the very reason for which they are attending the clinics.</p> <p>To restrict parking even further would be very detrimental to many people and cause considerable distress and inconvenience.</p>	

Orchard Lane (X44)	No	Due to Orchard Lane clinic situated in Orchard Lane having many clients suffering from disabilities it is important that parking should be made easier not harder. I am surprised your list of roads does not include Raans Road and Quill Hall Lane where too many parked vehicles create hazardous conditions.	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	As a regular visitor to the podiatrist, given my physical condition, the idea that I can't park there will make it very hard for me as I can't always walk long distances.	This parking review I cant believe has gotten this far - its a total waste of public money.
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>We accept and agree with the current restriction of no parking 11 am - 12pm. However, our services would be greatly affected should the restrictions be enforced for a no waiting at any time, no waiting between 1.30 pm – 2.30pm; as this would further reduce the capacity of number of patients we can see and consequently, closure of our clinic.</p> <p>These parking restrictions will also affect visitors to residents on Orchard Lane and parents who use the road to pick up their children from the local school; and also, Amersham health centre and Amersham police station users. Frankly, speaking the proposal will not practically work for the local community either.</p> <p>The freedom to park on the road after midday enables ease of access for many vulnerable patients we see. We have capacity for 12 persons in the clinic at one time, therefore it is clear that we rely heavily on the flexibility of Orchard Lane parking for the success of The Orchard Clinic.</p> <p>Clearly, I object to this proposal and insist on no changes to be made to the parking on Orchard Lane.</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	This is a medical service which may be lost if parking is not provided for patients who in the main have trouble walking.	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	Give them a break it's bad enough that HS2 is being allowed to go ahead, please leave Orchard Road restrictions as they are and don't increase them. Thanks. .	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I will be unable to park for my visit / treatment at the Orchard Clinic. I cant walk far and need my feet doing every four weeks.	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>I regularly use the osteopath, psycholotherapy and podiatry services at The Orchard Clinic. Not being able to park would affect my care and convenience of using the services at the clinic.</p> <p>Parking here is essential and necessary as there is no where else to park.</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I use the Walk this Way podiatrist on Orchard Lane and restricting the length of parking time would make it very difficult to attend.	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>There are restrictions in place already that protects the road from commuters parking. The extended restriction impacts on the residents, their family and carers and local businesses.</p> <p>I use the podiatrist. I have a learning disability and my carer drives me to the clinic. Following COVID and the after effects supporting local businesses is important and adding further blocks to using them can only lead to job losses and less local facilities</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I attend a podiatry clinic in Orchard Lane and usually park well away from the clinic in a car park as I am able bodied, however there are many elderly and less agile patients who need to park close to the clinic as they are unable to walk very far. I would appreciate you reconsidering the new parking restrictions to take into account these less able people.	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	Access to the Orchard Lane Clinic is so important for many local residents. Some are elderly and would struggle to attend appointments. The commercial effect on the clinic would be considerable, as well. Please reconsider.	

Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>To whom this may concern,</p> <p>I have witnessed first hand the struggles that the current 11:00 am - 12:00 pm restrictions have presented.</p> <p>Here in the clinic we have those who are vulnerable, elderly, terminally ill and those who are both physically and mentally impaired.</p> <p>Our parking on the road is pinnacle to ensure that our patient's have easy access to see us here in the clinic as healthcare professionals. We as a team here in the clinic provide treatment each and every day to help those with their lower limbs mobility. I for one, cannot comprehend how our generation that we see here in the clinic will subsequently be able to continue to receive their imperative care with us if there are further proposals put into place. This then puts them at greater risk of infections and foot neglect. Our GP services are not currently advocating podiatry services and the NHS is limited with vast waiting lists.</p> <p>I myself would also need to look for an alternative job as I could not financially afford to park and pay each day; especially as a full time employee at the business. As such, I would be even more financially unstable on top of the effect that Covid-19 has had and not be able to support myself.</p> <p>Furthermore, I am deeply concerned as to the effect of the small business in which we are and how we would be able to continue as a business and as effect no longer provide services to our valued patient's.</p> <p>For the sake of not losing more jobs, a small business in the local area and to ensure we can continue to provide the care people need and reduce the strain that the NHS are currently facing, I object to this taking place.</p> <p>Regards</p>
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>My wife and I both pensioners are regular clients of the Orchard Clinic and my wife is unable to walk any real distance. The availability of parking on Orchard Road is important to us. Although we appreciate a need to have a no parking break in the day to avoid commuters etc parking all day we see no reason why you now need a second one not long afterwards. This will make it more difficult in arranging appointment times in the early afternoon when we can travel when traffic is lighter. It could also impact on the business at the Clinic.</p>
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>In order to use the Orchard Clinic to treat my feet, i need to be able to park nearby, and i'm not disabled. But sometimes the treatment means it's uncomfortable to walk any distance. I would not book an appointment during this time and that will cause the Clinic problems.</p>
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>Like my mother, when attending the Orchard Clinic, due to the fact they treat feet, I would not want to go if I had to walk any distance, and so parking outside is essential.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>I need to park in order to attend essential podiatrist appointments. NHS do not offer me any podiatry because I do not have diabetes. I need to go to the clinic in Orchard Lane.</p>
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>Both my husband and I are registered Disabled we Visit the Walk This Way clinic to get the podiatry needs for our feet and we need to be able to park close enough to get into the clinic</p> <p>Regards</p>
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>There is a clinic for elderly people situated in Orchard Lane and they need parking for their various clients, many of whom cannot walk far and all parking is desperately needed.</p>
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>my husband and I both use the podiatrist regularly and we are both pensioners. We need to be able to use this facility easily and there are already restrictions on this road and this would reduce the availability of parking. We chose a business where there were parking facilities on the road and this business will be severely damaged by further restrictions.</p>

Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I assume the current parking restrictions are enforced to 'discourage' commuter parking. However, to attend the Orchard foot clinic requires somewhere to park. They have some limited parking on site but it is insufficient to guarantee a space. The current restriction means that I have to avoid making an appointment between 10:30 and 12:30. If the proposed 13:30 to 14:30 restriction is introduced, I'll need to avoid 10:30 to 15:00. Effectively meaning I can only try to make appointments after 3pm. This problem will potentially affect other users of the clinic, and may detrimentally affect their business. I don't understand what this additional restriction is designed to do.	We need to support local businesses by making parking easier for people who have mobility issues and are using a specific service.
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	A concession needs to be made for patients of Walk this way Podiatry and the associated practices in Orchard Lane as, by definition, the majority of visitors will be suffering from conditions which affect their mobility	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	It is unnecessary and will make access to very popular podiatrist difficult for many older or disabled patients. What is the point - only a few patients need a parking space and not for very long. Surely this can't cause a nuisance to other residents	Parking in Amersham is already difficult if you impose more restrictions people like myself who do not live in Amersham would consider taking our custom elsewhere.
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I am a client at Orchard Clinic and whilst I am able bodied at the moment not all their clients are so parking is vital to their business.	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	If parking restrictions change there, it will mean the podiatry clinic is less assessable to some of the most vulnerable people they treat.	There is no reason to change the existing Parking restrictions
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I visit my podiatrist in Orchard Lane regularly and if parking is further restricted it will have an impact on my visits and in turn, my health.	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I have a foot condition which makes it very painful to walk long distances without orthotic support. I am a regular visitor to the Orchard Clinic and need somewhere close by to park for an hour	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I visit the podiatry clinic on Orchard Lane and I would find it very difficult to walk far if I had to park further away to get to my appointment. The Walk this Way clinic offer a very valuable service to many clients from the area and many outside the area. I am afraid these restrictions would impact negatively on their business and also on the health and well-being of many of their clients.	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I need to visit Walk This Way in the early afternoon.	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	Walk This Way Podiatry is a fantastic clinic serving residents of Amersham and beyond. By the nature of their services, the patients they see have physical conditions that may make walking distances difficult. The fact that we can park on the road after midday is a great help. There is not a public car park or metered roadside parking within the close vicinity. Yes there is for those of us who can walk some distance but surely this small business deserves to have flexible parking to enable all of the community to be served by it? The restriction in the morning prevents commuters parking on the road all day and an afternoon restriction is overkill surely?	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	The current restriction between 11am-12pm is difficult already. Most of our patients are elderly and vulnerable who cannot walk for more than 20 yards. If they are not seen by it us it will become a burden on the NHS as they will start to neglect their own care. Please please keep us small businesses in mind. Thank you	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I attend the Orchard Clinic in 4 orchard. Lane . With a further restriction apart from 11-12.As is at present , would make attending the clinic difficult as public parking is quite a walk away.	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	Clients of the podiatry service need to be able to park at all times, as many have mobility issues	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	I visit the chiropodist in Orchard Lane and with social distancing we have to wait in the car until our appointment . I need to park nearby to get there in time Like most of their patients I visit when I have a problem walking .I have osteoporosis and a knee problem. I am asking you to consider the patients of this local clinic.	

Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>I drive my mother to the podiatry clinic at The Orchard Clinic on a regular basis. She is extremely vulnerable, has dementia and is unable to walk very far. She is in need of regular treatment and may be unable to get this if further parking restrictions are introduced.</p> <p>Many of the clients we see at the clinic are elderly, vulnerable and need ease of access. The Orchard Clinic offers a lifeline to those such as my mother, who need to keep mobile and do so thanks to the services it provides.</p> <p>Because of the nature of the services The Orchard clinic provides and it's clientele, it relies on parking in Orchard Lane in order to operate. To introduce further parking restrictions would be detrimental to the health and welfare of many and to a company which provides a vital service to the community.</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>As a customer to Walk This Way Podiatry, it will be difficult with the new parking restrictions to attend appointments as parking is limited near there.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	No change please for Orchard Lanr
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>The Orchard Clinic provides an invaluable service to the Community as a whole and therefore requires parking facilities near bt during working hours. The original restriction was to prevent station users parking all day free, most appointment are less than 1 hour. Please do not penalise clinic users .</p>	<p>When the clinic is back to full capacity, there is not enough parking for staff and patients. Most people will use the run-off at the end of Orchard Lane which already has time restrictions in place. Please consider this - could there be another solution?</p>
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>I think that the extra parking restrictions will seriously impact both the Walk This Way business (who will have been affected by the Coronavirus outbreak and will only just be starting to provide treatment) and the patients who use the service. There is very little parking nearby and most people who use the clinic will have long term foot and leg problems, therefore they can't walk very far. Please consider this when you make your decision.</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	Yes	<p>consultation works!heartily agree with proposed changes... thank you</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>The Orchard Clinic is a valuable asset to our community and provides essential health services such as Podiatry and Osteopathy which are becoming even more difficult to get access to on the NHS. It is already hard to park sometimes with the current restrictions. If more are imposed, it will make it very difficult to attend appointments particularly for people who have disabilities or unable to walk far. Please do reconsider this before imposing further parking restrictions.</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>Although I understand the need for a one hour parking restriction at some point during the day, to discourage commuter and other non-resident parking, to have more than one hour puts too much pressure on the Orchard Clinic, many of whose clients (elderly and/or disabled) need to be able to park close to the premises.</p>	
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>I am a patient at the Orchard Clinic, specifically their chiropody practice. I am with limited mobility and therefore need to park in the vicinity of this excellent small business which provides a great professional service to the neighbourhood, and is a great local asset. If parking were to be prevented I would be unable to use this facility.</p>	

Orchard Lane (X44)	Yes	<p>I have received this afternoon by hand correspondence dated 19th June from Directorate for Communities on the above subject.</p> <p>As you will be aware myself and another were responsible for obtaining and collation the collective views of the 56 residents of Orchard Lane and these were handed to you and your colleague when we met at the Chiltern District Council offices at the time you had your informal presentation there.</p> <p>The residents of Orchard Lane have an existing 'No Waiting' of 1 hour between 11.00am and 12.00 Monday to Friday which we wish to retain.</p> <p>We are seeking an additional 1 hour of 'No Waiting' between 1.30pm - 2.30pm, together with a double yellow 'No Waiting' at the 90 degree bend half way along orchard Lane and at its junction with King George V Road and Hyrons Bridge in the interests of road safety.</p> <p>This request was accepted at the informal consultation to be taken forward to the final stage consultation, We wish to confirm that the results of the initial survey undertaken with the residents of Orchard Lane remain unchanged, and refer to the previous paragraph.</p> <p>The correspondence of the 19th June referring to the 'Statutory Consultation' covering Orchard Lane only refers to 'No Waiting' at any time (this is assumed to be for the double yellow lines at the bend and the junction, and 'No Waiting' (Monday - Friday 1.30pm - 2.30pm) and does not make any reference to the existing 'No Waiting' restrictions.</p>
Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>We received letter dated 19th June Ref: 'Amersham parking - Statutory' to which we are responding with great concern and objection.</p> <p>The property, 4 Orchard Lane is a private healthcare clinic that has been established since 1954. The clinic provides osteopathy and podiatry with additional treatments/ services such as acupuncture, reflexology, psychotherapy, homeopathy and nutrition.</p> <p>We are a family run practice, offering solutions for chronic and acute pain and medical conditions for over 65 years. During this time, we have served the local community, 1000's of local patients, of all ages from babies to the elderly.</p> <p>We are at the heart of the community, keeping Amersham and surrounding areas on their feet. Many of our clients suffer from long term medical conditions, disabled both mentally and physically, terminally ill, and generally unwell.</p> <p>Our services are an asset to the local community, and our clients need, want and demand these. Part of our service/ facilities include parking on Orchard Lane/ our driveway with disabled/ easy access. We also positively participate to the local economy and revenue generation for HMRC.</p> <p>We accept and agree with the current restriction of no parking 11 am -12 pm. However, our services would be greatly affected should the restrictions be enforced for a no waiting at any time, no waiting between 1.30 pm - 2.30 pm; as this would further reduce the capacity of number of patients we can see and consequently, closure of our clinic.</p> <p>These parking restrictions will also affect visitors to residents on Orchard Lane and parents who use the road to pick up their children from the local school; and also, Amersham health centre and Amersham police station users. Frankly, speaking the proposal will not practically work for the local community either.</p>

Orchard Lane (X44)	No	<p>Orchard Clinic of 4 Orchard Lane has served the community since 1954 as a private healthcare Clinic specialising in Osteopathy and Podiatry.</p> <p>This Clinic has a large number of patients which have mobility problems due to pain as well as age related issues.</p> <p>The current parking restriction (11am to 12pm) although inconvenient is acceptable (patients either being dropped off or arriving by Taxi) but a further restriction would inhibit access to the clinic and compromise the safety of out Patients.</p> <p>With the current COVID-19 situation Patient safety is our priority and therefore all Practitioners will request that Patients wait in the Car to avoid crossover contact and allow us to sanitise the treatment room before the Patient is collected from their Vehicle. Currently the waiting area is closed for that reason. .</p> <p>Our Patients feel reassured and safe waiting outside the Clinic to be collected for their appointment. It is essential to be located outside the Clinic.</p> <p>It is clear that this situation with COVID-19 will not change in the healthcare sector for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>The wellbeing of the community we serve is enabled by convenient access to the Clinic.</p> <p>Therefore we ask you to reconsider this proposal.</p>
Penn Street (L60,L61,L62)	No	<p>By implementing restrictions at the junction (widest portion of School Lane) you will cause problems further down School lane which gets narrower as you go down the hill. Would support this if it was paired with making a School Lane a one way (inconvenience to me as a resident however much safer for all).</p> <p>With cars parked down the lane and traffic both ways I certainly cannot see oncoming traffic as I vacate my property during school events and drop off times.</p> <p>The pavement only extends as far as the houses down the lane so in winter parents and children due to boggy conditions walk up the road, if the cars are pushed further down I I assume that will be a safety concern in winter months.</p> <p>Road rage is common between parents and the many commuters using School Lane as a cut through to Penn / Tyler Green during peak times with cars trying to go both ways down a already narrow lane with cars parked up.</p>
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	No	I think the proposal is an absolute disgrace should've thinking of the resident not the own pockets
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	Yes	<p>I support the proposals 100% as this will make the road a safer enviroment for all the school children particularly to negotiate the walk to scool using the many footpaths there are on this estate. i.e. making it safer to cross roads.</p> <p>I also would like to see restrictions on vehicles parking either partially or wholly on pavements within our estate. I regularly puch a buggy with a grandchild and have in the past had to push an adult in a wheel chair around the estate. Invariably I am having to venture into the road as I can't get past a vehicle parked on the pavement. I know some roads are narrow but perhaps making the parking on one side of the road only would negate the need to park on pavements.</p>
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	Yes	<p>I am in full suport of these proposals because of cars parked constantly on the pavements around our house . I push my grandchildren in pushchairs and my parent in a wheelchair both of which i have to push straight out into the road. The children and pedestrians that use the footpath between no.67 and 69 will fair a lot safer when entering into quarrendon road as they will not have to step straight into the road to pass the parked cars. Outside our house, cars are parked on the pavement constantly to collect children and students from stanley hill.For us this means we have absolutly no way of seeing traffic coming down or up the road because we are on the bend of the road. Quarrendon road houses have large enough front gardens to park several vehicles should they wish to,which would make the road so much safer for pedestrians and others. During the 34 years that we have lived in our house we have witnessed so many, too many, very near fatalities to the cars parked on the pavements.</p>
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	No	<p>I am confused as to why there is no waiting at any time in these side roads such as Quarrenden Road when the main road of Acres End is only restrictions at certain times. My worry is the knock on effect that these restrictions are going to have on other already busy roads in the area.</p>

Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	No	<p>Good afternoon. My mum has told me about the proposed parking restrictions and I would like to register my opposition to these plans. I realise that these roads may be used by non residents, I suspect in the main these may be commuters? However I struggle to understand why this is a huge problem. Compare this to the potentially huge issues faced by people unable to park outside their own houses, or have visitors etc and I think it's clear that these measures are unnecessary. What are you expecting those who may be elderly, disabled or suffer from a lack of mobility to do? Or households where it is necessary to have two or more vehicles with a single vehicle driveway? I would urge you to reconsider and weigh up the day to day impact this will have on a huge number of residents.</p>	
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	No	<p>Restrictions from 11 - 12 as other surroundings roads i agree, however providing selective permits only will only push the problem into the surrounding roads that have different restrictions. Residents have family & friends over which now will be unable to park legally. A small minority mustn't dictate for the majority.</p>	
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	Yes	<p>I very much support the proposal for no waiting at any time.</p> <p>However, the council has opted for measures which are the least likely to be accepted. We only needed double yellow lines at corners and junctions.</p> <p>Oh, wait.. when the proposal is rejected by residents and, of course people who don't even live here, the council won't need to do anything at all. Well done. ☹</p>	Recruit more traffic wardens.
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	No	<p>I am in favour of No waiting at any time on junctions but we need to restrict parking in other areas of the road as passage along the road is often difficult at times due to parking by residents in the road and from Drakes road.</p> <p>All houses in the road down to Sheepfold Lane have sufficient parking for at least 2 vehicles.</p> <p>I would be in favour of either single yellow lines effective for part of the day or parking permits.</p>	
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	No	<p>with regard to the proposed restriction toward the end of Quarrendon road I feel the implementation of these restrictions will cause more problems than the current arrangement, i am aware that parking on a curve in the road is frowned upon but this does not cause a problem as the end of the road is quiet and all residents are used to it, the only other option would be to park on both sides of the road causing more problems or using the residents parking behind the flats which will no doubt create friction.</p>	
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	No	<p>I would submit that the proposed no-waiting at the western (dead) end of Quarrendon Road, beyond that proposed for the junction with the southern end of Sheepfold Lane, is unnecessary and very unfair. None of the properties in this part on Quarrendon Road have their own off-road parking, and there are not enough parking bays even for one per property, and many houses have 2 or more vehicles. Not even allowing for any visitors.</p> <p>All residents try to squeeze in where possible, but this area marked in red on the map is definitely required. Evenings and weekends particularly are when the extra room is always used. Unwanted commuter parking is not a problem here as most vehicles are usually still in situ, and this proposal would make residents lives a misery. Certainly not "preserving or improving the amenities of the area".</p> <p>Could I propose that this restriction is dropped - as it has been for West Acres only 50 yards away, where I am sure the same situation occurs.</p> <p>If traffic or pedestrians are a concern, may I suggest that speed humps would be far more effective.</p>	

Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	No	<p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>I have lived in Quarrendon Road for nearly forty years. Whilst the number of vehicles has increased over that time, I have not been aware of vehicle overcrowding in the road overall. I do agree that there should be restrictions on vehicles parking on or near the junctions, particularly at the top of Quarrendon Road at the junction with Hundred Acres Lane and Acres End where carparking can appear unmanageable and potentially dangerous. However, I do not see the necessity to impose restrictions along the entire stretch of Quarrendon Road. It would be inconvenient and impractical, to say the least, for residents who own more than one car to be restricted to a single vehicle driveway. In the same way, visitor parking would be completely compromised. And, surely, if there were the need to locate alternative parking, would it not simply move the issue elsewhere?</p> <p>I am also concerned that if there were nothing parked on the road at all, that it might become a would-be racetrack.</p> <p>In summary, I think the "No waiting at any time" proposal for Quarrendon Road is drastic and unnecessary.</p> <p>With thanks Yours faithfully</p>	
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	Yes	<p>I support the proposals 100%. But on studying the detail it appears that the double yellow lines are only going to be put on one side of the road at the junctions of Drakes road, Leywood Close and Mortens Wood. This will encourage people to park directly opposite the junctions, just as they do now, Particularly at the Drakes road junction due to that road being permit parking only. Surely this practice needs to be discouraged. In fact if you read the highway code Rule 243 it states DO NOT stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space. So if people park there will this rule be enforced? Because it seems to be tolerated or ignored constantly at the moment.</p>	I do hope that all comments are debated and considered, then the safety and wellbeing of all the residents and general public are treated as paramount before making your final decisions.
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	I'm not sure	I will comment below as my concern is Hillside Gardens which is not mentioned as an option.	Please consider our earlier comments.
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	Yes	<p>Resident only permits will be a great improvement as will stop the parking from people in Drakes road and the commuters, should be 24 hours and enforced.</p> <p>Double yellow lines on the junctions with black acre close, hundred acres, drakes road and hillside gardens an absolute necessity.</p>	The proposals need to be carried out soon
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	Yes	<p>Residents permits should be 24 hours and enforced.</p> <p>The junction protection is essential, with Drakes Road, Black Acre, Hundred Acres and Hillside Gardens.</p> <p>It is only a question of time until someone is seriously injured as a direct result of inconsiderate and illegal parking</p>	Please Expedite this, it's a great plan.
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	Yes	<p>Stopping parking on the junctions is a must. Particularly with Hundred Acres, Drakes Road, Black Acre and Hillside Gardens.</p> <p>Resident permits should be policed and be 24 hours, as presently residents from Drakes simply park all over Quarrendon road.</p>	
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	Yes	<p>As a resident opposite Black Acre Close, people constantly park in front of my drive and along the road. When coming off of my drive it makes it very difficult to see and makes the manoeuvre difficult, especially with the junction of Black Acre Close directly opposite. This is very dangerous.</p>	The parking restrictions proposed would greatly help with this problem and would make Quarrendon road a much safer place. I am sure it is not just my house greatly affected by the cars parked, others will struggle with the visibility of our road as well.
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	Yes	<p>The proposal will make Quarrendon road a much safer place. It will ensure clear visibility of the road when coming on and off the drive, which is safer for the community.</p>	Currently, it can be a real challenge getting off the drive with the cars heavily reducing the visibility of the road. You simply cannot see past the cars parked, which makes it very hazardous to exit on and off the drive.

Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	No	<p>The cars parked in the area to be restricted are residents or their visitors (mostly residents). Removing their parking will put pressure on other parking areas and is likely to cause friction.</p> <p>If the local authority wish to remove vehicles regularly parking in this area then they should first provide new alternative parking areas for residents of the adjacent flats equal to the parking being removed.</p> <p>Have the authority carried out a proper parking study to ascertain the number of cars parked overnight to predict what the true impact will be?</p> <p>Whilst the parking on the curved section of road restricts visibility it has the effect of informal traffic calming keeping speeds low.</p> <p>I note that earlier consultation resulted in 70% of responses objecting to restrictions and only 27% supporting and yet still the authority is looking to proceed which begs the question why consult, if the majority response is to be ignored?</p>	
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	Yes	<p>I do support the proposed restrictions for Quarrendon Road, however I must protest at the way the second review was communicated. The letter dated 19th June 2020, which was hand delivered to residents of Quarrendon Road, stated that there would be 'No waiting at any time' (as did numerous other roads, although the only one I have specifically checked was Sheepfold Lane). Mortens Wood stated 'No waiting at any time on junction'.</p> <p>To the best of my knowledge residents of the side roads off Quarrendon Road did not receive a copy of this letter. It caused considerable consternation amongst many of these residents when they were shown the letter because the knock on effect of 'No waiting at any time' on Quarrendon Road and Sheepfold Lane would have been considerable. There were visions of emergency vehicles and refuse lorries being unable to drive down these side roads as well as occupants not being able to reach their own driveways.</p> <p>When we eventually located the maps showing the proposals in the second parking review (the link at that time in the first paragraph of the letter showed maps from the first parking review) it was clear that the actual proposals were for No waiting at any time on junctions and the bottom bend in Quarrendon Road (curiously, not the sharper bend at the top of Quarrendon Road. One wonders if it might not be sensible to extend the double yellow lines at the junction of Hundred Acres Lane/Acres End further down beyond this bend.) Notwithstanding the anomaly just mentioned, this is acceptable and indeed reinforcing the requirements of the Highway Code.</p>	<p>However I must protest at the poor communication at least to our immediate neighbourhood,(I cannot comment on other areas,) and the appalling lack of proof-reading and checking links in the letter dated 19th June 2020. I feel sure that many people would not have persisted in getting the correct information and therefore would either reject the proposals on the basis of the letter or given up and not made any comment at all. Therefore the proposals will or will not be carried out as a result of this. Whilst I appreciate it is difficult in present circumstances, I do think that efforts should be made to have the correct proposals available on public display and this is communicated to EVERY household in Amersham before these proposals are implemented. That way, everyone has been given the chance to have their say.</p> <p>But regardless of my comments above, I am glad that efforts have been made to address the problem. Thank you.</p>
Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47,Y46)	No	<p>We feel strongly that implementing resident parking permits is going to add additional expense to our family and surely it's going to affect other families who live along the road too. Not all houses along this road have drives that can fit 2 cars (which most household do). What more when we have visitors or tradespersons who require parking? We need a solution that does not incur financial cost to households (if they need for 2nd or 3rd car, visitors, and tradespersons), at the same time deter commuter parking that will likely trickle down once restrictions are in place on Acres End.</p>	<p>There's a total of 12 feedback in the 2nd consultation. There's definitely more than 12 homes along Quarrendon Road. It just seems wrong to have consultations with so few feedback and going ahead to implementing the solutions which brings more financial costs to households. Are online surveys/ feedback for consultation the best way in this case?</p>

Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47, Y46)

No

I have been advised of the new Amersham Parking Review by fellow residents on a Facebook community group 'your Amersham' as it seems that only a handful of residents have received these letters.

This also means that anyone who isn't aware of the new rules you are proposing to put into place cannot voice their opinion on what's happening and this will be a very inaccurate and biased review. Not everyone is aware of the new parking restrictions and would not be able to write to you to tell you how this will affect all of us.

Pretty unfair and unprofessional, don't you think?

This states that there will be NO parking at ANYTIME down many roads throughout Amersham/Chesham Bois & Penn Quarrendon road being one of these.

My mother has lived there and never had to pay to park outside her own house! No one will be able to visit her now unless they pay for a permit? This is wrong.

For instance, if we had a second Wave of this horrible virus many of the residences around Amersham/Chesham & Penn would not be able to pop to their loved ones God forbid they fall ill and need shopping/help WITHOUT having to pay and sort out a permit before doing so.

This is so wrong and I can't believe many residents of Amersham have agreed that this is the right thing to do and that this should ever go ahead.

I am gobsmacked that no one is taking any consideration into those who do not have drive ways to park their cars.

In fact, it's the people who haven't got the funds to have a house with a drive that are going to now be charged park outside their own property.

Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47, Y46)

No

I am emailing to express my thoughts about the above proposals. I also would like to register my surprise that nobody on Mortens Wood received a letter this week, we were told about it by residents of Quarrendon Road.

I live on Mortens Wood, which is off Quarrendon Road. While there is no proposed change to parking rights on our road, the proposals for "no parking at any time" on Sheepfold Lane and Quarrendon Road have given all residents on my road concern. As I am sure you know, Mortens Wood is a small cul-de-sac, and if people living on Quarrendon Road cannot park near their homes, they will be forced to look elsewhere, and our road will become overcrowded, we may not even be able to negotiate our own cars to and from our homes, never mind delivery vans, ambulances, or people coming to the houses in a professional mobile capacity, such as carers, 2 vulnerable families live on the road.

I have done some research, and on talking with fellow Mortens Wood residents, we would be happy to have permits for our road, similar to the arrangements on Pineapple Road, costing between £55 - £70 per year, with a small extra charge for visitors' permits.

If a no parking rule goes ahead, we, and other residents on many roads, will have no option but to tarmac our front gardens, losing green space which absorbs CO2, the hedge is used by birds so this will harm wildlife, and then drainage will become a problem after downpours. All these problems before the extra expense of the tarmacing work is taken into account, at a time of income loss for many of us. I say we on Mortens Wood will feel forced because if more people from Quarrendon Road park on the road I live, where will my car go?

At a time when many Amersham residents have been furloughed, lost income through having their hours cut back, or lost their jobs, these restrictions are an extra financial stress that is surely very unfair, we are all council tax payers after all. Can I also say that your proposals are totally at odds with your appreciated waiving of parking costs in car parks and metres.

Quarrendon Road (X47, Y47, Y46)	No	<p>The restriction of 'no waiting at any time' is proposed to start from the outside of my house. I am not part of a junction and have not experienced any issues with parking and therefore fully object to any restrictions (i.e a single yellow line, resident permits) being put outside my property.</p> <p>We are not at a junction (houses affected by the junction start from 67/69 Quarrendon road) Parking has always been plentiful outside my house and therefore I do not think any parking restrictions are needed and therefore see this as being very poor value for money for the taxpayer. All residents affected have driveways – with plenty of space on the road for any overflow. We are a residential road with very little traffic.</p> <p>The results of the informal consultation that ran from December 2019 to January 2020 show that 31/45 residents objected to the proposals – the majority. In fact, most objected to any form of restriction - single yellow line or resident permits. The working group decision was to proceed to the second informal asking for views on resident's permit parking. I also see this as not being needed and therefore is a waste of money not just for us but also the taxpayer.</p> <p>I object to a resident's permit parking or yellow line being put outside my house (where it starts)– as I am not at the junction (and not affected by it) and have not experienced any other parking issues.</p>
Scholars Way, Centenary Way and Quill Hall Lane	Yes	<p>This is a rather late comment on the second consultation of the Parking Review as I did not know it was happening.</p> <p>I see that Scholars Way is not mentioned and that Quill Hall Lane (QHL) and Centenary Way are not to be included in the next stage of the Review. I wanted to draw your attention to the Parking on QHL, entirely by the staff employed by IQ Glass in Sky House. The absence of any cars now and in 'normal' time at weekends shows how the road has been turned into a one-way street, which is very dangerous, as there is bend just before Platt House and then delivery vehicles/customers to Jewsons. I frequently have to back up to Platt's House to go down the road. The difference between visitors and commuters is that the latter stay all day, leaving no space for local residents.</p> <p>The MD of IQ Glass claims to provide parking on site for his staff (I went round one to ask, if he could discourage the on-road parking). Unfortunately, there are very few places for visitor parking in Centenary Way (very badly affected by 'stranger' parking) and Scholars Way and now people are resorting to parking on the pavements and grass verges.</p> <p>Please reconsider including these roads.</p>
School Lane	No	<p>Dear review panel</p> <p>I am writing regarding the proposed changes to parking on school lane. I do park and walk in the car park in old Amersham but it is quite often nearly full/ full on pick ups currently. I am extremely concerned that there will be no where for me to park to collect my child if these measures go ahead due to the extra parents and workers who park in other areas of old Amersham who usually park along school lane/old town needing spaces in the car park- I work and usually have to come from the office (pre- Covid) so timing is key. I also have a child who attends a different school so being able to perform the school pick up quickly so I can also pick them up is important.</p> <p>I am sure I am not alone in having circumstances where- by the use of the car is essential to the school journey and adequate provision for parents in my situation needs to be laid out. I do not believe the current car parking solutions in old Amersham will be able to provide adequate parking if the proposals go ahead.</p> <p>I also believe that introducing such measures will encourage dangerous parking behavior outside of the school where parents idle and drop children directly at the gate- this is dangerous and will also have a potential environmental impact. ☹️</p>

School Lane	No	I can't believe that this is still being spoke about as a parent that has to drive to school I can't believe that you are thinking about making school lane residents only parking. The town is not big enough for everyone to park and there are not enough spaces in the car park even though we get free parking permits. Please please please re consider this
School Lane	No	<p>We currently use St Marys school and have done for a number of years. We have children at the school and currently looking to change schools due to the parking issues currently.</p> <p>From my experience the traffic in the area at school drop off and collection times really are terrible.</p> <p>To further restrict the parking in that area will just cause parents collecting to park where they should not.</p> <p>It is already horrendous to park close to the school and restricting the roads further will just cause so many more problems. For only 7 residents complaining about the 30 minutes in the morning and 30 minutes in the afternoon, I'm not sure this will support a better environment for young children to be collected from school safely.</p> <p>Why don't you enhance the area by opening the unused parking facilities such as barn meadow which is always empty this would relieve over 20 spaces for parents and reduce road side parking.</p> <p>Parents would be happy to pay £1 a day for parking in these facilities which would support the council and FC with funding and for parents keeping the children safe.</p> <p>I have personally witnessed some awful arguments outside the school, so much so that I have moved two of my children for September and am looking to move our daughter as soon as is possible.</p> <p>Good luck with your decision, I'm sure it's hard to keep everyone happy!</p>
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	I don't think the fact can be ignored that there is a primary school with 300 pupils in School Lane. Where can parents park to drop their young children off if School Lane and surrounding roads are to be made residents parking only.
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	Making it one way and allowing for school pick up and drop off would be helpful
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	<p>You are penalising parents and children Who attend StMarys School. If, like myself, both parents work in our household and we have children, who are all at different schools then you are going to make it impossible for us to achieve this logistical conundrum!! What about after school clubs - in the middle of winter when parents have to collect children from after school clubs? How are parents supposed to collect children then??</p> <p>There is no sense behind implementing these restrictions & I urge you to see sense and consider the wider view of the StMarys constituency, and not just the narrow will of residents.</p>
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	Restricting parking on this road will be very difficult for staff who work at St Marys School. I understand parents have a permit to park for drop offs and pick ups in dovecote car park but teachers and teaching assistants do not have this option. We often live further away and have to drive to work and sometimes have to head off somewhere after work too so time is precious for those working here.
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	<p>It will make it very difficult for me to drop my children at breakfast club and get to work on time if the proposed restrictions are brought in</p> <p>I struggled to get to work on time when I could park on school Lane and as a teacher myself I have to be in work on time or my pupils can't start school on time. Please reconsider the residents only parking</p>

School Lane (V46, U46)	No	I disagree completely with the large no parking zone. I have been through that road too many times to count. The road is only busy with parking during school drop off and pick up, which means it's vital for parents. At other times it's very quiet, so the residents clearly are fine as it is. Please consider the school parents or people like me who have a disability and can't walk far when dropping of the children!	
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	There is not a problem with availability of parking for residents. This is a policy looking to solve an issue that doesn't exist. However, what it will do is create a problem, where there currently isn't one. Namely that of access to the school. Whilst it may be laudable to try to encourage active travel to school, it simply will not be delivered by taking away parking spaces. Parents drive their children to school for time-based reasons, not laziness. Multiple school drops, the need to get to work after school drop off or pick up, taking children to afterschool enrichment activities - these all need to be carried out swiftly and maximising time. This demand will not resolve itself and the parking problem will be pushed elsewhere.	To reduce congestion on School Lane and Mill Lane, I suggest that alternative school parking could be provided by private landowners near the school. A good example would be Amersham Football Club, who are rebuilding their clubhouse etc with grants from HS2 Ltd. The car park for this facility is empty for most of the day during the week. They could be encouraged to offer parking to parents for a termly fee, which would generate income for them and ease the flow of traffic past the school. The school also currently offers parking permits for Dovecote car park, but this is already operating at full capacity and will not be able to accommodate further vehicles. Please don't assume we are driving our children to school because we are lazy and we need to be prised from our cars. We do it because there is no other option.
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	As a staff member at St Mary's school, I would find it hard to continue my employment there if there was no parking provision for staff members. On a daily basis I am taking and bringing school books for marking plus other resources. It would not be practical for me to park at Dovecote and walk there and back each day. There is not enough parking on the school site to accommodate all staff members. Where do you propose we park? I try to get in work early to deal with a large work load and this would add additional pressure to my already busy day. Many staff members don't live close by and some drive a distance, meaning that an additional walk in the morning and evening would not be possible. Please consider school employees.	
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	The restrictions proposed will make school drop off and pick up for many parents very difficult. Many working parents rely on parking close to the school in order to make a swift onward journey allowing them to reach places of work on time. There is insufficient parking to cater for all parents in the near vicinity of the school. There will also be a significant impact on staff within the school in terms of being able to park close to where they work.	
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	As the street's resident i oppose the parking restrictions on both community and financial grounds. School lane is extensively used by the local community not just to access the school but also the leisure facilities, such as Bran Meadow and the playground. Taking into account that the community has been deprived of the ability to socialise for a long time, it would be entirely inappropriate to severely limit access to communal spaces in the future. In addition, at this time of financial hardship, as a resident i do not have financial means to afford the parking permit. It would also be more financially prudent of the council to direct their financial resources towards education and social care that will need to be re-inforced after COVID crisis.	
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	There is no way that you can close some parking on the road on school lane outside St.Marys. Old Amersham car park is not large enough to hold all the cars from the school parents, the teachers and the people who want to use old Amersham shops. It is not a feasible idea.	
School Lane (V46, U46)	Yes	I am in favour of these proposals but have 2 questions: 1. Who will police the situation to ensure non-residents are not parking where they shouldn't? 2. What is a household has more than 1 car? Where are they expected to park the extra vehicles? As long as the school run adheres to these changes there will not be an issue.	
			What is the cost likely to be for permits?

School Lane (V46, U46)	No	<p>-- Please do not widen the road or make it one way without putting in traffic calming measures such as bumps. It is already used as a shortcut (and indicated as such on some GPS systems) which means at quiet times many cars race through it. This is dangerous for residents, people using the park, children from the school and people visiting the health centre.</p> <p>-- putting in only 6 bays for residents is going to be highly problematic. Between the 12 households, there are at least 12 cars and vans. How will we work out who gets to use the bays? This is going to cause problems between neighbours, which is highly undesirable. And what about visitors, or houseguests, or tradespeople?</p> <p>-- The problem in this road is the School - and the fact that many parents drive their children to school. Can parents drop of several children at once (ie sharing the school run)? Why doesn't the school put in place a 'kiss and ride' system (with a dedicated bay for this) so that parents literally drop off their children and go? This works very well in other countries! At the moment parents sit around in their cars for ages which holds up the traffic and makes it difficult for residents to park. Or, alternatively, why don't parents use the other parking lot near Tesco, which I believe they can use for free?</p> <p>-- there is no real parking problem (we find) near the start of School Lane (near houses no 1-6). The real problem is near the school. So putting the bays at the start of the road may not be the solution.</p>	<p>Amersham really needs to make walking and biking paths, facilities and safety a priority. This will (hopefully!) reduce car journeys, help with people's fitness, and be better for the environment. A dedicated crossing at the start of School Lane, bumps in the road, and another crossing near the school would also help - it may encourage parents to let their children walk.</p>
School Lane (V46, U46)	I'm not sure	<p>I saw only one flyer on a lamppost for the second review. Has there been enough notice given.</p> <p>I am disappointed that the changes for school lane have concentrated on parking permits. Why is the speed limit past a school 30 miles an hour on a NARROW when many other areas in the UK have implemented 20? Why is the lighting between the school and mill lane not being addressed? The street lights east of the school are low intensity barely worth mentioning. West of the school the next light is at the junction of mill lane and school lane but it doesn't help much. The light in Mill lane is low low intensity. If the sun has gone down you need a torch to get from the school to the high street. This makes it difficult/dangerous to encourage walking.</p> <p>It looks like the school lane is narrower than it was originally due to lack of maintenance. There is no weight limit or width restriction for school lane as far as I can tell so occasionally we get the chaos of HGVs trying to get along it. A nightmare at school times.</p> <p>School lane is congestion helps to slow the traffic down.</p>	
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	<p>I volunteer at the School. It seems as though parking nearby will be virtually impossible, so that it may mean I can no longer volunteer there.</p>	
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	<p>This will push the problem into Pondwicks. There are not enough proposed resident parking places for the houses. The issues is at the other end - that's where they need the parking places. I don't agree with restricting the parking at the corner of Pondwicks and School Lane. This just reduces the amount of parking at peak times and its not a safety issue.</p> <p>The use of this area by local commuters who park their car all day is one of the most anti-social problems and the proposals do not address this.</p> <p>Congestion is good - it naturally slows the traffic down which is necessary where there is a school and children's playground.</p>	<p>I appreciate you are only responding to people's wishes and trying to solve problems. I would really like to say a wider integrated transport plan to encourage walking and biking. Church lane and Rectory hill are used by fast motorised commuters and make it dangerous for children walking and for cyclists. They can't cross School Lane safely as there is no crossing. The current speed limits are far too high. Can we work with local businesses to stop them parking in side streets and enable them to use public transport.</p>

School Lane (V46, U46)	No	<p>There are a number of allotments on School Lane. There needs to be arrangements made to allow some parking at the allotments even if it just at the weekend so that people can transport plants and equipment to them. The proposals for no waiting at any time will cause many of the allotments to be abandoned as there is no alternative parking nearby.</p>
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	<p>I have major concerns about the limiting of parking in Old Amersham. Our children attend St Mary's school in School Lane. My wife and I both go straight from school drop-off to our jobs by car. If the parking is restricted as heavily as is being proposed, then this will cause major issues for many working parents, which simply isn't needed right now.</p> <p>The parking / traffic flow situation in School Lane isn't great at the moment at peak school times, but the simple solution is just to make School Lane one-way (East to West), and this will solve the congestion. If School Lane is heavily restricted, then the problem will just be pushed to other areas.</p> <p>I live in Hillside Gardens, and unsure why our street isn't available for me to make comments upon?</p>
School Lane (V46, U46)	No	<p>Hi</p> <p>I've been informed by a local resident that the parking review has proceeded to formal statutory consultation.</p> <p>Having been provided with a link, I can find no reference to the results of the second informal consultation, just a comment that these will be published when available.</p> <p>How are we supposed to comment without the results?</p> <p>My particular concern is School Lane HP7 OEL. I led the response to the consultations outlining our concerns and objections, and if forced upon us potential mitigations.</p> <p>Could you provide me with the results please and how our concerns are being addressed?</p>
School Lane (V46, U46)	Yes	<p>Today I received an update regarding the proposed plans for parking in School Lane, Old Amersham. As a resident I was hoping that my voice would have been represented regarding my original email to the proposals.</p> <p>I understand that on double yellow lines I am allowed to park for up to 3 hours but this will not be suitable for me even if yellow lines were implemented.</p> <p>Thank you for your time</p>
Sheepfold Lane (X46, X47)	I'm not sure	<p>I am confused as I commented previously when we had an earlier consultation on the proposals. At that time I thought it was agreed that Sheepfold Lane would have no parking restrictions, other than at each end on the junctions where there would be double yellow lines. The letter received today, dated 19 June, seems to suggest there would be no parking allowed at all - No waiting at any time - is this correct?</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you.</p>

Sheepfold Lane (X46, X47)	No	<p>Restrictions from 11 - 12 as other surroundings roads i agree, however providing selective permits only will only push the problem into the surrounding roads that have different restrictions.</p> <p>Residents have family & friends over which now will be unable to park legally.</p> <p>A small minority mustn't dictate for the majority.</p>
Sheepfold Lane (X46, X47)	Yes	<p>I would definitely like to see double yellow lines at the junction with Hundred Acres Road. The cars parked there are a huge danger to both cars turning and pedestrians as they leave no room to walk on the pavement.</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>In January of this year, I wrote to BCC asking for South Road's views to be taken into account in the Amersham Parking Review which, for no reason I could ascertain, had not been included in the original consultation. The response I received directed me to results which noted that there were no changes planned for South Road.</p> <p>In June of this year, I was made aware of a second consultation which again excluded South Road even though the original consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extended to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. It is unclear to the residents of South Road why our road has been excluded when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a rat-run for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 to avoid congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars.</p> <p>I would like South Road to receive the same consideration as the roads nearby. This would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions as imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat-run • Blocking off the west end of South Road so that cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut-through <p>I know that many of the residents who were previously unaware of this consultation have now engaged with the process and wish to lodge their own views here. Please can you ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered together and given full consideration in the process.</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>I am contacting you with regard to the second parking consultation of 2020 for Amersham. Despite that the fact that numerous roads around and further from South Road were included in the survey South Road was not. South Road is used for commuter/ school children parking and is at times challenging to navigate. It is also used as a rat run between Chesham Road and Chesham Bois Road. A third point is the rebuilding of the parish centre which will lead to more parking challenges. As such I would request South Road is included in scope and at the minimum the following completed.</p> <p>1. Restricted parking between 12.00 and 13.00 in weekdays. This is essential to manage parking and quite simply people should use the parking facilities in town.</p> <p>In addition the following should also be considered 1. Traffic Calming measures 2. Potential 1 way routing of South Road to reduce it being a rat run I look forward to South Road being included in the consultation.</p>

South Road	Yes	<p>In January of this year, my husband wrote to BCC asking for South Road's views to be taken into account in the Amersham Parking Review which, for no reason we could ascertain, had not been included in the original consultation. The response he received directed him to results which noted that there were no changes planned for South Road.</p> <p>In June of this year, he was made aware of a second consultation which again excluded South Road even though the original consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extended to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. It is unclear to the residents of South Road why our road has been excluded when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a rat-run for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 to avoid congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars.</p> <p>We would like South Road to receive the same consideration as the roads nearby. This would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions as imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat-run • Blocking off the west end of South Road so that cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut-through <p>Many of the residents who were previously unaware of this consultation have now engaged with the process and wish to lodge their own views here. Please can you ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered together and given full consideration in the process.</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>In January of this year, my father wrote to BCC asking for South Road's views to be taken into account in the Amersham Parking Review which, for no reason we could ascertain, had not been included in the original consultation. The response he received directed him to results which noted that there were no changes planned for South Road.</p> <p>In June of this year, he was made aware of a second consultation which again excluded South Road even though the original consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extended to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. It is unclear to the residents of South Road why our road has been excluded when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a rat-run for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 to avoid congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars.</p> <p>We would like South Road to receive the same consideration as the roads nearby. This would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions as imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat-run • Blocking off the west end of South Road so that cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut-through <p>Many of the residents who were previously unaware of this consultation have now engaged with the process and wish to lodge their own views here. Please can you ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered together and given full consideration in the process.</p>

South Road	Yes	<p>In January of this year, my father wrote to BCC asking for South Road's views to be taken into account in the Amersham Parking Review which, for no reason we could ascertain, had not been included in the original consultation. The response he received directed him to results which noted that there were no changes planned for South Road.</p> <p>In June of this year, he was made aware of a second consultation which again excluded South Road even though the original consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extended to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. It is unclear to the residents of South Road why our road has been excluded when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a rat-run for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 to avoid congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars.</p> <p>We would like South Road to receive the same consideration as the roads nearby. This would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions as imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat-run • Blocking off the west end of South Road so that cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut-through <p>Many of the residents who were previously unaware of this consultation have now engaged with the process and wish to lodge their own views here. Please can you ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered together and given full consideration in the process.</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>I would like South Road to have the same restrictions as North Road and adjoining roads.</p> <p>Speeding and cutting through is frequently very dangerous indeed. Also a nightmare trying to exit own drive as it is impossible to see oncoming vehicles because parked cars obliterate view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions as imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat-run • Blocking off the west end of South Road so that cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut-through. ☒

South Road	Yes	<p>In January of this year, my husband and I both attended the consultation taking place at the District Council's offices. The reason we both attended and made written and verbal submissions was that we wanted to ensure that South Road was included in the Amersham Parking Review. Neither of us could understand why South Road had not been included in the original consultation. The results of that consultation showed that there were no changes planned for South Road. It is as if it is excluded from the whole process</p> <p>In June, I was made aware of a second consultation which again excluded South Road, even though the original consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extended to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. It is unclear to both me and the residents of South Road why our road has again been excluded, when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a short cut for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 and / or avoiding any congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a real danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars. I know that this concern has been previously raised with the Council.</p> <p>I believe it to be reasonable that South Road receives the same consideration as the roads nearby so as to address the concerns that we have. Solutions to the danger would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions, as are already imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat run • Blocking off the west end of the road so cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut through <p>I know that many of the residents that were previously unaware of the original consultation have now</p>
------------	-----	---

South Road	Yes	<p>In January of this year, my wife and I both attended the consultation taking place at the District Council's offices. The reason we both attended and made written and verbal submissions was that we wanted to ensure that South Road was included in the Amersham Parking Review. Neither of us could understand why South Road had not been included in the original consultation. The results of that consultation showed that there were no changes planned for South Road. It is as if it is excluded from the whole process</p> <p>In June, I was made aware of a second consultation which again excluded South Road, even though the original consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extended to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. It is unclear to both me and the residents of South Road why our road has again been excluded, when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a short cut for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 and / or avoiding any congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a real danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars. I know that this concern has been previously raised with the Council.</p> <p>I believe it to be reasonable that South Road receives the same consideration as the roads nearby so as to address the concerns that we have. Solutions to the danger would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions, as are already imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat run • Blocking off the west end of the road so cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut through <p>I know that many of the residents that were previously unaware of the original consultation have now engaged with the process and will lodge their own views. Please can you ensure that all such views</p>
------------	-----	---

South Road	Yes	<p>I was very upset to find South Road excused again from parking restrictions. On weekdays I can rarely park outside my front path because of commuter parking. The last 3 months has been excellent for me parking wise as I am disabled and find my back entrance very difficult to use as I have difficulty walking and the back entrance involves steps and little light. I have had a very expensive path laid at the front with good lighting but can't do it at the back. If the new plans go ahead I really don't know how I will manage with little hope of parking outside my gate. Quite clearly South Road will provide almost the only, and nearest, free parking to the new centre. Please help!</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>Just to draw your attention to the fact that South Road has not been included in the consultation of the Amersham parking review in June.</p> <p>It is imperative that the road is included, because we suffer from people using it as a shortcut going from Chesham through to the M25 (avoiding any congestion at the Boot and Slipper roundabout.) The speed the cars do coming off the Amersham road is very alarming and a risk to pedestrians crossing the road and drivers exiting their drives. This is particularly relevant at the west end if you are crossing the road with small children to go to the cricket pitch on the common.</p> <p>Secondly South Road is used as a carpark for the station and for DCGS students. I would like these solutions to this problem:-</p> <p>Timed parking restrictions, as imposed on other roads, e.g. no waiting from 11 am to 12 noon to deter commuters and students.</p> <p>Physical speed restrictions or a speed camera placed in the road.</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>I would like to ask why South Road has twice been excluded from the Amersham parking consultation, both in January of this year and now in the second consultation. The original consultation recommended actions or at least a further review for many of the roads surrounding South Road, including those which are actually further away from the town centre and the station. I did not understand why South Road was not included in the original consultation, and was very disappointed that when some residents of South road wrote to ask for it to be included this was basically dismissed out of hand, despite it being in potentially a worse situation than North Road, which was recommended for further review/action.</p> <p>South Road has three major issues related to traffic. It is well known that it is a regular weekday parking spot for commuters and Dr Challoners students, and it is also constantly used as a short cut for both local and commuter traffic (Chesham to the M25 and those avoiding congestion at the Boot and Slipper roundabout) as well as being a known 'racer route' for young people in the evening. This makes it puzzling as to why our road has again been excluded from the consultation. The combination of the parking and speeding pose a real danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars. Pedestrians and dog walkers also have to be extremely careful crossing the road when leaving Chesham Bois common for the same reason.</p> <p>I believe it to be reasonable that South Road receives the same consideration as the roads nearby so as to address the concerns that we have. Solutions to the danger would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions, as are already imposed on nearby roads, such as no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes <p>I noticed that the first consultation quickly dismissed our concerns by stating that the parking helped self-regulate the speeding so no action was needed. I can see that argument that less parking would make the road even more inviting as a shortcut/ 'race track' but believe that the current state of affairs is very dangerous, so would urge the council to seriously consider implementing both or at least the</p>

South Road	Yes	<p>I am aware from the recent consultation on parking in Amersham that South Road is excluded from the scope of the current parking review, and am writing to share my feedback and urge you to include South Road in the review.</p> <p>As you will be aware, the recommendation from the original consultation was for further review and applicable actions to extend to roads around South Road, including some which are farther away from the central hub of shops, offices and Amersham station. It is unclear to all interested residents of South Road why our road has again been excluded, when it is a popular and fully-occupied weekday parking destination for commuters and local students. Furthermore, it is used as a short-cut for drivers cutting across from Chesham through to the east and seeking to avoid congestion at the nearby 'Boot & Slipper' roundabout. The parking and speeding issues present a real danger to residents of South Road by creating a restricted view when turning out of our driveways and potentially into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars. I believe this concern has been previously raised with the Council.</p> <p>I would urge you to consider including South Road in the consultation and the roads nearby so as to address the concerns that we have. In line with the views of the road, we would like to suggest some potential solutions to these dangers, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions (similar to those already on nearby roads) such as no waiting from 11am to 12pm on weekdays, to deter commuters/students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat run • Blocking off the west end of the road so cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut through <p>I am hopeful that with engagement from many of the residents who were unaware of the original consultation, that you will ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered and given full consideration in the process.</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>We understand that South Road has been removed from the 2020 Amersham parking review. Following previous consultations we understand also that no changes are proposed for South Road on the basis that it has been decided there are sufficient restrictions in place. It is not clear on what basis South Road has been excluded from this Review. South Road is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a short cut for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 and / or avoiding any congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a real danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars. not to mention cars parking very close to driveway exits, decreasing visibility further. We understand that this concern has been previously raised with the Council. There are also a number of families (like ours) on the street with young children and several points along the road where families cross South Road to access the woods opposite (hence particular danger posed by speeding cars when people emerge from the woods in order to cross South Road). It therefore seems reasonable that South Road should receive the same consideration as the roads nearby. Solutions to the danger could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Timed parking restrictions, as are already imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students ● Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps/ bumps or chicanes ● road signs indicating a lower speed limit (i.e. 20 mph). ● Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat run ● Blocking off the west end of the road so cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut through

South Road	Yes	<p>I am aware from the recent consultation on parking in Amersham that South Road is excluded from the scope of the current parking review, and am writing to share my feedback and urge you to include South Road in the review.</p> <p>As you will be aware, the recommendation from the original consultation was for further review and applicable actions to extend to roads around South Road, including some which are farther away from the central hub of shops, offices and Amersham station. It is unclear to all interested residents of South Road why our road has again been excluded, when it is a popular and fully-occupied weekday parking destination for commuters and local students. Furthermore, it is used as a shortcut for drivers cutting across from Chesham through to the east and seeking to avoid congestion at the nearby 'Boot & Slipper' roundabout. The parking and speeding issues present a real danger to residents of South Road by creating a restricted view when turning out of our driveways and potentially into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars. I believe this concern has been previously raised with the Council.</p> <p>I would urge you to consider including South Road in the consultation and the roads nearby so as to address the concerns that we have. In line with the views of the road, we would like to suggest some potential solutions to these dangers, including:</p> <p>Timed parking restrictions (similar to those already on nearby roads) such as no waiting from 11am to pm on weekdays, to deter commuters/students</p> <p>Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes</p> <p>Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat run</p> <p>Blocking off the west end of the road so cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut through</p> <p>I am hopeful that with engagement from many of the residents who were unaware of the original consultation, that you will ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered and given full consideration in the process.</p>
------------	-----	--

South Road	Yes	<p>I writing in relation to the Amersham parking review, to ask that South Road be added within the scope of the consultation. It has come to my attention that a second consultation has commenced, which again excludes South Road, despite the original consultation recommending that a further review be conducted and extended to all roads around South Road.</p> <p>South Road is a well-known popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a short cut for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 and / or avoiding any congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. The parking poses a real danger to residents by restricting the view when manoeuvring out of their driveways, with potential fatal consequences if residents pull out in the path of speeding drivers, which are unseen beyond the lines of parked cars.</p> <p>I ask that South Road receives the same consideration as the roads nearby so as to address the parking concerns that I and all of the residents have. Solutions to the danger may include timed parking restrictions, similar to nearby roads. At this stage I am asking that South Road simply be added within the scope of the consultation, in order to come up with a viable solution.</p> <p>I know that many of the residents that were previously unaware of the original consultation have now engaged with the process and will lodge their own views. Please can you ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered together and given full consideration in the process.</p>
------------	-----	---

South Road	Yes	<p>I am at a loss to understand why South Road appears not to be included in this review, as I, and other residents in South Road, have raised the difficulties and dangers raised by the persistent parking all along the road which means that we cannot see whether it is safe to come out on to the road - we have to stick the front of the car out and hope that there is not a car driving along - even if it is keeping to the 30 mph speed limit there is still a danger of an accident.</p> <p>Other roads in our immediate neighbourhood have timed parking restrictions, eg no waiting from 11 am to 12 noon, which in my opinion would be sufficient to make South Road safe, which currently it IS NOT.</p> <p>I have heard it said that there has to have been an accident before such restrictions on parking can be introduced, but I find that a not - credible concept, and I would not expect any serious person to accept that as something that prevents them from making a sensible and needed decision.</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>In January of this year, my wife and I both attended the consultation taking place at the District Council's offices. We made written submissions about our views on the situation about the parking, speed of cars and safety considerations on South Road and the need for action. The result of that consultation was that no changes were planned for South Road.</p> <p>In June of this year, I was made aware of a second consultation which again excluded South Road even though the original consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extended to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. It is unclear to the residents of South Road why our road has been excluded when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a rat-run for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 to avoid congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars.</p> <p>I think that South Road should receive the same consideration as the roads nearby. Possible solutions to the situation in South Road would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions as imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat-run • Blocking off the west end of South Road so that cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut-through <p>I know that many of the residents who were previously unaware of this consultation have now engaged with the process and wish to lodge their own views. Please can you ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered together and given full consideration in the process.</p>

South Road	Yes	<p>In January of this year, my husband and I both attended the consultation taking place at the District Council's offices. We made written submissions about our views on the situation about the parking, speed of cars and safety considerations on South Road and the need for action. The result of that consultation was that no changes were planned for South Road.</p> <p>In June of this year, I was made aware of a second consultation which again excluded South Road even though the original consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extended to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. It is unclear to the residents of South Road why our road has been excluded when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a rat-run for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 to avoid congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars.</p> <p>I think that South Road should receive the same consideration as the roads nearby. Possible solutions to the situation in South Road would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions as imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat-run • Blocking off the west end of South Road so that cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut-through <p>I know that many of the residents who were previously unaware of this consultation have now engaged with the process and wish to lodge their own views. Please can you ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered together and given full consideration in the process.</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>I understand there is a fresh parking consultation for Amersham and currently South Rd is not included. I believe South Road should be included for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Already South Rd is used as free parking for the station, shops and no doubt other reasons. In the event that the consultation does lead to restrictions in nearby roads this will lead to more people using South Rd, and thereby exacerbating the current problems. 2) We are thankful for the white lines to limit parking but it is quite common for a driver in a rush to see a few metres of clear parking and leave the car there, irrespective of the length of their car. Consequently our drive is partially blocked. 3) South Rd is only just wide enough, with no parking, for two cars to cross. When cars are parked, especially when partially covering a drive it means the only way to exit the drive is to pull out at ninety degrees to the road to get past a car width and then turn the wheel. This has to be done at slow speed and with no visibility for other traffic using the Road, especially at speed. The consequence of this is an accident waiting to happen. <p>The parking review should therefore include South Rd and the consequences there if restrictions are placed on nearby streets, such as Lexham Gardens.</p>

South Road	Yes	<p>In June, I was made aware of a second consultation which again excluded South Road, even though the original consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extended to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. It is unclear to both me and the residents of South Road why our road has again been excluded, when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a short cut for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 and / or avoiding any congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a real danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars. I know that this concern has been previously raised with the Council.</p> <p>I believe it to be reasonable that South Road receives the same consideration as the roads nearby so as to address the concerns that we have. Solutions to the danger would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions, as are already imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes <p>I know that many of the residents that were previously unaware of the original consultation have now engaged with the process and will lodge their own views. Please can you ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered together and given full consideration in the process.</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>I am aware that the road was excluded from the original consultation. In June, I was made aware of a second parking consultation which again excludes South Road, even though the original consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extended to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. Since moving to the road in 2014 I have had ongoing concerns about the safety of children on the street – more than half the residents have children under 10. The street is unfortunately used as a cut through road with cars regularly speeding at more than 50 mph. It is also used in the evening by 'boy racers' who race up and down the street. Upon emailing the council to raise concerns about this the response I received was that traffic calming measures would only be considered if there have been fatalities on the street which I found unbelievable.</p> <p>It is unclear to both me and the residents of South Road why our road has again been excluded, when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a short cut for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 and / or avoiding any congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a real danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars. I know that this concern has been previously raised with the Council.</p> <p>I believe it to be reasonable that South Road receives the same consideration as the roads nearby so as to address the concerns that we have. Solutions to the danger would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Timed parking restrictions, as are already imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat run • Blocking off the west end of the road so cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut through <p>I know that many of the residents that were previously unaware of the original consultation have now engaged with the process and will lodge their own views. Please can you ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered together and given full consideration in the process.</p>

South Road	Yes	<p>I am writing to express my complete disappointment that the views and requests of South Road residents have been disregarded thus far in relation to the Parking Review, resulting in the complete exclusion of South Road from both the Original and Second consultations that have taken place.</p> <p>There is no clear explanation as to why the concerns of South Road residents have been continuously ignored. South Road is closer in proximity to the High Street, offices, Amersham Station and local schools than several other roads included in the consultation. South Road is also frequently used as 'free' weekday parking for commuters and students, and the subsequent blocking of the view of cars coming out of driveways, combined with the frequency of cars that speed along South Road being unable to see pedestrians and hazards clearly results in significant and real danger to residents, drivers and pedestrians, including the disproportionate number of children that walk along South Road. This is exacerbated by the many speeding drivers that use South Road as a shortcut to avoid traffic at the roundabout of Chesham Road / Rickmansworth Road / Devonshire Avenue.</p> <p>As the father of a young child I have been dismayed and highly concerned to see the level and frequency of speeding drivers along South Road since I moved here with my family early last year. The current parking situation, unnecessarily high 30mph speed limit as well as lack of any sort of speeding restriction or deterrent is a very real danger and concern to all residents. I have been informed by many other residents that these concerns have been repeatedly raised to the council, and ultimately ignored. There is no reason whatsoever to maintain the current situation and to not consider safety improvement measures including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of the unnecessarily high 30mph speed limit to 20mph. There is no justification to keep this at 30mph in an otherwise quiet, unlit, residential road used by many pedestrians as well as children walking to and from local schools, and this is highly unlikely to create any build-up of traffic. • Making South Road one-way from Sycamore Road to Chesham Road or completely closing the Chesham Road entrance to vehicles. Either of these will dramatically reduce the incidences of speeding cars with the associated danger and risk to life.
------------	-----	--

South Road	Yes	<p>I am writing to express my frustration and disappointment that the views and requests of South Road residents have been disregarded thus far in relation to the Parking Review, resulting in the complete exclusion of South Road from both the Original and Second consultations which have taken place.</p> <p>There is no clear explanation as to why the concerns of South Road residents have been continuously ignored. South Road is closer in proximity to the High Street, offices, Amersham Station and local schools than several other roads included in the consultation. South Road is also frequently used as 'free' weekday parking for commuters and students. This road-side parking and the subsequent blocking of the view of cars coming out of driveways, combined with the frequency of cars that speed along South Road being unable to see pedestrians and hazards, clearly results in significant and real danger to residents, drivers and pedestrians. This is especially worrisome considering the disproportionate number of children that walk along South Road given its proximity to 2 local schools. This is exacerbated by the many speeding drivers that use South Road as a shortcut to avoid traffic at the roundabout of Chesham Road / Rickmansworth Road / Devonshire Avenue.</p> <p>I am saddened and highly concerned to see the frequency of speeding drivers along South Road since I moved here with my family early last year. The current parking situation, unnecessarily high 30mph speed limit, and lack of speeding restriction or deterrent is a very real danger and concern to all residents. I have been informed by many other residents that these concerns have been repeatedly raised to the council, and ultimately ignored. There is no reason whatsoever to maintain the current situation and to not consider safety improvement measures including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of the unnecessarily high 30mph speed limit to 20mph. There is no justification to keep this at 30mph in an otherwise quiet, unlit, residential road used by many pedestrians as well as children walking to and from local schools. • Making South Road one-way from Sycamore Road to Chesham Road or completely closing the Chesham Road entrance to vehicles. Either of these will dramatically reduce the incidences of speeding cars with the associated danger and risk to life.
------------	-----	---

South Road	Yes	<p>Regarding the recent parking review of the roads around Amersham, I would like to raise my concerns regarding South Road.</p> <p>The existing consultation again ignored South Road, while putting restrictions on all surrounding roads. This seems very strange to us considering that South Road is already full of commuters parking their cars the whole day, meaning that we cannot have visitors to our property during the day. We have friends with young families for whom parking far away and carrying the baby in the car seat for instance is not practical. It would be great if South Road were able to have residents only parking for 1 hour a day to stop the all day parkers.</p> <p>In addition there is increasing speed to some of the cars cutting through the road. Perhaps the council could consider making the road one way from East to West between Lexham Gardens and Chesham Road to stop people using the road as a cut through from Chesham Road? Or blocking that end of the road completely?</p>
South Road	Yes	<p>have been made aware of a parking consultation process which is currently excluding South Road, even though the previous consultation's recommendations for actions and further review extend to roads all around South Road, including those which are further away than South Road from shops, offices and the station in Amersham. It is unclear to both me and the residents of South Road why our road has been excluded, when it is well known that it is a popular weekday parking spot for commuters and DCGS students, as well as a shortcut for drivers going from Chesham through to the M25 and / or avoiding any congestion at the Boot & Slipper roundabout. Both the parking and speeding pose a real danger to residents when turning out of our driveways into the path of speeding drivers that are unseen beyond lines of parked cars. I know that this concern has been previously raised with the Council.</p> <p>I believe it to be reasonable that South Road receives the same consideration as the roads nearby so as to address the concerns that we have. Solutions to the danger would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed parking restrictions, as are already imposed on nearby roads, eg no waiting from 11 am-12 noon to deter commuters and students • Physical speed restrictions, such as speed ramps or chicanes • Making South Road one-way from east to west to prevent cars from Chesham Road using it as a rat run • Blocking off the west end of the road so cars from Chesham Road are unable to use it as a cut throughout. <p>I know that many of the residents that were previously unaware of the original consultation have now engaged with the process and will lodge their own views. Please can you ensure that all such views from South Road are gathered together and given full consideration in the process.</p>
The Copse (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>No parking at any time would on the one hand be useful for stopping people parking for the train station, especially at weekends, however this would also make things very difficult for residents when we have visitors or workmen etc. I would support no parking at any time if residents were also issued with permits that we can use for our own use, visitors or workmen etc.</p>

The Copse (W44, W45, X44)	I'm not sure	<p>There is very limited places for visitors to our house and the flats on the Copse to park if all of The Copse, The Drive and the Rise are to be made no parking. The "No waiting at any time" is very heavy handed; and does not help residents. What would be the cost of resident permit scheme?</p> <p>There needs to be a proper drop off area for the station. The Copse or the corner of The Green/The Rise is used as a de-facto drop off and wait/collect for the station (including all the school kids who get the train).</p>	<p>School lane: The picture is very unclear. My children attend St Marys. My key concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1, Is there enough parking for the staff and the people working at St Marys school? 2, The road should be made One Way. More and more sat navs are bringing more traffic including large building lorries (from the houses being rebuilt on Mill lane) the "wrong" way down School Lane. 3, There should be double yellows on at least 1 side of Mill lane. 4, It is reasonable that parents need to "pop" into school outside drop off hours. I am concerned there's no provision for this sort of parking. Could a couple of spaces be provisioned ie 30mins max. 5, I'm strongly in favour of trimming barn meadows and putting 'diagonal' spaces 6, I don't think the road should be widened; neither Mill Lane or the lane at the end can support the 2-way traffic .
The Copse (W44, W45, X44)	Yes	<p>Dear Madam.</p> <p>Thank you for your letter and for your efforts in sorting out these issues.</p> <p>We note your proposal for "The Copse" is to turn the cul-de-sac into a "no waiting at any time" zone.</p> <p>This is fine and partially addresses the problems as described in our previous letter.</p> <p>However, it does not address all the issues and actually changes some of the issues mentioned into new or different issues.</p> <p>The "no waiting at any time" provision will simply encourage vehicles picking up or dropping off rail passengers to drive into the cul-de-sac and keep car engines running whilst waiting as an example. This now adds another element with driving noise, exhaust fumes, car doors/boots slamming etc. at all hours</p>	
The Drive (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>I do not support the proposal of designating the road of no waiting at any time. This will cause problems for visitors as residents don't have big enough drives.</p>	This second consultation has not been communicated well
The Drive (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>Mon - Sat why car users will just park in Highland road, West Stanley Hill Avenue Maybe resolving one issue though causing another.</p>	
The Drive (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>Limit double yellow lines only around the green.</p>	Do not agree to double lines would accept longer restriction ie 2 hours rather than one.
The Drive (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>I think this proposal will just result in people parking in other nearby roads instead such as Stanley Hill Avenue and Westanley Avenue, and walking to the station from there.</p>	
The Drive (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>Further to your letter dated 19th June, 2020, I would like to object to the proposal of 'No waiting at any time' on our street.</p> <p>The main concern we have as a family is that we have a number of cars already on our drive and it will be problematic for us to find parking space for ourselves and our visitors when they come to visit us. The original proposal document does not suggest that there will be options to provide visitors parking or residential parking permits. We can not extend our parking space due to limited space as the land outside our property boundary belongs to London Underground or local council to enable access to London Underground equipment buried underground.</p>	

The Green (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>Sirs</p> <p>We live on The Green and are directly affected by the proposals, and commented to the last proposal by BCC.</p> <p>We note that you have now turned the proposal on its head to BAN all street parking on The Green and adjoining roads.</p> <p>We vehemently OBJECT to this modified proposal and question its motives.</p> <p>Reasoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sledgehammer to crack a nut. Shows no subtlety in finding a solution to a problem we don't consider exists. Complete overkill. • Removes the Residents' ability to temporarily park a vehicle outside for any of the multiple purposes required in connection with Living, eg, friends and family visiting; deliveries; temporary parking while washing or working on vehicles in the drive; quick stop for collection. • What we have at present seems to work fine. There are very odd occasions where it gets busy or awkward, but we do not advocate for any changes to current. • Such changes that your Council deems to impose unilaterally and without Residents' full consent should only include fully justified modifications, which you have not produced. It has been presented as a 'stab in the dark', and not what we expect to receive from 'experts'. • No Petition or Lobby has been made or submitted for such a revolutionary change, nor would one gain support. Your proposal is, we consider, Authoritarian and ill-judged. <p>We previously reluctantly supported the PREVIOUS change to extend the 11am-12noon to include Saturdays, if you had justification for doing so, and stand by that as a possible compromise.</p> <p>We do support some of our neighbours who are lobbying for SUBTLE changes in restrictions so that access to their driveways is protected at all times. We have witnessed them suffering this several times. This would include inter alia Double Yellow Lines around 1) the inner perimeter of The Green green only, and 2) south side of The Copse.</p> <p>Otherwise, we object to any more stringent blanket restrictions being imposed. Why don't you come down and TALK to us?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
The Green (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>I do not agree because I think it will just result in people parking in other nearby roads such as Stanley Hill Avenue and Westanley Avenue, and walking to the station from there.</p>
The Green (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>Sirs</p> <p>We refer to your latest Consultation Letter dated 19 June. We live on The Green and are directly affected by the proposals, and commented to the last proposal.</p> <p>We note that you have now turned the proposal on its head to BAN all street parking on The Green and adjoining roads.</p> <p>We vehemently OBJECT to this modified proposal and question its motives.</p> <p>Reasoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sledgehammer to crack a nut. Shows no subtlety in finding a solution to a problem we don't consider exists. Complete overkill. • Removes the Residents' ability to temporarily park a vehicle outside for any of the multiple purposes required in connection with Living, eg, friends and family visiting; deliveries; temporary parking while washing or working on vehicles in the drive; quick stop for collection. • What we have at present seems to work fine. There are very odd occasions where it gets busy or awkward, but we do not advocate for any changes to current. • Such changes that your Council deems to impose unilaterally and without Residents' full consent should only include fully justified modifications, which you have not produced. It has been presented as a 'stab in the dark', and not what we expect to receive from 'experts'. • No Petition or Lobby has been made or submitted for such a revolutionary change, nor would one gain support. Your proposal is, we consider, Authoritarian and ill-judged. <p>We previously reluctantly supported the PREVIOUS change to extend the 11am-12noon to include Saturdays, if you had justification for doing so, and stand by that as a possible compromise.</p> <p>We do support some of our neighbours who are lobbying for SUBTLE changes in restrictions so that access to their driveways is protected at all times. We have witnessed them suffering this several times. This would include inter alia Double Yellow Lines around 1) the inner perimeter of The Green green only, and 2) south side of The Copse.</p> <p>Otherwise, we object to any more stringent blanket restrictions being imposed. Why don't you come down and TALK to us?</p>

The Green (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>Unless we are misreading it, these have changed substantially from what was first proposed, with no parking allowed at all now on a number of roads including The Green, and we don't understand why at all?</p> <p>We feel that these have been very poorly thought out. We did not object to the original recommendations but we feel that we must object to these.</p> <p>If there are double yellow lines on The Rise, The Green, The Copse and The Drive but no restrictions on Batchelors Way (except at junctions) Batchelors Way will inevitably be used as a parking area for the station. This will mean cars will be parked there all day every day and there will be NO local parking for visitors to residents at all at any time! This seems unnecessary as the current system generally works well.</p> <p>We trust that you will reconsider these proposals.</p>
The Green (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>With regard to the above parking review, I am emailing to raise my objection to the proposal. I live on The Green and do find the parking quite annoying sometimes, but I had hoped that adding an hour to the current parking restriction which is between 11-12 to be an acceptable proposition. However, it now appears that you have changed it to no stopping at any time. I heartily object to this. As a resident I do need to occasionally park outside my own house, and we do have people or work people visiting. Not being able to park outside at all is just very prohibitive to general living. I also don't understand what you intend with Batchelors Way? Are you intending to lift any restrictions apart from around the junctions? If so, that will cause chaos for the residents. It will be full up on both sides of the road with people parking for the station, causing misery and problems for any service vehicles, like ambulances and rubbish lorries getting through. Plus the added stress to the lives of the residents getting upset about people parking over their drives. Complaints to your email will double. I just can't understand this thinking. Please can this be thought out properly? Regards</p>
The Green (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>Could you please send the map that shows the restrictions on the Green ? The map you have sent cuts off what the proposal is for the Green. (or a link to the maps) I cannot support complete restrictions of parking around the Green (I do accept the restrictions at junctions and for safety) . There are times we need to park outside our house and there is a perfectly safe area to do that. I do agree the parking is becoming more and more difficult; that is since the construction of the car park at the station and, it seems, everyone finding the area convenient as a result of not being able to park at the station . I would propose either residents parking OR rather than an hour restricted parking make it 2 separate hours and extend it to weekends as well.</p>
The Green (W44, W45, X44)	Yes	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 19 June. We strongly support the proposal for no waiting at any time on The Green.</p> <p>The parking on The Green has become worse over the last 5 years. The cars parked are a danger to other road users since they block driveways or severely affect the visibility when exiting the driveway. Cars are parked around junctions and around The Green itself. The one hour current restriction is not a deterrent since cars are parked from 12 noon on Friday until Monday morning.</p>

The Limes (V38)	I'm not sure	<p>The recent proposal states "No waiting at any time" but the original proposal was for "no waiting at any time on junction"</p> <p>Why has this changed as the danger is when cars are parked at the junction?</p> <p>Does the revised proposal mean visitors can not park on the road, even outside of peak hours? We, and our neighbours, often have visitors and they park on the road along the hedge.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Thanks and kind regards</p>	
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>There's seems to be inconsistent information. We support the extra double gold lines at the junction and parking restrictions Monday -Friday for one hour to prevent commuter parking. I have read somewhere, your plan was to include the restriction on a Saturday. This is unnecessary and would cause great inconvenience to residents. We are happy to have resident parking permits to keep one car on the road If necessary.</p>	<p>Thank you for taking our comments on board but it remains to be seen after COVID whether all the commuters will return!</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>No waiting at any time is not ideal . Where would I park my car or visitors if this take place. Could be not have residence parking permits instead .</p> <p>What is no waiting at anytime ?? 24hrs no parking 7 days a week or 5 week days</p> <p>Weekends should be no restrictions</p> <p>Please</p>	<p>The Meadows no parking at any time is not ideal for most residences as residence cars are parked. Could we therefore have residence permits holders for this street and visitors passes</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>The original proposal was for a restriction between 11 and 12 or 10 and 11. This would stop commuters from leaving their cars on the road which I agree with. However a full restriction mean that friends and family that visit in the week will have no where to park there cars outside of these times. I really disagree with this. This is Anti-Community. Please reconsider the proposal.</p>	
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Placing "no waiting at any time" would have a massively negative effect on residents in this road. There is insufficient off street parking for all resident vehicles and indeed some houses do not have any driveway. There are on average around a dozen resident vehicles parked on the street, in addition to any visitors. As a household we would personally be hugely affected and cannot support this recommendation.</p> <p>Preventing anyone from parking, will also be detrimental to any family or care support for those elderly residents within The Meadows and will prevent necessary and vital holistic care being provided.</p> <p>We have been supportive of the resident permit scheme that was suggested in the second consultation and are both surprised and disappointed that the "no waiting at any time" is now being proposed.</p> <p>The recent Covid 19 restrictions has meant that no-one other than residents have habitually parked within The Meadows and from that it is abundantly clear that the perceived parking problem is only due to non-resident parking. Throughout the period there have been no difficulties, issues or concerns caused through resident parking and it is clear that a resident permit scheme would successfully and completely alleviate any perceived issues.</p> <p>We are also disappointed in the way this second consultation has been quietly closed and the consultation website neither updated or linked to this separate website, nor, as is suggested has any letter been received at this household.</p> <p>We pay one of the highest rates of council tax in the country; yet we pay to have green waste removed, we now pay to re-cycle the majority of household items; yet this is one of the richest local authorities in the country. What level of service are you providing for your residents. where you are denying them</p>	<p>The only viable option is for Resident Parking to be instigated in The Meadows</p>

The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Placing "no waiting at any time" would have a massively negative effect on residents in this road. There is insufficient off street parking for all resident vehicles and indeed some houses do not have any driveway. There are on average around a dozen resident vehicles parked on the street, in addition to any visitors. As a household we would personally be hugely affected and cannot support this recommendation.</p> <p>Preventing anyone from parking, will also be detrimental to any family or care support for those elderly residents within The Meadows and will prevent necessary and vital holistic care being provided.</p> <p>We have been supportive of the resident permit scheme that was suggested in the second consultation and are both surprised and disappointed that the "no waiting at any time" is now being proposed.</p> <p>The recent Covid 19 restrictions has meant that no-one other than residents have habitually parked within The Meadows and from that it is abundantly clear that the perceived parking problem is only due to non-resident parking. Throughout the period there have been no difficulties, issues or concerns caused through resident parking and it is clear that a resident permit scheme would successfully and completely alleviate any perceived issues.</p> <p>We are also disappointed in the way this second consultation has been quietly closed and the consultation website neither updated or linked to this separate website, nor, as is suggested has any letter been received at this household.</p> <p>We pay one of the highest rates of council tax in the country; yet we pay to have green waste removed, we now pay to re-cycle the majority of household items; yet this is one of the richest local authorities in the country. What level of service are you providing for your residents, where you are denying them access to park outside their own home residences and indeed will be preventing vital care for elderly or infirm residents? Where exactly would the Council suggest that residents park, if unable to park anywhere near their own homes?</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>I don't support the plans for no parking on the meadows. Especially the new plans - which haven't been mentioned till now about 'no waiting at any time'. Who has decided this would be a good idea? I would like to know where the parking restriction idea first came from - was it residents on the meadows or the council?? It feels like a money making scheme to make more people use the over expensive multi story carpark and I wish you would just leave our road alone. We have never minded that people park on our road and there has never been a problem with too many cars.</p>

The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>I am a resident of The Meadows and I would be hugely negatively impacted upon if these new unreasonable measures were implemented. I have read the second consultation document and it is clear that The Meadows has been singled out for unfair treatment in a much more draconian way than other roads.</p> <p>The number of respondents to the survey from The Meadows second consultation was in keeping with, or more than other roads; yet it is treated as having "insufficient response" and therefore go to double yellow lines - which was NOT the original recommendation; that recommendation being single line restriction 11 -12.</p> <p>There were 26 responses to the first survey and from that it was clear that the majority of respondents did not want any parking restrictions - the single yellow line between 11 and 12. The alternate proposal put forward by residents was for a resident parking scheme as a compromise. Sufficient people responded for the second consultation to occur.</p> <p>It is clear, therefore, that residents have not responded as they were accepting of the proposals in the second Informal Parking review. It was what they had proposed as a compromise and it is therefore entirely reasonable to expect a lower response. They were not objecting, so did not respond. To suggest now, that because the response was below 70%, when that target was never raised as a criteria within the review, then the proposal should be amended and increased to much more draconian measures than originally proposed is absurd. I would also suggest that is outwith the power of the consultation, as it is not what was originally proposed, has not been proposed by any resident and therefore, has not gone through the appropriate consultation process. It would therefore, be unlawful.</p> <p>A reasonable summation of events would be that the initial response showed that yellow lines were not wanted. There has been insufficient interest in the amended proposal, therefore the residents clearly do not wish restrictions and the proposal should therefore be withdrawn. This would be the logical conclusion, not that of increasing the proposed restrictions.</p>	To amend the proposal at this stage to more stringent measures without any representation of such is unlawful
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Placing "no waiting at any time" would have a massively negative effect on residents in this road. There is insufficient off street parking for all resident vehicles and indeed some houses do not have any driveway. There are on average around a dozen resident vehicles parked on the street, in addition to any visitors. As a household we would personally be hugely affected and cannot support this recommendation.</p> <p>Preventing anyone from parking, will also be detrimental to any family or care support for those elderly residents within The Meadows and will prevent necessary and vital holistic care being provided. We have been supportive of the resident permit scheme that was suggested in the second consultation and are both surprised and disappointed that the "no waiting at any time" is now being proposed.</p> <p>The recent Covid 19 restrictions has meant that no-one other than residents have habitually parked within The Meadows and from that it is abundantly clear that the perceived parking problem is only due to non-resident parking. Throughout the period there have been no difficulties, issues or concerns caused through resident parking and it is clear that a resident permit scheme would successfully and completely alleviate any perceived issues.</p> <p>We are also disappointed in the way this second consultation has been quietly closed and the consultation website neither updated or linked to this separate website, nor, as is suggested has any letter been received at this household.</p> <p>We pay one of the highest rates of council tax in the country; yet we pay to have green waste removed, we now pay to re-cycle the majority of household items; yet this is one of the richest local authorities in the country. What level of service are you providing for your residents, where you are denying them access to park outside their own home residences and indeed will be preventing vital care for elderly or infirm residents? Where exactly would the Council suggest that residents park, if unable to park anywhere near their own homes?</p>	
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Mon - Sat why not Mon - Fri car users will just push out onto Highland road, Stanley Hill Avenue Maybe resolving one issue though causing another.</p>	
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Require residence parking permits for this road to be considered and guess parking.parking limited for each house.</p>	Residence parking requieed for the meadows area for all.

The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>As a sole carer for 2 children who works full time, I would like my childminder / parents etc to be able to park outside my house.</p> <p>At the very least I would like for there to be residents parking available, or for there to be no waiting for an hour or so at lunch time.</p> <p>The current plans for 'no waiting at any time' would be very inconvenient to me.</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	Yes	<p>Yes I agree that there should be parking restrictions around the Meadows, but not just on the corners, a single yellow line with no parking between 11&12a.m. would be better.</p> <p>Sometimes we have parking on both sides of the road which causes emergency services and delivery lorries have great trouble trying to get through.</p> <p>Every house in the Meadows has off road parking and those who have more than two cars should have a parking permit, some cant even be bothered to park on their drives, and some park on the road to stop commuters parking outside their house.</p> <p>SO, COME ON GIVE US A SINGLE YELLOW LINE AND BE DONE WITH IT.</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>I don't fully support the proposals but have comments to add</p> <p>The junctions to Highland road - the no parking/ Double yellow lines should be increased further than the what is being suggested (3mtrs I think) but should be more like what has been done on Westanley Avenue/junction with Highland Road. As viability is very poor and made worse by cars parked in the way, especially at times of school runs.</p> <p>No Waiting at Any Time at junction - Agree, but increase the length</p> <p>No Waiting Mon-Sat 11am12noon, if this is for the whole road then I have to disagree as some properties do not have driveways, Solution we all have residents permits</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Propose</p> <p>single yellow. With times ie 11 to 1200 no parking thus reduce towns and city commuters on train as non residence parking</p> <p>Plus most important residence yearly parking permits</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Ideally we would like to have the yellow single line with time restrictions or permit holders only so anyone visiting could still be able to park during certain times rather than not at all. Thank you</p>

The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>No yellow lines at all times only restricted times as highlands n other roads</p> <p>Residence parking permit annual and guest passes available.</p> <p>Parking limited as it is within residence driveways for 1 or 2 cars at a push.</p> <p>We all live in this road n agree Parking to be limited fpr non residence esp with average house now has 3 to 4 cars. These house mostly 3 to5 beds</p>	<p>No yellow lines at all times only restricted times as highlands n other roads</p> <p>Residence parking permit annual and guest passes available.</p> <p>Parking limited as it is within residence driveways for 1 or 2 cars at a push.</p> <p>We all live in this road n agree Parking to be limited fpr non residence esp with average house now has 3 to 4 cars. These house mostly 3 to5 beds</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Residence parking only n guest too.</p> <p>Single yellow during restricted times. Mon to fri only free at weekend</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>Residence parking only n guest too.</p> <p>Single yellow during restricted times. Mon to fri only free at weekend</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>I agree the yellow lines should be extended as people do park too close to the end of the road and it is dangerous. However, changing the road to no stopping at any time is unrealistic and caused more problems for resident than it solves as many residents park at least on vehicle on the road. Some residents don't have a driveway, and as all surrounding roads are facing the same measures there would be nowhere for them to park.</p>	<p>I agree the yellow lines should be extended as people do park too close to the end of the road and it is dangerous. However, changing the road to no stopping at any time is unrealistic and caused more problems for resident than it solves as many residents park at least on vehicle on the road. Some residents don't have a driveway, and as all surrounding roads are facing the same measures there would be nowhere for them to park.</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	Yes	<p>The issue around commuter parking causes real danger to residents turning into or out of The Meadows. Any steps which eliminates this problem has my backing.</p>	
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	Yes	<p>Need to reduce commuter parking on this road.</p> <p>Would support restricted waiting times, or a residents permit scheme.</p>	
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	Yes	<p>The yellow line only goes two foot down the road and drivers park their cars in the morning and walk to the station to go to work and don't come back until the evening . Therefore, it would be better if there was a yellow line both sides of the road with residents parking permits.</p>	

The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>On the letter I received in the post dated 19th June 2020 it said that the proposed restriction for The Meadows (Y44 & Y45) was to be No waiting at any time. However on the online results form: https://www.buckscc.gov.uk/media/4515056/amersham-2020-parking-review.pdf p48 it says that the working group's decision is to proceed to second informal consultation seeking residents' views on resident parking permit scheme Monday to Friday. This chimes with the feedback shown on the form where it shows that a significant majority of residents and others who responded said they objected to the proposed restriction because of the issue of residents not having off street parking & that the majority of us would prefer resident parking permits. This seems sensible and would still solve the perceived issue of commuters parking in the road. The proposed restriction in the letter I received in the post is directly at odds with the feedback from residents and does not seem to arise from taking into account the consultation at all, nor do the two findings/conclusions match. Please could you look at this again and follow the recommendation of the working group as outlined in the online PDF - to consult on resident parking permits. Putting in a full no waiting at any time restriction would be extremely unsuitable for the residents - who include someone with a disability who requires carers to regularly attend and specialist vehicles for transport - where are they supposed to park? Please review.</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Double yellow lines doesn't help the residents of the meadows, if we have any visit from a friend they won't be able to park. When ever we've had work on the house the service vans park on the road. The problem is with non resident Cars, either commuters or town workers.</p> <p>With a single yellow with permits holders only it'll make living at the meadows a lot easier..</p> <p>Thank you</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>I would support a single yellow line with Parking permits for residents</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	I'm not sure	<p>I support the proposal for no waiting at the entrances to The Meadows and at the corners. As expressed previously, however, I do NOT support any other restrictions on parking in The Meadows as I believe they are unnecessary to meet the stated objectives of the review, ie they do not address any particular danger (evidence of accidents etc?); there are no, or very rarely, and problems with passage of traffic (this not a through road after all); and they do not improve the amenities as far as I am concerned.</p> <p>I note in response to previous correspondence that you have no complaints on record about parking from any residents in The Meadows. I assume therefore that the proposals for The Meadows arise directly as the result of other proposed restrictions locally to prevent "knock on" problems.</p> <p>I do support the move to residents' permits rather than the previously proposed parking ban between 11.00 and 12.00. However, I would welcome more details on e.g. how many permits per household and costs. Also any exclusions for e.g. deliveries and workmen, and for bank holidays?</p> <p>Please note also that I did NOT receive a copy of the consultation letter dated 19 June despite being directly impacted.</p> <p>Finally, I do regard the following wording from your introduction to the statutory consultation as rather unfortunate, or perhaps Freudian! "It is your final opportunity to comment on the proposals before they become legal parking controls" . A fait accompli?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">See above. I would welcome further details on the proposed residents' permit scheme and believe these should be provided before any scheme is finalised.</p>

The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Because The Meadows is one of the closest roads to Amersham Town and particularly Amersham Train Station, we have always had problems with dangerous and inconsiderate parking from people either working in town or commuting to London, and leaving their cars here for most of the day, as well as from residents in adjacent roads using it for their benefit</p> <p>The dangerous parking has been exacerbated on the 2 junctions adjoining Highland Road because the existing Yellow Lines installed many years ago, are not compliant with Parking Regulations, terminating less than 3 metres around the corner in to The Meadows. Due to this, non residents parking there cars here will park right on the end of the road in the belief they are legally parked, forcing cars entering and leaving the road to approach the junction on the wrong side, and in the face of oncoming traffic</p> <p>Despite this the new proposals which will see these lines extended and new Double Yellow Lines on the two corners of the road, will reduce this hazard but almost certainly just condense parking in to the reduced areas where no lines are present. Without any single lines at all this will increase the amount of double parking which we regularly see in the road , which is already to an extent where emergency vehicles such as Fire Tenders and Ambulances would find it difficult to gain access</p> <p>In light of the above, proceeding with the current proposals would be both short sighted and irresponsible.</p> <p>You have said in previous correspondence that it necessitates 70% of residents to approve a scheme before it can come into force. I am not sure if this is actually a legal requirement, but what it does not take into account are the number of rented properties in the road , whose residents are far less likely to be inclined to respond to surveys of this nature, because they are generally relatively short term lets, and any implementation of restrictions will not affect them long term</p> <p>Equally we also have a high proportion of elderly residents who either do not have internet access or the comprehension as to the means of having their voice heard</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Because The Meadows is one of the closest roads to Amersham Town and particularly Amersham Train Station, we have always had problems with dangerous and inconsiderate parking from people either working in town or commuting to London, and leaving their cars here for most of the day, as well as from residents in adjacent roads using it for their benefit.</p> <p>The dangerous parking has been exacerbated on the 2 junctions adjoining Highland Road because the existing Yellow Lines installed many years ago are not compliant with Parking Regulations, terminating less than 3 metres around the corner in to The Meadows. Due to this, non residents parking their cars here will park right on the end of the road in the belief they are legally parked, forcing cars entering and leaving the road to approach the junction on the wrong side and in the face of oncoming traffic.</p> <p>Despite this the new proposals which will see these lines extended and new Double Yellow Lines on the two corners of the road, will reduce this hazard but almost certainly just condense parking in to the reduced areas where no lines are present. Without any single lines at all this will increase the amount of double parking which we regularly see in the road , which is already to an extent where emergency vehicles such as Fire Tenders and Ambulances would find it difficult to gain access.</p> <p>In light of the above, proceeding with the current proposals would be both short sighted and irresponsible.</p> <p>You have said in previous correspondence that it necessitates 70% of residents to approve a scheme before it can come into force. I am not sure if this is actually a legal requirement, but what it does not take into account are the number of rented properties in the road, whose residents are far less likely to be inclined to respond to surveys of this nature, because they are generally relatively short term lets, and any implementation of restrictions will not affect them long term.</p> <p>Equally we also have a high proportion of elderly residents who either do not have internet access or the comprehension as to the means of having their voice heard.</p>

The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>As I understand it there is a proposal to put double yellow lines at the two junctions with Highland Road and extend them back a bit further up the Meadows to avoid people parking dangerously close to the end of the road. This I agree with.</p> <p>I also understand that there is a suggestion to add double yellow lines at the inside corners of The Meadows, to avoid people in Meadowbank close using the nearest stretch of road to park. I understand the concept, however there isn't enough parking inside Meadowbank close for the residents as it is, so it will not help those residents solve their parking issue. As our house is right next to Meadowbank close, it also means that those proposed double yellow lines will run outside our house. This I DO NOT want as it will disable our ability to invite friends or family over to visit.</p> <p>I would suggest that single yellow lines throughout (with the exception of the aforementioned junctions at Highland Road with double yellow lines), with the option for residents parking would be the most logical and practical solution. This will prevent the commuters from parking in The Meadows for the day (which is predominantly the issue), but will enable the residents to park on the road for short periods of time (such as when needed for visitors) without being penalised.</p> <p>I appreciate that many of the houses in The Meadows have usable driveways, but some of those driveways only have space for one car which will deny them the option of either parking a second car or having any visitors without being penalised or being effectively disabled by double yellows (as would be the case with us). We need to use the road directly outside our house, and single yellow lines with resident permit capability would fulfil the need appropriately.</p> <p>I will be most displeased if double yellow lines are placed outside our house near the internal corner, which affects us more than someone on a straight part of the road. Single yellow with parking permit please.</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>We agree with the proposal to extend the double yellow lines on the entrances and corners of The Meadows, but are disappointed that the all day commuter parking has not been addressed. It is impossible to comment on residents parking without specific information on how this will work e.g. allocated bay per house, or windscreen permit on a first-come first-served basis which would be unfair to many residents.</p> <p>More information needed please.</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	Yes	<p>I support single yellow lines with bays for residents permits.</p>

The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	No	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>I have today received the Statutory Consultation correspondence from yourselves regarding the parking review being undertaken in Amersham.</p> <p>I would like to express my reluctance to the introduction of parking permits. I'm somewhat bewildered that if your analysis and feedback indicate a commuter challenge on this road, which I agree with to a degree, I feel the introduction of permits to be a disproportionate solution to the problem. The initial proposal of no waiting between 11am-noon and an extension of the existing double yellow lines at the junction would eradicate the issue as those parking to use the trains into London etc as they arrive in the morning and return in the evening which would mean if they continued to park on a The Meadows they would be issued parking tickets.</p> <p>I feel the solution of parking permits is more a revenue generator for the council and feel that with year on year increases in council tax that this would be an added expense per year which is completely unfair especially for those with no off road parking.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider this proposal and reinstate the no parking from 11am-noon Mon-Sat proposal as this provides a fair solution for all residents whilst tackling the commuter challenge.</p> <p>Thankyou for your response. I may have misunderstood the current proposal but am clearer now having viewed your attachments. Still a little baffled with the feedback from residents on the street as to why a single yellow was not the preferred option as that would alleviate the commuter issue. Dont really see how the images you have attached will curb commuters from continuing to use The Meadows as a car park other than potentially reducing park capacity by approx 4/6 vehicles. Lets await the results of the current consultation....</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	Yes	<p>Generally there is a big problem with commuter parking.</p> <p>We were hoping for for some kind of restriction along the whole road..maybe no parking between 11-12 which would prevent some of the all day parking. Permits for residents only would be fine too.</p> <p>We welcome the double yellow lines at the bends of the road and the 2 entrances/exits</p> <p>However it seems that a couple of our neighbours received no letters at all regarding the parking changes. Also the information does not seem very clear on the website and also on the letter you sent us on 19th June 2020...which states "no waiting at any time"</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	Yes	<p>Re roads Y44 and Y 45 The Meadows Amersham HP79AT I do believe the lines should be Extend further around the corner , but I strongly disagree with the implementation of no parking mon to sat 11-12 as the residents need to park on the road as not every house has off road parking, Sent from my iPhone</p>
The Meadows (Y44, Y45)	Yes	<p>I'm writing in response to your letter I received 19th June (I did not receive the first one and I would have responded to that). I live on the corner of The Meadows and to get out of my drive is hard enough watching for cars that sometimes come too fast around the corner but it is hard with cars that are always pakrked opposite my house so I would like no waiting at any time please. It always worries me that if an ambulance or fire engine was to try and come down it would be impossible as ther is parking on both sides and by the time they asked for cars to move people could die. So please bear that in mind when making your decision.</p>
The Rise (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>The new proposal is "No waiting at any time". Currently waiting is permitted except between the hours of 11am and noon Mon to Fri. This is quite a significant change. I realise that it stops cars parking when using the station and going into town so forcing the use of paying car parks BUT it means that visitors and callers e.g. delivery vans, workmen, cleaners, doctors and nurses are unable to park either. Many residents have 2 cars and limited driveway space.</p> <p>I notice that you have made School Lane resident permit holders only (Mon-Sun 8am to 5pm) but what about St Mary's School. Staff need to park along the road as there is inadequate parking at the school. Also parents need to drop off and pick up their children so please consider their needs too. As a school governor I feel this is an important issue that needs addressing.</p> <p>I would support double yellow lines on one side of the road and some form of restricted parking on the other. Have you considered a residents' visitor parking permit system? (In Bristol they charge for these.)</p>

The Rise (W44, W45, X44)	No	<p>We really feel resident permits need to be put in place. The road is right next to the station and is used all the time by non residents parking for the station. The change to include Saturday 11-12am will not solve the problem as often people park after midday to go to London and spend an afternoon/evening there. The road is TOO NARROW for lots of parking especially on both sides of the road where at times is is near impossible to get a car up and down the road let alone an emergency vehicle. We have had such big problems getting on and off the drive we have had to spend a lot of money extending our driveway and access.</p> <p>If permits were used people would then use the council car parks and generate money for the council which would surely be beneficial??</p> <p>If it is impossible to have permits (which would hugely benefit those in the flats at the bottom of the road too) then we support double yellow lines down one side of the road as, as said earlier, the road is TOO NARROW for double sided parking and we have seen some terrible parking, on one occasion right over our driveway blocking us in overnight.</p> <p>There have been several occasions recently where residents have received parking tickets for parking on the road while they have workmen etc present. It doesn't seem right or fair as this is not the issue that is trying to be solved. Surely someone that owns a house in the road should be able to park their car on the road??? Extension of the 11-12 as far as we can see is not resolving the problem for local residents. Most other towns have MUCH stricter parking restrictions on a road so close to the station and town centre. We also feel that when the new leisure centre is completed this is likely to drive more traffic to our roads - this is a real worry.</p>
The Rise (W44, W45, X44)	Yes	<p>I have just received a letter dated 19th June 2020 stating that following the informal consultation you are moving to the statutory consultation phase. Please can I ask why our road The Rise now is "No waiting at anytime" when currently the restriction is just Mon to Fri between 11am and 12noon? The initial consultation was just to extend it for Saturday which I support. In the statement of reasons given on the website it says:-</p> <p>"For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising.</p> <p>For facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians)</p> <p>For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs."</p> <p>I applaud you wishing to make the road safer and improve the area. However I always thought the current restrictions were to limit people using the road for parking whilst travelling to and using the nearby station. I support any move that will make access up the Rise safer since currently parking is inconsiderate and at times access is impossible for wider vehicles. This danger could be alleviated by the use of double yellow lines on one side of the road. Also there could be some marked permitted parking areas for residents and their visitors. A visitor parking permit system could be introduced which residents could apply for. (In Bristol there is a charge for this)</p> <p>Often cars are parked in such a way as to make it difficult for me to reverse safely out of my drive. If there is no waiting at anytime all along the road that would mean that any visitors we have, delivery vehicles, workmen, cleaners, doctors and nurses calling have nowhere to park. Most residents in the road have two cars and depending on the size and layout of the driveway some need to park on the road temporarily to manoeuvre the cars around.</p>
Tudor Park (X41)	Yes	Fully support
Tudor Park (X41)	Yes	I'm writing in response to your letter about the Statutory Consultation for Amersham Parking. I'm writing on behalf of my mother, who is a resident. She wishes to voice her support for the proposed restriction of "no waiting at any time" on Tudor Park (X41).

Whielden street	Yes	<p>About two years ago at a meeting in Amersham Town Council offices Mr Martin Tett announced that the whole of Buckinghamshire would be subject to parking schemes installations in all towns and villages. He also advised that communities should take an interest in putting forward suitable schemes for their town or village. Failure to do so would result in the County Council imposing schemes of their own design because existing parking arrangements are out date and that schemes introduced by BCC would be self financing.</p> <p>Old Amersham was included in consultation in January 2020 the results of which were recently published. We note that in the categories of those who responded to the consultation is a heading "Others". We need to know who 'others' are?. We know that a faction within the town canvassed for 'no change' to the existing parking arrangements. We suspect that outsiders were recruited to boost the survey figures in favour 'no change' We already know that the businesses in Old Amersham are not in favour of a parking scheme, simply because car parking is free of charge in the streets. Business owners and their staff park all day free of charge. The survey did not take into account that in such a situation there is little or no displacement of parked vehicles to provide movement in and out of the town. It inevitably follows that visitors, business people and shoppers are inconvenienced and move on to the next town eg, Gerrards Cross.Wendover, Berkhamsted ,Uxbridge, High Wycombe and others most of which have more to offer than Amersham. That will remain unchanged as long as Amersham neglects to recognise the urgent need for a sensible parking arrangement. Businesses are being held back and this is evidenced by the number of business failures.</p>
Whielden Street	Yes	<p>I understood that when the results of the first round of informal consultation, and Whielden Street was excluded from the review, that the decision had been made to exclude it, and also many other streets in Old Amersham. There was no indication that residents should respond about roads that had been excluded.</p> <p>Now that I see the results of the second informal consultation, it would appear that the residents of Whielden Street have little or no problem with parking. It would also appear that the opinions of non-residents ("others") are given the same weight as residents, and that they are entitled to enjoy free for all parking in Whielden Street. Did anyone in the parking team find out why these people are parking in Whielden Street? Were they the four people who arrive in separate cars each morning, park three cars in Whielden Street, and car share in the fourth car for their onward journey to work. Were they the people who travel from other parts of the country, leave their cars in Whielden Street, and head off to Heathrow for a two week holiday? Were they the people who live locally and have a car restoration business, but don't have space for all their cars ... but leave them in Whielden Street?</p> <p>Many of the houses in Whielden Street have no parking. During lockdown, it was apparent that there are enough parking spaces in Whielden Street for residents with no parking of their own. However, due to "others" using Whielden Street's free unrestricted parking, residents once again are finding it almost impossible to park at any time of the day or night. While i welcome the decision not to charge for parking in the two northern most parking bays by the hospital, something must be done to help the residents of Whielden Street park near their homes. I therefore urge you to reconsider the introduction for a Residents Parking Scheme for Whielden Street.</p> <p>Thank you</p>

Whielden Street	Yes	<p>I certainly did not know of a second parking review, which, if I knew earlier, I would have responded earlier.</p> <p>Whielden Street in Amersham old town is desperately in need of some form of parking control. Permits would be the ideal solution.</p>
-----------------	-----	--

Whielden Street	Yes	<p>I was disappointed that the second round of the proposed parking review for Amersham excluded Whielden Street, and my understanding of the reason given by BCC for this was the high number of "others" who responded to the first round of consultation were against a scheme.</p> <p>I realise Data Protection rules mean you are unable to reveal who the "others" are, however it was disappointing that their views are taken into account over and above the residents' responses.</p> <p>Now that "normal services" are being resumed with regard to shops and restaurants reopening and Amersham Hospital getting busy again with clinics operating fully, residents in the street are again suffering from the issue of being squeezed out of the limited available street parking.</p> <p>Residents were strongly in favour of a residential parking scheme, but as our numbers were lower than the number of "others", residents' preferences were overruled, so that meant we were not consulted again.</p> <p>Could I urge you to look again at the plight of residents' parking in Whielden Street and reconsider your decision not to include us in the parking review.</p>
-----------------	-----	---

Whielden Street	Yes	<p>I do not recall being informed of the second consultation, if I had been, I would have responded and supported Whielden Street residents parking to be included in the parking review. I originally responded stating that Whielden Street would benefit from Residents Parking due to the fact there are only enough spaces available for residents and these are being used by commuters, hospital visitors and workers to avoid parking in either the car park. The 'others' that responded to initial consultation possibly do not wish to lose this free parking.</p> <p>Please could you reconsider the scheme for Whielden Street</p>
Woodside Avenue (X39)	Yes	<p>This map on yourvoicebucks website shows no parking at any time at the junction of Woodside Avenue with Bois Lane - I.e. restrictions only applied to that end of Woodside Avenue. This is the proposal made in the previous parking review consultation on BucksCC (which was to be progressed after the last review) and I support this proposal, which is why I have written 'Yes'.</p> <p>However, in a letter sent to an Amersham resident (visible on social media on YourAmersham) it details Woodside Avenue in description as being no parking at any time. No parking at any time all the way along the road would be contrary to the content previously shared by Bucks CC and I would not support that proposal as making it prohibitive for those who live on Woodside Avenue without drives and also making it very challenging for anyone to visit by car. I am presuming, however, that this letter content was phrased in error.</p>
Woodside Avenue (X39)	Yes	<p>Please can the two turning circles red/yellow lines be instated, often people park on them even though the law states that no vehicles should be parking on turning circles.</p>
Woodside Avenue (X39)	Yes	<p>Agree with working group's decision to protect junction and proceed to formal consultation.</p>

I am writing on the behalf of an elderly couple I know.
They are both extremely distressed by the potential change which means that parking will begin outside their house. This will make exiting the site at certain times of the day extremely dangerous for them. Some of his hospital appointments do not give them flexibility as to when they can leave the house. This is a serious safety issue for them.

Is it not possible to begin the parking outside?

Parking in the road outside their home has rarely been an issue for the years they have lived in that house. At the moment she remains competent to drive but setting up an obstacle course at her age seems unfair. In the context of the young schoolchildren and the traffic problems what you are doing is understandable but it causes significant potential difficulties.

She asked me to handle this. They share an email address and she is trying very hard not to upset her husband further. Hence why they are not copied. But you have her phone number if you can help.

Yes

To Whom It May Concern

Chepping Wycombe Parish Council support the proposal for the changes with reference to the following maps:
K58 (Coppice Farm Rd, Penn)
L60 (Elm Rd, Penn)
L61 (Elm Rd, Penn)
L62 (Elm Rd, Penn)