

Appendix A

Petitions

| Road/ Area | Objection | Council's Response |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Birch Drive, Douglas & Fairfield Road | 70 Signatures Objects to DYL in Douglas Rd , Birch Drive and Fairfield Rd impacts negatively on residents, proposes limited waiting. | Request originally came from residents of Fairfield Road, from the consultation it is clear majority of residents do not agree with proposals. A revised scheme at this location is proposed and shown in 8 B . Restrictions have been removed from residential area; however lengths of double yellow lines remain in areas where highway safety concerns are raised such as at junctions. The suggestion of Limited Waiting restrictions was considered and dismissed as it was anticipated that vehicles would be displaced into unrestricted areas. |
| Fairfield Drive | 16 signatures Objects to extent of DYL Fairfield Drive, proposed a revised scheme | Request originally came from residents of Fairfield Drive, from the consultation it is clear majority of residents do not agree |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| | | with proposals. A revised scheme at this location is proposed in accordance with residents' feedback and shown in 8 B . |
| Fairfield Drive & Narrow Lane | 680 signatures Object to yellow lines outside Hurst Green 'Home and Garden' | Revised scheme is proposed and shown in 9 B . Plan does show significantly reduced section of double yellow lines outside 'home and garden' however in practice the restrictions will have no further impact 'on street' as the area in question is already covered by a 'no stopping' Order (zig zags). Lines are required to preserve existing visibility conditions should the pedestrian crossing facility ever be removed in the future. |
| Feldon Lane | 5 signatures Residents deem the scheme too excessive, they consider that the proposals would unfairly limit their chance to park near their homes. | Double Yellow lines removed outside affected residents' houses. Revised scheme is proposed and shown in . |
| Green Lane & Clement Road | 30 signatures Support for 'one way' streets in Green Lane & Clement Road and request for traffic calming measures to be installed within said roads. | One way scheme to be introduced as advertised (13). Double yellow lines removed at junction of Green Lane and Clement Road following objection from resident revised proposal shown in plan 5 B . |
| 88 Long Lane | 20 signatures Haircare Salon; opposes restrictions | Petitioner appears to misunderstand legal implication of 'no waiting'; loading and |

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| | <p>outside business, fears elderly customers will not be able to park or be dropped off, fears deliveries will be unable to unload as business has no rear access and feels proposals will adversely affect business in the area.</p> | <p>unloading will be permitted. In addition proposal is deemed to have no impact on business as current Order (No Waiting Mon. –Sat. 7am -7pm) prohibits parking during existing opening hours.</p> <p>Revisions have been made to Long Lane proposals (4 B). The latest plan introduces increased levels of on-street parking available, particularly on Saturdays.</p> <p>It is recommended that restrictions in close proximity to the junction of Southwick Rd with Long Lane remain in order to preserve visibility splay for egress from Southwick Road and to facilitate kerb alterations to be implemented (subject to consultation) as part of a local safety scheme</p> |
| Maltmill Lane | <p>124 signatures Objects to Maltmill Lane Proposals, citing negative impact on mosque, community centre and local businesses</p> | <p>In light of objections scheme has been revised and is shown in plans 12 B & 4 B. It is proposed only to prohibit the right turn from Long Lane into Maltmill Lane. The extent of restrictions have been reduced in Maltmill Lane; remaining lengths are required to maintain visibility in close proximity to the junction and to facilitate the installation of a pedestrian refuge as part of a local safety scheme to be consulted upon)</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Nimmings Road ,Clement Road, Masters Lane, Green Lane, Church St, Fairfield Road & Douglas Road</p> | <p>104 signatures Objects to DYL in Nimmings Road,Clement Road, Masters Lane, Green Lane, Church Street, Fairfield Road, Douglas Road says there is no alternative provision made in scheme for residents and proposals may have a negative effect on business' .</p> | <p>Original proposals did seek to preserve 'on street' parking for residents without 'off street' facilities, however in light of comments scheme has been amended further to return lengths of carriageway to unrestricted. (4 B, 5 B, 7 B, 8 B). The remaining restrictions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To preserve visibility at junctions. • To facilitate turning manoeuvres for large vehicles upon access and egress from many of the industrial units in Nimmings Road. • To improve vehicular flow along Nimmings Road (B4169) which forms part of the strategic network within the Borough. |
| <p>Long Lane between Belgrave Road and Southwick Road.</p> | <p>1340 signatures Objection to proposals over length of carriageway in Long Lane between Belgrave Road Southwick Road. Petion states that proposals will have a negative impact on businesses and residents as parking will be removed.</p> | <p>Petitioner appears to misunderstand legal implication of 'no waiting'. Loading and unloading will be permitted. In addition proposal is deemed to have little impact on business as existing restrictions (No Waiting Mon. –Sat. 7am -7pm) prohibits parking during the opening hours of the majority of businesses within the affected zone. At present anyone parking (during restricted times) to visit the premises</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>within the affected area does so illegally. There are however a small number of businesses that do operate beyond the limits of the existing restrictions. Revisions have been made to Long Lane proposals (4 B). The latest plan introduces increased of levels of on-street parking available, particularly on Saturdays.</p> <p>The revised plan (above) when combined with the proposed measures to be introduced as part of the local safety scheme aims to increase pedestrian permeability and that of other modes which could be deemed to benefit the businesses of Shell Corner. The revised proposal also seeks to accommodate the needs of car users.</p> |
|--|--|---|

Individual Correspondences (excluding petitions)

| Road | Objection | Council's Response |
|---------------|---|---------------------------|
| Entire scheme | 4 letters of objection to entire scheme | |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | 2 letters of support for entire scheme | |
| Beech Avenue | 1 letter of objection to scheme states that proposals will have adverse effect on residents. | The access road to Beechfield Close is very narrow, obstructive parking could present difficulties of access for emergency vehicles. Scheme has been amended to minimise impact on residential parking (6 B). |
| Beechfield Close | As Beech Avenue | 6 B. |
| Belgrave Road | 3 Letters of objection 1. objector doesn't support any of the one way proposals feels they are unnecessary 2. Objector feels one way will adversely affect business 3. Objector feels proposal is unnecessary. | Scheme has been amended to introduce limited waiting in close proximity to local businesses within affected road. One way system will resolve vehicular pedestrian conflict created by vehicle exiting Belgrave road in very close proximity to pedestrian crossing facility. The revised plan (4 B, 11) when combined with the proposed measures to be introduced as part of the local safety scheme (which aims to increase pedestrian permeability) could be deemed to benefit the businesses of Shell Corner. |
| Birch Drive | 9 Letters of objection Objectors feel the proposal is excessive and impacts negatively on residents | Request originally came from residents of Fairfield Road, from the consultation it is clear majority of residents do not agree with proposals. A revised scheme at this location is proposed and shown in 8 B . |

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| | | Restrictions have been removed from residential area; however lengths of double yellow lines remain in areas where highway safety concerns are raised such as at junctions. |
| Church Street | <p>2 letters of objection.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned about impact on residents. 2. Objects to 'one way' system, fears are expressed about potential difficulty in parking on street. <p>4 letters of support.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for 'one way' system but concerned about the availability of 'on street' parking for parishioners. | In response to public feedback, restrictions amended (5 B), Double yellow lines are still required in close proximity to junction with long Lane in order to protect visibility. |
| Clement Road | <p>1 letter of objection</p> <p>Resident of Nimmings Road objects as they park in Clement Road during the evening (outside current restricted hours), if proposals go ahead this space will be lost</p> | It is deemed that sufficient 'on street' parking exists within close proximity to objectors home to accommodate any vehicles displaced as a result of the proposals for Clement Road. Recommendation is to overrule objection. |
| Douglas Road | <p>8 letters of objection</p> <p>Restrictions are considered to be too excessive by residents and affected</p> | Request originally came from residents of Fairfield Road, from the consultation it is clear majority of residents do not agree |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| | businesses. | <p>with proposals. A revised scheme at this location is proposed and shown in 8 B.</p> <p>Restrictions have been removed from residential area; however lengths of double yellow lines remain in areas where highway safety concerns are raised such as at junctions.</p> |
| Fairfield Drive | No letters of objection received (NB petitions objecting to proposals for Fairfield Drive and Narrow Lane have been received – see petitions above). | Request originally came from residents of Fairfield Drive, from the consultation it is clear majority of residents do not agree with proposals. A revised scheme at this location is proposed in accordance with residents' feedback and shown in 9 B . |
| Fairfield Road | <p>1 letter of support. Resident would like to see measures introduced as frustrated by levels of 'commuter' 'on street' parking in their road.</p> <p>9 letters of objection. Restrictions are considered to be too excessive by residents and affected businesses</p> | <p>Request originally came from residents of Fairfield Road, from the consultation it is clear majority of residents do not agree with proposals. A revised scheme at this location is proposed and shown in 8 B, 9B.</p> <p>Restrictions have been removed from residential area; however lengths of double yellow lines remain in areas where highway safety concerns are raised such as at junctions.</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Feldon Lane | 1 letter of objection objector feels that demand for 'on street' parking is high due to presence of doctor's surgery and school, feels problem will be exacerbated by proposals | Double Yellow lines removed outside affected residents' houses. Revised scheme is proposed and shown in 10 B . Remaining restrictions are to facilitate the safe and effective loading and unloading of children attending Halesbury School. |
| Green Lane | 4 letters of support. Residents support the scheme as they feel road is used as a 'rat run' and that high levels of 'on street' parking (terraced properties) narrow the road to a level that cannot safely accommodate two way vehicular flow. One resident also concerned that the introduction of double yellow lines at the junction of Green Lane and Clement Road will displace vehicles into areas that cannot accommodate them leading to long term neighbourly disputes. | One way scheme to be introduced as advertised (13). Double yellow lines removed at junction of Green Lane and Clement Road following objection from resident revised proposal shown in plan 7 B . |
| Greenhill Road | No objections | Proposals have been amended in order to accommodate small number of vehicles (currently parked in Long Lane) that will be affected by restrictions proposed in other street nearby amendments shown on plan 1 B . |
| Hill Top Avenue | No objections | Introduce restrictions in Hill Top Avenue as advertised. |
| Holt Road | No objections | Introduce restrictions in Holt road as |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <p>(NB petitions objecting to proposals for Nimmings Road have been received – see petitions above).</p> | <p>advertised. Shop is present at the junction of Nimmings Road and Holt Road, approximately one parking space at the junction is estimated to be lost by proposal.</p> |
| <p>Long Lane</p> | <p>9 Letters of objection 1 Letter of support NB Petition objecting to proposals for Long Lane between Belgrave Road and Southwick Road has been received – see petitions above). From consultation objection appear to be concentrated across area set out in petition received. Generally there is opposition to restrictions outside business, fears elderly customers will not be able to park or be dropped off, fears deliveries will be unable to unload as business has no rear access and feels proposals will adversely affect business in the area</p> | <p>From the feedback it appears as if there is a public misunderstand as to the legal implication of ‘no waiting’. Loading and unloading will be permitted. In addition proposal is deemed to have little impact on business as existing restrictions (No Waiting Mon. –Sat. 7am - 7pm) prohibits parking during the opening hours of the majority of businesses within the affected zone. At present anyone parking (during restricted times) to visit the premises within the affected area does so illegally. There are however a small number of businesses that do operate beyond the limits of the existing restrictions. Revisions have been made to Long Lane proposals (4 B). The latest plan introduces increased of levels of on-street parking available, particularly on Saturdays. The revised plan (above) when combined with the proposed measures to be</p> |

| | | |
|---------------|--|---|
| | | introduced as part of the local safety scheme (which aims to increase pedestrian permeability and that of other modes) could be deemed to benefit the businesses of Shell Corner. |
| Maltmill Lane | . | In light of objections scheme has been revised and is shown in plans 4 B, 12 B . It is proposed only to prohibit the right turn from Long Lane into Maltmill Lane. The extent of restrictions have been reduced in Maltmill Lane; remaining lengths are required to maintain visibility in close proximity to the junction and to facilitate the installation of a pedestrian refuge as part of a local safety scheme (to be consulted upon) |
| Maple Road | 2 Letters of objection The scheme was considered to be too excessive and would displace parking across residents' frontages. In addition were maltmill Lane to become 'one way' then residents suggest that Maple Road would experience increased levels of through traffic effectively 'by passing the 'one way' proposal. | Extent of 'no waiting' has been reduced (4 B, 12 B) to accommodate public feedback, however restrictions are still recommended at the Junctions of Maple Road with Long Lane and the service Road, restrictions are considered necessary in order to preserve visibility splays in an area currently experiencing high volumes of pedestrian and vehicular movements. |
| Masters Lane | No individual objections received | Introduce restrictions in Masters Lane as |

| | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| | | advertised. |
| Narrow Lane | <p>7 Letters of objection (N.B. Petition objecting to yellow lines outside Hurst Green 'Home and Garden' has been received see above). Residents object to the extent of the restrictions proposed and perceive that current levels of 'on street' parking attributed to 'Home and Garden' will be displaced across their frontages. One resident requested that the proposals were extended.</p> | <p>Revised scheme is proposed and shown in 4 B. Plan does show significantly reduced section of double yellow lines outside 'home and garden' however in practice the restrictions will have no further impact 'on street' as the area in question is already covered by a 'no stopping' Order (zig zags). Lines are required to preserve existing visibility conditions should the pedestrian crossing facility ever be removed in the future.</p> |
| New England | No individual objections received. | Introduce restrictions in New England as advertised. |
| New John St | No individual objections received. | Introduce restrictions in New John Street as advertised. |
| Newlands Drive | <p>No individual objections received. (N.B. Petition objecting to yellow lines has been received from Residents of Feldon Lane and Newlands Drive see above).</p> | <p>Double Yellow lines removed outside affected residents' houses. Revised scheme is proposed and shown in 10 B.</p> |
| Nimmings Rd | <p>11 letters of objection. (NB petitions objecting to proposals for Nimmings Road have been received – see petitions above).</p> | <p>Revised scheme is proposed and shown in 4 B, 7 B, 8 B. Remaining elements serve to protect turning manoeuvres and visibility splays to the many industrial units and junctions</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|---|
| | Objectors feel the proposal is too excessive and adversely affect residents by removing their ability to park 'on-street'. | within the Road. It is recommended that the revised scheme is introduced. |
| Oak Barn Road | No letters of objection. | Introduce restrictions in Oak Barn Road as advertised. |
| Olive Lane | 1 letter of objection Objector feels proposal is excessive | Aim of proposal is to remove obstructive parking in close proximity to junction with Stewarts Road as Olive Hill Primary School is nearby; highway safety concerns are raised due to the potential for vehicular pedestrian conflict. It is recommended to introduce restrictions in Oak Barn Road as advertised. |
| Southwick Road | 4 letters of objection relating specifically to proposals for Southwick Road 1. Businesses concerned about reduced levels of parking for customers 2. Resident worried traffic volumes would increase in Beaumont Road. | Scheme has been amended (4 B) to introduce limited waiting in close proximity to local businesses within affected road. One way system is considered to reduce vehicular conflict and improve flow in Beaumont Road which experiences high levels of residential parking, it is therefore recommended to introduce the one way street as advertised and shown on plan 11 . |
| Springfield Drive | 1 Letter of objection resident will have restrictions across full | Resident has off street parking facilities; the property is positioned directly at a |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|---|
| | width of property feels this is excessive | junction which is affected by parental obstructive parking. It is recommended to introduce restrictions in Springfield Drive as advertised. |
| Springfield Road | See Springfield Drive | See Springfield Drive |
| St Paul's Drive | No letters of objection | Introduce restrictions in St. Paul's Drive as advertised |
| Stewarts Rd | No letters of objection | Introduce restrictions in Stewarts Road as advertised. |
| Upper Ashley Street | No letters of objection | Introduce restrictions in Upper Ashley Street as advertised |
| Vicarage Road | 2 letters of objection Objectors agree with aims of proposal but feel it is too excessive and adversely impacts on residents and visitors to St. Paul's Church. | In light of objections scheme has been revised and is shown in 5 B . The extents of restrictions have been reduced in Vicarage Road and Church Street; remaining lengths are required to maintain visibility in close proximity to the junctions. |
| Victoria Road | No letters of objection | Introduce restrictions in Victoria Road as advertised. |
| Woodland Road | 2 Letters of support Residents inconvenienced by parental obstructive parking across their vehicular accesses. | It is recommended to preserve the restrictions fronting affected residents and in close proximity to the junction of Woodland Road with Springfield Road. The extent of restriction has been amended (2 B). in order to permit on street parking in an area unaffected by |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | frontages; were this length of restriction to remain, it was anticipated that parking would be displaced further into Woodland Road thus impacting on other residents. |
|--|--|--|