

12/04/12

A resident of Corseley Road objected to the proposals, stating that they would affect people's ability to travel to work. It was also argued that most residents in the roads affected had driveways in any case.

Officer Comment - The proposals have been designed, not to discriminate against residents, commuters or local shops/businesses, but to provide a fairer balance between these user groups and to minimise conflict. The proposals in general are a result of comments made to the County Council by residents, many of whom need to park on-street.

13/04/12

A resident of Parkside voiced their support for the proposals.

15/04/12

A resident of Garden Wood Road objected to the proposals, stating that they would prevent her from parking out of university term time.

Officer Comment – If it were not possible to park in a driveway or garage, an option would be open to put an additional vehicle registration on a Resident's Permit or use Visitor Permits.

17/04/12

A resident of Blount Avenue objected to the proposals, stating that vehicles would displace into Blount Avenue and make it impossible for residents to park. A request was made to re-advertise the proposals.

Officer Comment - The proposals for Crossways Avenue and Parkside have been put forward in response to long standing concerns over safety/access. It is only possible to propose waiting restrictions in roads where problems have been reported/identified. It is not possible to pre-empt, and propose additional restrictions where it is suspected that displacement may occur. The effects of any changes, if implemented, would be monitored in roads such as Blount Avenue for a period of approximately six months and further changes would be considered by officers if appropriate.

18/04/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road objected to the proposals, stating that they were not justified and would create additional safety/access problems.

18/04/12

A resident of Parkside voiced their support for the proposals.

18/04/12

A resident of Garden Wood Road objected to the proposals, stating that the parking bays should be located on the south side of the road.

Officer Comment – It has been indicated by a number of residents during previous consultations that the current arrangement, with parking on the north side of the road, would be preferred. It is also considered that parking on the southern side would create additional risk as residents/visitors would then have to cross the

road. It is envisaged that by incorporating this road into the CPZ, visibility and access would be improved.

19/04/12

A resident of Parkside voiced their support for the proposals.

23/04/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road voiced their support for the proposals.

23/04/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue objected to the proposals, stating that residents and visitors would be prevented from parking.

24/04/12

A resident of Forest View Road objected to the proposals, stating that they would make it more difficult and costly to maintain child care and work in London. It was argued that additional bus services should be laid on early in the morning.

Officer Comment – The comments regarding bus services will be passed to the relevant officers.

25/04/12

A resident of Copyhold Road objected to the proposals, stating that they would make it more difficult for residents and visitors to park as there was not enough space.

Officer Comment – The number of parking spaces proposed for the carriageway is by and large the same as at present. Unfortunately, it is not possible to guarantee that a parking space will always be available in Copyhold Road or any other road. However, a parking permit would allow residents to park nearby in Brooklands Way. Some free limited waiting bays have also been proposed to enable visits etc.

25/04/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue voiced their support for the proposals.

26/04/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue voiced their support for the proposals but stressed the need to reduce the cost of parking at the railway station.

27/04/12

A resident of Holtye Road objected to the proposals, stating that they would displace vehicles into other residential roads as well as increase speeds etc in those roads where restrictions were in place.

Officer Comment - The effects of any changes, if implemented, would be monitored for a period of approximately six months and further changes would be considered by officers if appropriate.

28/04/12

A resident of Garden Wood Road voiced their support for the proposals.

28/04/12

A resident of The Dakins voiced their support for the proposals for West Hill and suggested some additional minor changes.

Officer Comment – It is proposed to continue to monitor the arrangements at this location and consider changes in the future if appropriate.

28/04/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road voiced their support for the proposals.

28/04/12

A resident of Mill Close objected to the proposals, stating that the CPZ would not achieve its aims. A suggestion was made to provide additional cheaper parking in the town.

Officer Comment – The County Council is not directly responsible for off-street parking provision in East Grinstead or the charges associated with it. This is the responsibility of the landowner, be it Mid Sussex District Council or a private company such as Network Rail.

29/04/12

Multiple objections were received from a property in Hurst Farm Road, stating that parking permits should be free and the hours of control less restrictive. It was argued that the station car park should be extended before any CPZ controls were introduced.

Officer Comment - Charging for parking within a CPZ is ring fenced and reflects the need for the County Council to cover the set up/on-going costs as well as those associated with enforcement.

29/04/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue voiced their support for the proposals.

29/04/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue objected to the proposal to introduce restrictions on a Saturday, stating that there were no problems then. A request was made for Monday to Friday restrictions only.

Officer Comment – The proposed restrictions match those already in place in surrounding roads and it is considered that a continuation of these is consistent and would reduce confusion. Only one side of Crossways Avenue is proposed to have a restriction and so those parking for longer periods at the weekend could park accordingly.

30/04/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road objected to the proposals, stating that they were unnecessary and unjustified.

30/04/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road voiced their support for the proposals.

30/04/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue objected to the proposals, stating that they would prevent residents, visitors and commuters from parking and move problems to other areas.

Officer Comment – Only one side of Crossways Avenue is proposed to have a restriction and this would only apply over a two hour period.

30/04/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue objected to the proposals, stating that a CPZ would be the preferred solution.

30/04/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue objected to the proposals and stated that the Monday to Saturday restrictions as well as double yellow lines at the junction of Crossways Avenue and Parkside were not necessary.

01/05/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road voiced their support for the proposals.

01/05/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road voiced their support for the proposals although did express concern over where commuters could park.

01/05/12

Two objections were received from a property in Blount Avenue, each stating that no consideration had been given to the needs of residents in that road and in particular to the impact of displaced vehicles.

01/05/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road objected to the proposals, stating that vehicles would be displaced further along the road and pose additional risks.

01/05/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue objected to the proposals, stating that they would prevent residents from parking outside of their own home.

02/05/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue voiced their support for the proposals but stated that the double yellow lines at the junction of Crossways Avenue and Parkside were not necessary.

Officer Comment – The proposed double yellow lines can be downgraded without the need to re-advertise.

02/05/12

A resident of Byron Grove objected to the proposals, stating that they were a waste of money and that additional parking was required at the station rather than a CPZ.

02/05/12

A resident of Crossways Avenue objected to the proposals, stating that they would prevent residents from parking outside of their own home.

02/05/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road objected to the proposals, stating that commuter parking in Brooklands Way caused no problem. It was also stated that the proposals for Hurst Farm Road were too restrictive and that not enough parking was being provided.

Officer Comment – The proposals for Brooklands Way came about largely in response to concerns from residents over the lack of parking and hence are considered justified. The proposed hours of restriction in Hurst Farm Road match those already in place in surrounding roads and it is considered that a continuation of these would be consistent, reduce confusion and reduce the need for signage. It is proposed to continue to monitor the arrangements at this location and consider changes (e.g. increasing the parking stock) in the future if appropriate.

02/05/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road voiced their support for the proposals but expressed to review restrictions further along the road as well as in West Hill and Brooklands Way.

03/05/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road voiced their support for the proposals

03/05/12

A resident of Heathcote Drive objected to the proposals, stating that vehicles would be displaced into that road.

03/05/12

An objection was received from a commuter who parks in Garden Wood Road, stating that more alternative parking should be provided.

03/05/12

A resident of Blount Avenue objected to the proposals, stating that vehicles would be displaced into the road and that their previous concerns had been ignored.

03/05/12

A resident of Blount Avenue objected to the proposals, stating that vehicles would be displaced into the road and that their previous concerns had been ignored, thus making the process undemocratic.

03/05/12

A resident of Blount Avenue objected to the proposals, stating that vehicles would be displaced into the road and that their previous concerns had been ignored.

Officer Comment – Blount Avenue was included in previous CPZ proposals for the area but due to a 65% objection rate overall, those proposals were dropped. Since that time, officers have only

been made of one concern over visibility/access in Blount Avenue and therefore, proposals for the eastern end of the road have been modified accordingly. It is only possible to propose waiting restrictions in roads where problems have been reported/identified e.g. Crossways Avenue and Parkside. It is not possible to pre-empt, and propose additional restrictions where it is suspected that displacement may occur. The effects of any changes, if implemented, would be monitored in roads such as Blount Avenue for a period of approximately six months and further changes would be considered by officers if appropriate.

A number of representations were received after the cut off date of 3rd May. These are outlined below for further consideration but have not been included within the main body of the report.

04/05/12

A resident objected to the proposed double yellow lines in Crossways Avenue and Campbell Crescent.

06/05/12

An objection was received from the Association of Imberhorne Residents, stating that it had not been consulted.

09/05/12

A resident of Bluebell Close objected to the proposals, stating that they were a money grabbing exercise and that visitors to the town would find it increasingly difficult to park. A request was made for parking to be made free.

10/05/12

A resident of Hurst Farm Road objected to the proposals, stating that they would be required to park on the other side of the road, which would lead to concerns over crossing the road. Concerns were also raised over the impact upon vehicle speeds.

14/05/12

A representative of the Association of Imberhorne Residents voiced their support for the proposals but outlined a potential impact upon parents picking up children from the school, as well as in roads such as Blount Avenue and Halsford Park Avenue.

Officer Recommendations

That the North Mid Sussex County Local Committee considers the responses to the formal consultation held in East Grinstead and that the Head of Legal & Democratic Services be authorised to make the proposed Traffic Regulation Order as advertised,

- **CPZ Zone A extension (Brooklands Way, Copyhold Road, Hurst Farm Road, Garden Wood Road and West Hill).**
- **Extension of double/single yellow lines in Blount Avenue (eastern end), Campbell Crescent (eastern end) Crossways Avenue, Fairfield Road, Parkside and Turners Hill Road (eastern end)**

save for the following amendments

- 1. Downgrade proposed single yellow line in Copyhold Road (northern access road) so that it applies for two hours a day, Monday to Friday.**
- 2. Reinstate the proposed Monday to Saturday restriction in the West Hill lay-by, so to negate the need for signage.**
- 3. Downgrade proposed double yellow lines at the junction of Crossways Avenue and Parkside to a single yellow line that applies from 10am – 11am, Monday to Saturday.**
- 4. Drop proposed double yellow lines at the entrance to the school in Crossways Avenue and revert back to a single yellow line on the southern side that applies from 10am – 11am, Monday to Saturday.**