

	Objection/Comments	Comments from Director Communities and Infrastructure
C1	<p><u>Resident of Chanctonbury Road</u></p> <p>Objects strongly to the proposal and asks why residents should suffer after County forced them to live with a third school.</p> <p>Suggests off-road parking should be provided on the verges as has been done at the north end of Chanctonbury Road</p> <p>Believes there shouldn't be any parking restrictions.</p>	<p>R1</p> <p>This TRO scheme is designed to reinforce rule 243 of the Highway Code. It will improve safety and visibility for pedestrians and drivers alike and minimise the congestion caused by obstructive vehicles.</p> <p>The comment raised concerning the number of schools falls outside of this TRO request.</p> <p>The Grass crete measures installed in the verge, was designed to protect the verges from further vehicle damage rather than provide facility to park on them.</p> <p>The local community through the local member generated concerns of hazardous parking, which has led to this TRO scheme.</p>
C2	<p><u>Resident of Chanctonbury Road</u></p> <p>Has no problem with parking restrictions on the eastern side of the road as this will not restrict homeowners.</p> <p>Notes that as most of the houses in Chanctonbury Road have shared drives they have to park a 2nd car on the road. Questions why if County is so concerned about traffic they allowed another school to be built</p>	<p>R2</p> <p>This TRO scheme is designed to reinforce rule 243 of the Highway Code. It will improve safety and visibility for pedestrians and drivers alike and minimise the congestion caused by obstructive vehicles.</p> <p>Public highway is for all to use, however, consideration has to be given to other highway users to avoid hazardous and unnecessary obstructions.</p> <p>The local community through the local member generated concerns of hazardous parking, which has led to this TRO scheme.</p> <p>The comment raised regarding the number of schools falls outside of this TRO request.</p>
C3	<p><u>Resident of Chanctonbury Road</u></p> <p>Agrees something needs to be done regarding the parking, however it would be an absolute nightmare to have restrictions outside their house. As most houses have shared drives parking off road is not always possible and does not accommodate visitor</p>	<p>R3</p> <p>This TRO scheme is designed to reinforce rule 243 of the Highway Code. It will improve safety and visibility for pedestrians and drivers alike and minimise the congestion caused by obstructive vehicles.</p>

<p>cars. Does not think visitors should be expected to park in the car park at the end of the road.</p> <p>As a driver is amazed by ridiculous places people park on corners across driveways etc with no thought for other road users.</p> <p>As a pedestrian with young children with the loss of the footpath through Oakmeeds they are forced to walk along the side of a busy road with no verge, where cars park on the pavements meaning they have to cross between parked cars which is dangerous. Asks if this area could have parking restrictions or bollards installed.</p> <p>Believes parking should not be allowed in bus stops, on the brow of the hill opposite Holmsdale Road or on corners/junctions i.e. Queens Crescent and other cul-de-sacs.</p> <p>Believes the double yellow lines in tile TQ3118SWN is totally unnecessary and the waiting restriction should reflect the school times only. As the residents have shared drives questions where they are going to park and what effect these restrictions will have on their house values</p> <p>Believes the single yellow lines restriction shown in Tile Plans TQ311SWN & TQ118SWS on the east side of Chanctonbury Road should be double yellow lines. Believes it would be dangerous for people to park in this location at all as it is on a hill & a corner and parking would obstruct visibility. Also, suggests that the restriction is moved south of Holmesdale Road as at this location the verge disappears and drivers park on the pavement which obstructs visibility for drivers turning right out of Holmesdale Road</p> <p>Believes the restrictions are not being proposed to protect residents but to make it easier for traffic to access the new school that was greatly opposed by the local community. Believes this is a short-sighted view. To reduce</p>	<p>Public highway is for all to use, however, consideration has to be given to those who use it to avoid hazardous and unnecessary obstructions.</p> <p>As mentioned above the concentration of restrictions are located at key areas of the road, any parking shift as a result will be minimal.</p> <p>The footpath being referred to in this comment is Public Rights of Way (PROW) footpath 21BH, which leads to the school grounds and is, or will be closed for security reasons.</p> <p>The alternate route may not have a verge adjacent to the road, however, there is a suitable width footway for pedestrian use. Regardless of verge availability, there will still be parked cars stationary in non-restricted areas. Therefore, finding a safe or safer point to cross, I would recommend using dropped crossing points.</p> <p>There has been no report from bus companies to suggest a problem with loading and unloading of passengers. However, if there are specific locations that genuinely require a bus stop cage, WSCC can investigate and implement if required.</p> <p>The SYL have been designed to provide a safe and balanced environment to manage live traffic during peak times and maintain parking capacity during the evenings. If further restrictions are needed, this would need to be addressed through a separate TRO.</p> <p>Any additional restrictions approved through the CLC will require a new TRO.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to address the initial parking safety concerns. This TRO scheme is designed to provide a balanced and safer area for resident and non-</p>
--	---

<p>traffic attending the school on a daily basis believes the roads and pathways need to be safer for pedestrians to use. After years of campaigning a crossing is being installed in London Road but Chanctonbury Road also needs to be crossed. With the new school site imminent there will be even more children and a pedestrian crossing in Chanctonbury Road is essential. Without parked cars to slow the traffic down it will be more dangerous to walk.</p> <p>Asks how the restrictions will be policed as numerous visits have been made by local police to sort out the traffic around the school but this is only effective when they are in attendance.</p> <p>Hopes that the Order will be reconsidered and re-advertised giving residents the opportunity to have their say again</p>	<p>resident parking.</p> <p>Requests for any type of pedestrian crossings falls outside of this TRO request.</p> <p>District and Borough Council Parking Teams are responsible for enforcing the parking restrictions. Police can be involved if the nature of the hazard threatens the public.</p> <p>Public consultation was carried out for this TRO, as is the normal procedure for all TRO requests.</p> <p>If further additions are required this will need a new TRO.</p>
--	--

<p>C4</p>	<p><u>Burgess Hill Town councillor</u></p> <p>Proposal fails to address the problems due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School traffic. Parents parking on grass verges, blocking drives and creating annoying and hazardous conditions ▪ Traffic travelling to the station using the route as a shortcut from the by-pass and Hammonds Ridge ▪ Workers parking in Potters Lane inconveniencing residents ▪ A bus route with no provision for bus stops or passing places ▪ Speeding motorists ▪ Traffic jams when school traffic and large vehicles meet <p>Believes that it would be foolish to agree changes to parking until the new school starts in 2012 when it is likely traffic will increase significantly and the effectiveness of the increased parking area can be assessed</p> <p>Believes the criterion for any parking restrictions should be to minimise inconvenience to residents who are not responsible for the parking problems that have been caused by the school and various housing developments. Does not believe planners and Councillors addressed most of the issues</p> <p>Suggests in the short term only minor changes are made with Queens Crescent double yellow lined in part and a low level speed hump to coincide with the footpath from Oakmeeds, designed to double as a crossing</p> <p>Various other areas could be double yellow lined to ensure passing places and prevent dangerous and inconsiderate parking. These measures would have to be agreed with residents and consultation with</p>	<p>R4</p> <p>This TRO scheme is designed to reinforce rule 243 of the Highway Code. It will improve safety and visibility for pedestrians and drivers alike and minimise the congestion caused by obstructive vehicles.</p> <p>Double yellow line restrictions legally cover both sides of the restriction line. Therefore, this falls under the enforcement of the District/Borough Council.</p> <p>Public highway is for all to use, however, consideration has to be given to other highway users to avoid hazardous and unnecessary obstructions.</p> <p>There has been no report from bus companies to suggest a problem with loading and unloading of passengers. However, if there are specific locations that genuinely require a bus stop cage, WSCC can investigate and implement if required.</p> <p>There is no evidence of a speed issue in this location.</p> <p>Requests for any type of pedestrian crossings falls outside of this TRO request.</p> <p>If further additions are required this will need a new TRO.</p> <p>Public consultation was carried out for this TRO, as is the normal procedure for all TRO requests, this also includes Sussex Police.</p>
------------------	--	---

<p>Burgess Hill police staff.</p> <p>Must bear in mind that most of the houses have shared drives and alternative parking areas are not available so the timing of restrictions is significant. Except for rush hour and school run period for most of the time the roads are clear</p> <p>Suggests the restrictions opposite the 2 school cul-de-sacs are pointless and will inconvenience the residents, increase the speed of traffic entering the school and encourage more parking in the cul-de-sac. Suggests the restriction in Holmesdale is also pointless and will also increase traffic in the cul-de-sac</p> <p>Believes the scheme needs to be renegotiated and selected yellow lining be proposed once the school is up and running.</p>	
--	--

<p>C5</p>	<p><u>Burgess Hill Town Council</u></p> <p>Planning Committee felt that the proposed Order would not address the issues</p> <p>Comments made during the design consultation were reiterated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Order was premature and should be held back until the impact of the changes as a result of the School had been assessed ▪ Believes the solution was out of proportion to the problem. It was felt traffic congestion only occurred at certain times of day yet residents would be penalised throughout the day ▪ Believe commuter parking may be reduced by advertising the reasonable cost of the Queens Crescent car park and opening up the closed section to create more space. ▪ As people park on grass verges were not clear how restrictions at junctions would improve visibility ▪ Requested a 20mph speed limit be considered once the work at the school had been completed. 	<p>R5</p> <p>This TRO scheme is designed to reinforce rule 243 of the Highway Code. It will improve safety and visibility for pedestrians and drivers alike and minimise the congestion caused by obstructive vehicles.</p> <p>If the CLC considers it necessary, they may defer the scheme.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to address the initial parking safety concerns. This TRO scheme is designed to provide a balanced and safer area for resident and non-resident parking.</p> <p>Double yellow line restrictions legally cover road, verge and footway. Enforcement responsibility falls under the District/Borough Council.</p> <p>Amending the cost of private parking falls outside of this forum. Car parks run by third party groups are responsible for managing and reviewing their parking charges.</p> <p>There is no evidence of a speed issue in this location.</p> <p>If there is a legitimate speed limit request, it would require a separate TRO, to be dealt with outside of this TRO request.</p>
------------------	--	--