

Waverley parking review 2021: Decision report

**A document explaining our final decisions on
proposed parking schemes following public
feedback**

Contents

Introduction	2
Farnham North division proposals.....	3
Farnham Central division proposals.....	6
Waverley Western Villages division proposals	9
Haslemere division proposals	12
Godalming South, Milford and Witley division proposals.....	14
Godalming North division proposals.....	16

Introduction

The Waverley Parking Review 2021 proposals, which were agreed at Waverley local committee on 12 November 2021, were advertised from 13 May to 10 June 2022. As part of this process, street notices were erected at each location, and notification cards were hand delivered to those properties immediately fronting proposed changes. In addition, a formal notice was published in the Surrey Advertiser and the Farnham and Haslemere Herald.

All these documents referred members of the public to drawings and a statement of reasons document available online via the webpage: www.surreycc.gov.uk/waverleyparking. This information was also made available to view at local libraries and council buildings as hard copies.

Responses to the advertisement were received via an online form through the webpage above, or by letters being sent to the following address: Waverley Parking Review 2021, Parking Team, Hazel House, Merrow Lane, Guildford, Surrey, GU4 7BQ. Members of the public were asked to submit either a support, comment or objection response.

During the advertisement period, there were 19 support responses, 20 comment responses and 47 objections. All these responses have been read and considered in full, and the total number of responses for each location have been listed. However, for the purpose of this report, the responses have been summarised into key points only, followed by analysis and a decision on how to proceed following these considered responses.

The decisions made in this report are final and there is no appeal process. Any further requests for changes to these agreed restrictions will need to be submitted as part of a future [parking review of Waverley](#).

At locations where no objections or comments were received there is no analysis and the proposals will - unless otherwise stated - be introduced 'as advertised' i.e. without any changes from the advertised proposal. Where changes have been made, there will usually be a revised drawing in addition to the written description.

Farnham North division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Catherine Powell](#).

Farnham

Upper Hale Road / Alma Lane / Bishops Road / Hope Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-1
- Objections: 5
- Comments: 3
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Visitor parking will be displaced to nearby surrounding streets or further into these streets.
- Restrictions will affect residents with no off-street parking.
- Restrictions will prevent school pick up and drop off parking.
- Restrictions in layby south of Tesco will prevent visitor parking to nearby properties.

The comments related to displacement to nearby streets; parking opposite Ocean's 11 being useful for parking and slowing traffic; parking on Hope Lane and Bishops Road not being a problem; and a suggestion to build a car park on the school's field.

Analysis

The existing single yellow line restrictions already prohibit the waiting of vehicles from 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday, during school peak times. These lengths of roads in the vicinity of the two staggered junctions have never been suitable areas to park on street, and this conversion to double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) is long overdue here. On street parking on Upper Hale Road has always been far more suitable to the west of the school's entrance where the existing restrictions end, and this conversion to double yellow lines will help to highlight this to drivers, as well as on adjoining junctions and approaches to them.

The layby to the south of Tesco on Upper Hale Road will benefit greatly from a 'no waiting at any time' restriction, to allow buses to pull into the layby up to the bus stop, but to also keep it clear for any pick ups and drop offs, or loading and unloading, including refuse collection, as well as helping to maintain access and sight lines for the Tesco car park. This will also include any deliveries for nearby properties. However, long term parking within the already small amount of space in-between the existing dropped kerbs within this layby, completely prevents these traffic movements from taking place over short periods throughout the day and evening, as the layby is effectively taken up for several hours by just one or two drivers. Therefore overall, the advertised restriction is deemed best for the area by meeting the needs of many more road users wishing to use the layby for brief periods only.

Parking on junctions is already prohibited in the Highway Code for a distance of 10m, and this is often used as a minimum distance for parking restrictions on junctions to maintain access, sight lines and turning. Parking on the junction of Hope Lane and Bishops Road has been seen to take place within this distance and even up to the give way markings, which is highly obstructive to turning and sight lines, even when only happening for a short period. Parking on Bishops Road between the car park entrance and the Hope Lane junction is also contributing to obstructed sight lines and turning in and out of Hope Lane, especially when larger vehicles are parked on Bishops Road, which is quite often the case here, and entirely obstructs the southbound lane. Double yellow lines here will help maintain two-way traffic flow, access and sight lines whilst still allowing

unloading and loading to take place or pick up and drop offs over brief periods, and similar to the Tesco layby, will be better for the area by meeting the needs of many more road users.

Farnborough Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-2
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

The Fairway

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-2
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Woodbourne

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-3
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Restrictions not worthwhile as will be ignored and will make drivers park over dropped kerbs more than currently.
- Restrictions will move parking to north side of the road and will be more problematic for nearby driveway access and sight lines as well as more hazardous for traffic travelling faster down the hill.

Analysis

The restrictions will be enforced as part of routine patrols of Waverley in the same way as all existing restrictions are enforced across Farnham and the borough. Drivers have been parking on this bend section near to the junction for many years now and this location has been complained about in previous parking reviews as well. Many drivers are also here for several hours throughout the day and double yellow lines tend to work well at keeping areas clear, as they have been doing on the junction.

Displacement to the north side outside numbers 6 to 10 is likely, although this is the outside of the bend and far from the junction and its approach. As the outside of the bend is less obstructive to sight lines than the inside of a bend (the shortest curve), and with the inside of the bend and approach to the junction clear, drivers travelling downhill towards the junction will have clear sight of the junction despite any parked cars on the north side.

As with most residential streets, any on street parking on Woodbourne will often be by driveways due to their frequency and staggered positions. However, there is no requirement to maintain sight lines for driveways, and parking is therefore allowed to take place between the starts and ends of dropped kerbs.

As with all parking restrictions, they will remain under review and subject to alteration or addition as part of future parking reviews.

Farnham Central division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Andy MacLeod](#).

Farnham

Hale Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-4
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

Comment referred to electric vehicle spaces not being used by such drivers and being ignored by non-electric vehicle drivers.

Analysis

Electric car use and on-street charging facilities are still relatively new, and Surrey County Council is actively working to map new spaces for drivers to see online and via apps, as well as working to meet the inevitable increase in demand for charging spaces across the county. Enforcement will be taking place as part of routine patrols across Waverley.

Upper South View

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-5
- Objections: 3
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- The free 2 hour restriction is useful for people to visit the town and park.
- Permit holders only is not necessary as spaces are not always full anyway.

One objection was a misunderstanding of the proposal as referred to the spaces being removed entirely, which is not being proposed as it is a conversion of shared use bays to permit holders only bays.

Analysis

Whilst the free 2 hour period in this part of Farnham town centre is certainly favoured by visitors, there is a long history of complaints from permit holding residents regarding spaces being taken up more by visitors than by residents. This is why permit holders only spaces have been proposed as part of several previous parking reviews in nearby streets such as Lower South View, Cherry Tree Close and Thorold Road, and where residents have no off street parking and rely entirely on on-street space being available. Whenever conversions from shared use (permit holders or 2 hours) to permit holders only are considered, it always follows majority support being proven by residents first for such a change, and always includes an assessment regarding the number of bays in relation to the number of properties without off street parking. There will continue to be a good provision of shared use spaces in and around Farnham town centre, especially with so many fronting properties with off-street parking and no need for a permit holders only restriction. However, for those residents without off-street parking, we will continue to review existing restrictions following requests

or complaints that we receive, whilst aiming to keep the right balance between the needs of residents and the needs of visitors.

St Cross Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-5
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Cherry Tree Close

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-5
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection related to the free 2 hour restriction being useful for visitors to the town. The comment related to the permit holders only spaces not being necessary with spaces on Lower South View.

Analysis

Cherry Tree Close has a longstanding history of complaints regarding a lack of on-street space for its residents, and often relating to space being taken up by non-residents visiting the town. As there are a very limited number of spaces in Cherry Tree Close for its many residents with no off-street parking, these proposals are deemed to be a priority here, with some existing shared use spaces remaining for visitors as well.

Long Garden Walk West

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-6
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection related to the spaces being useful for people visiting the town.

Analysis

The objection is a slight misunderstanding of what is proposed here, as the space was never installed on the ground as part of the previous parking review following late upheld objections regarding driveway access. Therefore, there is no space being taken away on the ground, only on the Traffic Regulation Order for this street.

West Street

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-7
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 0

- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

One objection is a slight misunderstanding of what is proposed as it referred to double yellow lines outside 2 and 3 Reliance Cottages, however, the proposed double yellow lines end just over halfway across the front of 1 Reliance Cottages, as shown on the advertised drawing number 2021-7. The second objection is one that has been repeated for a few advertised locations in Farnham as part of this review, regarding space being taken away from the town. However, this is a conversion of part of a single yellow line to double yellow lines for sight line and access reasons.

Analysis

As above.

Abbey Street

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-8
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The comment referred to an enforcement issue regarding the existing 2 hour restriction in Abbey Street and not regarding the proposal.

Analysis

As above.

Broomleaf Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-9
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Ridgway Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-10
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

The Hart

Overview:

- Drawing number: No Drawing
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Waverley Western Villages division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [David Harmer](#).

Frensham

Priory Lane / A287 / The Street / Bacon Lane / Pond Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-11, 2021-12 and 2021-13
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection appears to be a misunderstanding of what is proposed as seems to refer to additional restrictions being installed in the vicinity of the school, however, the proposal is to formalise the existing installed restrictions only.

Analysis

As above.

Rushmoor

Sandy Lane junction with Tilford Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-14
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection related to there not being a parking problem in Sandy Lane needing to be resolved with parking restrictions.

Analysis

The proposal is to double yellow line the junction of Sandy Lane and Tilford Road and its approach within Sandy Lane, as highlighted by residents as being an issue with regards to parked vehicles. The remaining majority length of Sandy Lane will remain unrestricted.

Churt

Jumps Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-15
- Objections: 15
- Comments: 3
- Support: 5
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Parking on Jumps Road is convenient for people visiting the sculpture park, the pub and the Devil's Jump.
- There are no issues with parking on Jumps Road.
- Further parking restrictions on Jumps Road would jeopardise the future of the Sculpture Park.
- Parking would displace further into Jumps Road and would be worse.
- The Sculpture Park recently significantly reduced the number of visitors allowed to enter the park each day. This has massively reduced parking congestion and a further review should be carried out again before additional restrictions are considered.
- Parked cars help reduce vehicle speeds.
- Restrictions should extend further westwards on both sides of Jumps Road to cover the bends.
- The existing parking restrictions are enough.
- The double yellow lines outside the Bel and Dragon pub will prevent deliveries.
- The businesses are being unfairly penalised by further restrictions.

The comments related to the following: -

- The restrictions are moving the problem onto bends further into Jumps Road.
- Restrictions should be extended by driveways.
- Parked cars will continue to affect pedestrians and cyclists with regards to safety.
- The grass verges where parking is being allowed will continue to be damaged.
- Driveways located opposite the parking will continue to experience access issues.
- Double yellow lines should be on both sides of the street not just in certain places.

Analysis

The detailed descriptions and reasons for each proposed additional length of restrictions in Jumps Road was explained in the Statement of Reasons document available online during and since the advertisement under our following webpage [Waverley Parking Review 2021](#)

The proposed additional lengths of double yellow lines on Jumps Road are primarily aiming to manage the visitor parking in this part of Jumps Road, which is by and approaching the Sculpture Park and Bel and Dragon Pub. Where it has been deemed safe and unobstructive to park, unrestricted gaps in the proposed double yellow lines have been left, with the restrictions intended to prevent the obstructive parking from taking place, with regards to maintaining access, sight lines and two-way traffic flow. The scheme's design is a compromise between the needs of visitors, nearby residents and passing traffic. By allowing parking to continue in the vicinity of the Sculpture Park in designated areas, displacement further into Jumps Road is being kept to a minimum, but this is something which will need to be monitored.

It is understood that the Sculpture Park has made much appreciated efforts to control and reduce the numbers of visitors each day, and that this has reportedly improved the parking in the area. However, visitors to the Sculpture Park will often still prefer to park as close to the entrance as possible, and following the previous parking review proposal to restrict the inside of the bend for a significant distance, there has always remained several sections of Jumps Road near to the park that have been either highly obstructive or quite obstructive to park on, and these places still remain regardless. Therefore, is it still believed that these additional restrictions are necessary to ensure that sight lines, access, road safety and two-way traffic flow are maintained as best as reasonably possible along this most popular part of Jumps Road for parking.

Driveways have been incorporated in the restriction design as best as reasonably possible.

The reduction in the overall number of cars parked on street and the improvements in traffic flow and sight lines as a result will benefit all road users, and having parked cars remaining in certain places should not result in any noticeable increase in the speed of passing traffic.

The loading and unloading of goods are allowed to take place on double yellow lines, therefore deliveries to the pub can continue to take place on the proposed double yellow lines adjacent to it.

Hindhead

Tower Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-16 and 2021-17
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 3
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- The restrictions on the side of the bus stops may mean drivers having to cross the road to collect their children.
- The restrictions may lead to more drivers parking across dropped kerbs opposite the restrictions.
- Parking will be displaced to Glenville Gardens.

The comments related to the following: -

- Questioned the necessity for further restrictions at further cost.
- Possible increase in speeds with parking on one side.
- Access Protection Markings should be installed for all driveways opposite the restrictions.

Analysis

Drivers are allowed to stop on double yellow lines to allow passengers to board and alight and may not necessarily be required to park on the opposite side to collect children from the school buses using the bus stops. Parking across dropped kerbs is a problem throughout the county during school peak times and is very difficult to enforce when drivers are often only briefly causing an obstruction. Generally, the additional double yellow lines will help to further control the parking throughout the north section of Tower Road and will help to maintain traffic flow and sight lines for all vehicles. The south section of Tower Road currently has a similar layout of double yellow lines and has worked well, with only the proposed extension south of Glenville Gardens being deemed necessary as part of this review. Any displacement issues within Glenville Gardens can be assessed as part of a future parking review of Waverley, although only a small number of cars would be displaced as part of the extension. Regarding access protection markings, residents are required to apply and pay for these markings individually if they wish to apply. Information can be found on Surrey's webpage [Access protection markings \(H bars\) - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/access-protection-markings-h-bars)

Haslemere division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [John Robini](#).

Haslemere

Lion Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-18
- Objections: 3
- Comments: 6
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Double yellow lines should be placed along the east side of the street instead, from the zebra crossing to Underwood Road as parking on this side causes the congestion.
- Proposed double yellow lines favours drivers only and not pedestrians and school children.
- Speeds will increase making road less safe.

One objection was a misunderstanding of what is being proposed as it referred to an increase in restrictions being needed rather than a decrease. However, this objector has not understood the advertised information as the new zebra crossing and its associated white zigzag markings superseded the previously installed school keep clear and double yellow line restrictions here, and these are shown as a revocation on the Traffic Regulation Order plan to reflect the new crossing layout on the ground. The additional restrictions are shown in red, which the objector did not mention specifically.

The comments related to the following: -

- Double yellow lines should be installed along the east side of the street.
- School keep clear (no stopping) restrictions should be installed on the east side of the street.
- The proposed restrictions are not enough to resolve all the issues in the street.
- Double yellow lines also required on the junction with Underwood Road.
- Some drivers block the pavement and more double yellow lines are needed to prevent this.

Analysis

The footway parking on the eastern side was acknowledged in the statement of reasons document explaining the proposed restrictions here. It was also stated that this passing place proposal is a compromise between the needs of residents and the needs of visitors to park on street.

In the vicinity of the two schools, Lion Lane has a large number of properties without off street parking, and many of those residents have to park on street and do so entirely on the carriageway. These parked vehicles impact on two-way traffic flow throughout the street even before the influx of school visitor parking at peak school times, and generally the road is not at all suited to such large numbers of parked cars at one time. However, as with almost all schools, drivers continue to seek to park as close to the school as they possibly can, and it is a very difficult balancing act when proposing restrictions in the vicinity of schools as it has to be considered where all these visitors will go instead. The carriageway section of Lion Lane between the zebra crossing and Underwood Road is up to one metre wider than the rest of Lion Lane and has significantly wider footways as well. Whilst it is certainly far from ideal to have drivers park on the footways on the east side, the remaining lengths of Lion Lane are even less suited to take additional visitor parking. All things considered, heavily restricting the eastern side of Lion Lane would create an unmanageable level of displacement, and likely would result in even more problematic obstructions elsewhere along the

street. Passing places are generally very effective at maintaining the ability of drivers to pass each other within areas of dense parking and being on the inside of the bend (the shortest curve) helps to maintain sight lines more significantly. The section of road was chosen to incorporate two existing driveway dropped kerbs to allow the greatest distance of passing place to be proposed with only a small reduction on resident parking. It is fully understood why many people are calling for further restrictions, but all things considered, this passing place was deemed to be the best step to make with regards to additional restrictions outside the school at this time. As with all on-street parking restrictions and requests, we will continue to review the location along with other issues in Waverley.

Lion Mead

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-19
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

St Christopher's Green

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-20
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Godalming South, Milford and Witley division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Paul Follows](#).

Godalming

Shackstead Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-21
- Objections: 9
- Comments: 0
- Support: 4
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- There is no issue here.
- Residents will be forced to park further away from where they live.
- Residents will be forced to park further up the hill towards the mini roundabout where the road narrows again.
- The restrictions should only apply for a short period in the morning and afternoon Monday to Friday.
- The proposal is too simple and will not resolve the problem.
- The road should be widened.
- The road should be made one-way.
- Permit parking should be introduced.
- The road is only busy for a couple hours of the day.
- 10 parking spaces are being lost for an issue which is only for a few hours each day.
- People will park closer to the mini roundabout.
- Alternative measures should be considered instead, including restrictions for HGVs; reviewing the bus timetable; using smaller buses; changes to traffic lights; priority systems; build outs; a review and enforcement of speeds limits.

Analysis

Whilst it is understood that the issues regarding two-way traffic flow will be worse during peak traffic times and will attract far more attention when buses or other large vehicles are unable to pass, it cannot be accepted that this is only a problem at peak times. During the parking review, the issue of drivers of all vehicles struggling to pass oncoming traffic in the vicinity of where the passing place has been proposed was seen to be taking place at multiple times throughout the day and going into the early evening. The continuous length of parked vehicles where the road narrows most significantly will affect all drivers meeting at this point.

Parked cars reducing the width of the carriageway at a narrowing resulting in vehicles being unable to pass with some being forced to reverse can already be classed as obstruction under highway law and is unacceptable at any time. The public highway is intended to allow vehicles to pass and repass, and no one has a right to park on the public highway, especially where obstructions are being caused. A passing place here is therefore a reasonable compromise proposal that still allows the vast majority of parking to continue along the street. Passing places have also proven to be highway effective when placed in areas of dense parking.

Whilst the remaining length of road towards the mini roundabout does vary at different points, where the footway begins outside number 53 is by far the most significant narrowing of the carriageway width and is the point where meeting vehicles have been repeatedly getting stuck. Site visits during the parking view confirmed this location to be the most problematic for passing traffic and the passing place was carefully sighted at the most suitable position to help several cars or one large vehicle or bus to pull in to let oncoming traffic pass.

The double yellow line passing place is 30m long. On average, this is 6 parked car lengths, not 10 as some people have stated in their objections. It is understood that the displacement of these 6 cars will take place elsewhere along Shackstead Lane, and this displaced parking will be monitored along with the effectiveness of the passing place. The remaining length of Shackstead Lane towards the mini roundabout has properties with off street parking and several extensive dropped kerb layouts. Therefore, there would not be any continuous line of parked cars along this section as there currently is outside the properties without off-street parking. However, should there be a need for a second passing place further up the hill towards the mini roundabout, this can be considered as part of a future parking review of Waverley.

As the issue regarding passing traffic has been seen to be occurring at all times and whenever traffic meets at this point, it is not deemed to be a restriction which should only operate at certain times of the day only. Shackstead Lane is a well-used street with steady flows of traffic as it links the A3100 with a very large cluster of extensive residential streets located south of the town centre. As passing places need to be kept clear to function, any part time restriction is also far more likely to be viewed more casually by drivers and will be more open to abuse, but ultimately it is deemed to be required at all times hence why double yellow lines have been proposed.

Significant alterations to the highway are not considered as part of parking reviews. Due to the embankment taper, road widening would not be feasible here and a one-way system would be highly disproportionate to the problem and at the detriment of the wider area. Permit parking is not proposed based on single requests but would not be feasible here regardless, as parking would not be formalised on this street with parking bays because the lane is not entirely suitable for on-street parking in the first place.

Overall, it is believed that a passing place on this part of Shackstead Lane is long overdue and will result in significant improvements to two-way traffic flow with limited disruption to residents without off-street parking.

Godalming North division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Penny Rivers](#).

Godalming

Catteshall Road junction with Catteshall Lane (Lawnwood Cottages)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-22
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- The area being proposed for restrictions is required by residents to park.
- Restrictions will reduce space for residents.
- Permit parking should be proposed.

Analysis

Drivers should be aware that it's already prohibited in the Highway Code not to park within 10m of a bend or junction, of which this location is both. Therefore, this location should not be viewed as parking spaces as drivers should never have been parking here in the first place. As stated in the statement of reasons document, when vehicles are parked in this area, it creates a significant obstruction for turning and sight lines. Drivers are forced to drive partly onto the wrong side of the road travelling around the bend and larger vehicles such as lorries are unable to turn due to the sharpness of the bend and junction. Photographic and video evidence submitted by residents has shown the obstructive implications of vehicles parking in this area upon passing traffic, especially lorries. The proposed restrictions aim to prevent this from happening in the future and will help enforce the Highway Code.

Tudor Road junction with Tudor Circle

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-23
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The comment is a request for a permit scheme in a separate street and not related to this proposal. The support response requests additional restrictions which have not been proposed and cannot be considered at this stage.

Analysis

As above.

Summers Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2021-24
- Objections: 0

- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.