

Appendix C

Summary of Comments and Objections **Yapton: Bilsham Road, Proposed Waiting Restrictions**

Comments	Engineer's Response
<p>Arun District Councillor: Proposed restrictions are unfortunate but necessary. Restrictions should be accompanied by other changes in the vicinity to alleviate consequences of the new restriction.</p>	<p>Following discussions with the developer it has been agreed to reduce the length of restriction to the south of the Cinders Lane junction. The revised proposal would only cover the frontage of no.8 Bilsham Road, which has an existing dropped kerb and driveway. As it is unlawful to park obstructing a dropped kerb, the revised scheme would not remove any parking south of the junction.</p>
<p>Two properties south of the junction will lose on street parking as a result of the restriction and it is important that residents and customers of local businesses are able to park similarly to how they do presently, otherwise the TRO will cause economic and social harm.</p>	<p>North of the junction the revised restrictions end at the access to the yard at the rear of the convenience store. It is estimated that this will result in the loss of 2 parking spaces. It is considered that such parking can be safely accommodated in nearby lengths of road.</p>
<p>Moving parking further north or south along Bilsham Road would place parked cars nearer a bend in the road or nearer to other junctions.</p> <p>Requests that new restrictions are considered in the laybys on the opposite side of Bilsham Road. These could accommodate parking but a fair proportion of the laybys are used as permanent vehicle storage. A short stay restriction in these bays would help create a turnover of parking for the nearby businesses.</p>	<p>This TRO is funded by the developer at Cinders Lane and is limited in scope to dealing with safety issues at the junction with Bilsham Road. It is not possible at this stage to extend the developer's liability to include funding installation of a short stay restriction in the layby. Such a restriction could be considered via the WSCC process for requesting community TROs. This process would also be the best way to request a crossing.</p>
<p>Spaces in the laybys could also be made residents only to accommodate parking lost to residents from the new restriction.</p>	<p>Residents' parking permit schemes are only viable where the income received from selling permits covers the cost of administering the scheme. This can only be achieved if permit schemes are installed in a wide area, so a residents' parking scheme is unfortunately not an option in this case.</p>
<p>As this parking is on the opposite side of the road the Council should investigate the possibility of a pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>Local businesses could help with the parking deficit, the GP surgery has a large private car park, and the convenience store has a yard to the rear which could help alleviate parking issues.</p>	<p>The revised restriction would install double yellow lines from the northern kerbline of Cinders Lane to the northern kerbline of the entrance to the rear of Bilsham Stores. This would result in the loss of two parking spaces</p>
<p>Yapton Parish Council: fully supports making the Cinders Lane junction safe but has strong concerns about the length of proposed restrictions outside Bilsham Stores. The required 15 metres of line must be measured</p>	

<p>from the centre of Cinders Lane to avoid the restricting covering the frontage of Bilsham Stores, ensuring minimal impact on an essential local business.</p>	<p>but leaves the frontage of the store unrestricted as requested.</p>
<p>Resident of Yapton: Objects to the proposal as it will impact on trade of the hairdresser and convenience store, which are the only businesses of their type in the village. Villagers will be unable to park at the shops due to the reduction in parking space. Parked cars also reduce the speed of traffic.</p>	<p>As discussed above, the restriction has been modified to minimise the reduction in local parking. The frontage of the nearby businesses will remain unrestricted and it is considered that the two lost parking spaces can be accommodated safely nearby.</p>
<p>Resident of Bilsham Road: Objects to the proposed Order as it will cause issues with the two businesses. Customers need to be able to park to visit the businesses and there is insufficient parking in the laybys, which are always full. Residents of Medway Cottages will be prevented from parking outside their property. Residential parking needs to be provided for those affected.</p>	<p>As above, the proposal has been modified to mitigate the issues raised here.</p>
<p>Resident of Loveys Road: Objects to the proposal, especially with more houses being built in the rural village. Parking restriction will impact on local businesses which rely on passing trade. Without customer parking they will be ruined. The layby on the other side of the road is used by a resident to store cars, which takes up yet more parking. The GP surgery has its own parking but also needs access for emergency vehicles so restrictions will affect them too. Measures are needed to prevent harm to trade for these businesses. Parking will also be moved further along the road causing issues towards the village itself. The wide grassed area opposite the shop should be made into a parking area.</p>	<p>As above, the restriction has been modified to reduce the loss of parking in the original proposal. The double yellow lines outside the GP surgery will not affect access for emergency vehicles, which are exempt from this type of restriction. Access for such vehicles would therefore be improved by the proposal. The two parking spaces lost by the modified proposal can be accommodated safely nearby.</p>
<p>Resident of Bilsham Road: Objects to the Order: if introduced parking for residents of Medway Cottages will be much more difficult and possibly affect property values. It will also negatively affect local businesses.</p>	<p>The modifications to the original proposal resolve these issues as no parking will now be lost outside Medway Cottages.</p>
<p>Resident of Loveys Road: Objects to the Order – No further details supplied.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p>
<p>Resident of Bilsham Lane: Objects to the Order – WSCC Highways should have prevented development off Cinders Lane as the access point was always going to be an issue due to parking needed for businesses and a GP surgery.</p>	<p>It is common for a TRO to be required to safely accommodate access to a new development and the modified proposal is considered to be a good compromise between ensuring safety and minimising lost parking.</p>

WSCC have allowed this dangerous situation to occur and now wish to remedy it with a TRO which will affect the viability of two businesses which need the public to be able to stop outside. The TRO will push parking further north, creating further issues.	As above, the effect of the proposal on local businesses has been mitigated by modifying the restriction so that only two parking spaces are now to be lost.
Resident of Tack Lee Road: Objects to the Order – parked cars cause a degree of traffic calming, drivers will speed if unencumbered. Restrictions would move parked cars to other points along the road and reduce footfall into the convenience store and the barbers.	The reduced scheme only removes two parked cars from this part of Bilsham Road and this is unlikely to affect traffic speeds. The modifications mitigate the effect of the restrictions on the affected businesses.
Resident of Johnson Way: Objects to the Order – no further details supplied.	Objection noted.