

APPENDIX B – CRW2002

Consultation Response Summary

	<b>Objection/Comments</b>	<b>Comments from Director of Highways Transport &amp; Planning</b>
	<p>Resident of Rother Crescent</p> <p>Objects as when they visit Leveret Lane vehicles are parked inappropriately, half in the bay and half out of the bay, which reduces the available parking space.</p> <p>This street is in close proximity to two schools and parents and carers use the on-street parking to pickup or drop off their kids.</p>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>Advisory disabled bays do not have any legal standing - the police and West Sussex County Council cannot take any action should other motorists choose to park in the bay.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, this section of the TRO proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>
	<p>Resident of Leveret Lane</p> <p>Parking bay in front of no 9: Vehicle is often parked in such a way that half is parked in the disabled area and half is parked on the normal road No other person is allowed to park in the disabled bay even if that person has a disabled blue badge. The homeowner demands the car is removed even if the driver is an elderly people</p> <p>Parking bay in front of no 13: The homeowners will not allow any other vehicle to park in the bay.</p>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>It is worth noting that disabled bays are not reserved for the sole use of the applicant and are available for use by any motorist displaying a valid blue badge.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>

APPENDIX B – CRW2002

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>Resident of Hare Lane</p> <p>Oppose this proposal as it will put more pressure on parking in their street as it is in close proximity to the school and people come to pick and drop off their kids so their road is already very busy.</p> <p>They have observed cars parked most of the time sticking out of the bays.</p> <p>Questions the need for the bay on the road outside No. 13 as the driveway of that property has space for 2 cars.</p>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>The advisory bays have been in place for many years. Nowadays new disabled bay applications from residents with off-road parking are not usually approved unless there is a serious medical issue. Residents are not guaranteed a space for all their vehicles on the public highway.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>
	<p>Resident of Hare Lane</p> <p>Strongly objects to the proposed disabled bay for these reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Number 13 the house has a driveway so questions the necessity for an on-street bay.</li> <li>2. Number 9 the bay is not used properly with the car parked part in and part out the existing bay. There are garages right next to property and space in front of them to use as a drop off point.</li> <li>3. It's a busy road with the school traffic as there are 2 schools there. Road space is needed to pull over and give way to on-coming traffic.</li> <li>4. It will increase traffic congestion on the road.</li> </ol>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>The advisory bays have been in place for many years. Nowadays new disabled bay applications from residents with off-road parking are not usually approved unless there is a serious medical issue. Residents are not guaranteed a space for all their vehicles on the public highway.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>

APPENDIX B – CRW2002

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>Resident of Mole Close</p> <p>They live in close proximity of two primary schools and Leveret Lane is always very busy normally and especially school times as people do park their cars in their close during school runs. They believe formalising the bays on Leveret Lane will create further troubles to local residents and drivers. Questions why if Nos. 9 &amp; 13 Leveret Lane have driveways why they need to occupy a public space opposite side of the road rather than their own driveway. Asks if this is the best way to share public space. Leveret Lane has already developed a blind spot on the junction of Squirrel Close where too many Vans/Cars parked on both sides of the road makes it very difficult to see what is coming. Therefore allowing these bays to be formalised is only going to make this worse. Leveret Lane is very narrow and it will cause the bottle neck of traffic on both sides.</p>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>The advisory bays have been in place for many years. Nowadays new disabled bay applications from residents with off-road parking are not usually approved unless there is a serious medical issue. Residents are not guaranteed a space for all their vehicles on the public highway.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>
	<p>Resident of Leveret Lane</p> <p>Opposes the proposal to formalise the disabled bays. Feel this would be unfair and all disabled bays on the roads should be for all the people to use. Questions the need for the bay as No. 13 has a driveway with parking for 2 cars. This area has two primary schools and there is a need to keep the roads free for everyone to use and not block for specific people who already have enough space to park their cars.</p>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>It is worth noting that disabled bays are not reserved for the sole use of any applicant and are available for use by any motorist displaying a valid blue badge.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>

APPENDIX B – CRW2002

Consultation Response Summary

<p>Resident of Mole Close</p> <p>Oppose the application for two permanent disabled parking spaces on Leveret Lane. Given the proximity of two schools, street parking can be a bit of an issue. They have seen that it is often the case that a car is parked partly in and partly out of the disabled bay outside No. 9 reducing the amount of parking space for other road users.</p> <p>They believe the creation of the disabled bays will create serious hardship for other road users when the properties have a driveway.</p>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>The advisory bays have been in place for many years. Nowadays new disabled bay applications from residents with off-road parking are not usually approved unless there is a serious medical issue. Residents are not guaranteed a space for all their vehicles on the public highway.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>
<p>Resident of Leveret Lane</p> <p>Strongly object the proposal due to take place on Leveret Lane. One of the disabled bays is in close proximity to their house. If any driver tries to park in the bay the homeowner verbally complains. House No. 13 has a double driveway so questions why a bay is needed on street.</p>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>The advisory bays have been in place for many years. Nowadays new disabled bay applications from residents with off-road parking are not usually approved unless there is a serious medical issue. Residents are not guaranteed a space for all their vehicles on the public highway.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>

APPENDIX B – CRW2002

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>Resident of Squirrel Close</p> <p>Objects to the proposal of two permanent disabled parking spaces on Leveret Lane where they know parking is an issue. At times they have to park on fox close which is opposite to their street. Leveret lane is a small road to allocate two designated disabled parking spaces, especially considering they have two schools nearby. Also that the owner of no 13 Leveret Lane has their own driveway so they see no need of the additional street spaces.</p> <p>They feel it would be unfair to other road users to allocate these spaces</p>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>The advisory bays have been in place for many years. Nowadays new disabled bay applications from residents with off-road parking are not usually approved unless there is a serious medical issue. Residents are not guaranteed a space for all their vehicles on the public highway.</p> <p>It is worth noting that disabled bays are not reserved for the sole use of any applicant and are available for use by any motorist displaying a valid blue badge.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>
	<p>Resident of Hare Lane</p> <p>Strongly object to the formalisation request for the disable bay opposite 13 leveret lane and 9 leveret lane. No 13 has a large driveway for at least 2 cars so the person with the requirement for a disable bay could park on their driveway giving them even more accessibility to the house. They have a disabled child and their application for a formalised disabled bay was not granted as they have a driveway. They respect the Councils decision and hope the same decision will be made in this case and the bays should not be formalised.</p>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>The advisory bays have been in place for many years. Nowadays new disabled bay applications from residents with off-road parking are not usually approved unless there is a serious medical issue. Residents are not guaranteed a space for all their vehicles on the public highway.</p> <p>It is worth noting that disabled bays are not reserved for the sole use of any applicant and are available for</p>

APPENDIX B – CRW2002

Consultation Response Summary

		<p>use by any motorist displaying a valid blue badge.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>
	<p><b>Resident of Langley Drive</b></p> <p>Their mum and son in their household are both disabled. They can't have a disabled bay as there are 2 in their road so are concerned where they will be able to park near their home especially as their mum can't walk far.</p>	<p>Residents have reported clashes and conflict with 2-way traffic opposite No.49/51 Langley Drive, with evidence of resulting damage to adjacent verges and kerbs.</p> <p>A short section of Double Yellow line was proposed to deter parking on a bend, improve forward visibility and allow 2-way traffic to travel freely without the need for drivers to mount the kerb &amp; footway.</p> <p>The request for the introduction extra parking provision is noted but is beyond the scope a Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to introduce parking restrictions opposite No.49/51 Langley Drive, will be not be progressed.</p>
	<p><b>Resident of Hare Lane</b></p> <p>Object to the proposal. They use Leveret Lane to drop off and collect their kids from Langley Green Primary School. The road serves a heavy traffic burden all day long and they believe that the proposal will affect traffic flow and will make the area more congested. Currently passing drivers face issues on leveret lane and have to give way.</p>	<p>The advisory bays have been in place for many years. Nowadays new disabled bay applications from residents with off-road parking are not usually approved unless there is a serious medical issue. Residents are not guaranteed a space for all their vehicles on the public highway.</p> <p>It is worth noting that disabled bays are not reserved for the sole use of any applicant and are available for use by any motorist displaying a valid blue badge.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>

APPENDIX B – CRW2002

Consultation Response Summary

<p>Resident of Seymour Road</p> <p>A family member lives in Leveret Lane and when they try to park on-street there are issues due to the disabled bays. The homeowners don't like it if cars pass on the street outside their houses which happens frequently because Leveret Lane ends up on Queen Lady School towards Hare Lane and other side ends up on Rushetts Road towards Langley Green Primary School. No. 13 has got a wide gated driveway The car parked outside No. 16 is usually parked halfway in the disabled boxed bay. Granting a designated Disabled bay on the narrow section of Leveret Lane will not solve any issue it will increase the issues.</p>	<p>Disabled residents of Leveret Lane have made TRO applications to formalise 2 existing advisory disabled bays that they allege were being abused by non-disabled drivers. To support the requests to formalise existing disabled bays, to make them enforceable, the disabled applicants contacted their local MP and County Councillor to obtain their support.</p> <p>The advisory bays have been in place for many years. Nowadays new disabled bay applications from residents with off-road parking are not usually approved unless there is a serious medical issue. Residents are not guaranteed a space for all their vehicles on the public highway.</p> <p>It is worth noting that disabled bays are not reserved for the sole use of any applicant and are available for use by any motorist displaying a valid blue badge.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to formalise 2 existing disabled bays in Leveret Lane, will be not be progressed.</p>
<p>Resident of Langley Drive</p> <p>This matter has been in discussion, since 2010. They have spoken with WSCC and CBC but their suggestions have been discounted as too costly. Believes the proposal has very little merit. It seeks to relieve traffic flow whilst doing nothing to relieve the parking problem. Rather than relieving the problem your proposal will exasperate the problem, result more parking on the grass verges as residents have less parking spaces to use. Understands the need to have unimpeded traffic flow on Langley Drive, (which is one of the three feeder roads to the M23) but this should not be done at the expense of the residents. Their previous suggestions of</p>	<p>Residents have reported clashes and conflict with 2-way traffic opposite No.49/51 Langley Drive, with evidence of resulting damage to adjacent verges and kerbs.</p> <p>A short section of Double Yellow line was proposed to deter parking on a bend, improve forward visibility and allow 2-way traffic to travel freely without the need for drivers to mount the kerb &amp; footway.</p> <p>The introduction of physical measures, such as hardened verges, 'grasscrete' or laybys, to provide extra parking provision is noted but is beyond the scope a Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>However, upon consideration of the negative public consultation response, the proposal to introduce</p>

APPENDIX B – CRW2002

Consultation Response Summary

	<p>putting 'grasscrete' into the grass verges grass to provide parking or removing the grass verges back to the pavement to provide parking spaces and leave the road free for use by vehicular traffic.</p> <p>Double Yellow Lines are a cheap alternative to help traffic flow but don't solve the issue for residents. The present situation has already resulted in their drive way gates being damaged beyond repair by a vehicle using my crossover to do a three point turn, the grass verges being torn up by vehicles, either parking or using it as part of the road to pass oncoming traffic.</p>	<p>parking restrictions opposite No.49/51 Langley Drive, will be not be progressed.</p>
--	--	---