

Consultation Response Summary

Objection/Comments	Comments from Director of Highways Transport and Planning
<p>Resident of New Road</p> <p>Object for the following reasons. It will deprive Ashdown House a parking space, which will impact on the other 7 houses in New Rd. It could be solved in a more neighbourly way, by offering Ashdown House a parking space in Spring Meadows. Precedence was established when the development was new.</p> <p>A resolution which would not impact on us would be to make it a left hand turn only from Spring Meadows . It would still give access into town or in 200yds making a right turn round would bring you back again. This is something they often do. Putting yellow lines will they believe, not resolve the problem, the real issue is the speed of the traffic. Very few vehicles in either direction adhere to the 30mph limit .This is the issue that needs addressing.</p> <p>When Spring Meadows was proposed they, and their neighbours objected , one of the grounds was elderly people turning onto New rd. The Council agreed to the development, so did not agree it would be a problem. When buying a house surely one should weigh up all the possible issues that might cause you a problem, so in purchasing the property access to the road should have been taken into account and accepted.</p>	<p>Legally, there can be no allocated parking spaces on the public highway for adjacent residential properties. Where there are no parking restrictions on the highway, drivers may park so long as it safe to do so.</p> <p>The parking restrictions are proposed at the junction of Spring Gardens as drivers are not complying with the recommendation required by Rule 243 of the Highway Code (Not to park within 10metres of a road junction). The proposals have been extended east of the junction to address local conditions presented by the layby, whereby drivers may park within the lay-by taper. The layby will still be able to use the setting down and picking up of passengers and loading.</p> <p>A proposal to introduce a “Left Turn Only” out of Spring Gardens would not resolve the road safety issue created by parking in contravention of the advice in the Highway Code. It would also present drivers using Spring Gardens with an unnecessary diversion in order to travel west from the junction.</p> <p>Any new development goes through the planning process under the Town and Country Planning Act and the development was approved. The current proposals are about how traffic is behaving in the vicinity of the junction and not parking in accordance with the advice in the Highway Code.</p> <p>The issue of enforcement of speed limits is matter for the Police. Any</p>

Objection/Comments	Comments from Director of Highways Transport and Planning
<p>They have lived in my house for 45 yrs, the houses are 90 yrs old, it seems to me that it is unfair that we should have our lives disrupted when there is a more neighbourly resolution . It is of note that when Spring Meadows had a major six month building project starting a year ago ,their visitors were told to park outside our houses in New Road . On two occasions cars were parked across their drive when they needed to go out, and they had the inconvenience of going round to find the owner. So it is ok for cars to be parked when it suited them, but it doesn't matter if it gives us a problem.</p>	<p>contravention of speed limits should be referred to them as they are best placed to determine where their resources should be deployed.</p> <p>Vehicles parking so as to obstruct driveways is an offence that the Police have adequate powers to deal with and should have been reported to them.</p>
<p>Resident of New Road</p> <p>1. Evidence: No evidence has been provided that introducing double yellow lines either side of Spring Meadows will improve safety of residents and other visitors when exiting that complex. Suggestions: Other road calming measures should be considered (speed bumps, flashing sign, 20 mph zone, etc) and introducing a left-hand turn only rule outside of Spring Meadows before re-considering this TRO change. Incidentally the hashed area outside of Spring Meadows is already de facto double yellow lined as nobody parks there.</p> <p>2. Parking congestion: Introduction of double yellow lines outside Ashdown House will directly impact any residents within and visitors as there will be a knock-on effect further up New Road (indirect effect). Furthermore, double yellow lines</p>	<p>Drivers are not complying with the recommendation required by Rule 243 of the Highway Code (Not to park within 10metres of a road junction). The proposals have been extended east of the junction to address local conditions presented by the layby whereby drivers may park within the lay-by taper. The layby will still be able to be used the setting down and picking up of passengers and loading.</p> <p>The hatched road making is not supported by a traffic regulation order so is unable to be enforced by Civil Enforcement Officers.</p> <p>There is an exemption for Blue Badge Holder to park on double yellow lines for up to 3hours provided it is safe to do so. Government advice to Blue Badge Holders specifically reference the requirements of Rule 243 of the Highway Code.</p> <p>The creation of off-road parking spaces is a matter for the landowner</p>

Objection/Comments	Comments from Director of Highways Transport and Planning
<p>would not prevent a disabled badge holder from parking outside Ashdown House thus not mitigating the perceived safety problem anyway. While they should have legal access to their back gate - they dont believe the residents would appreciate them parking their vehicle in view of their property (and they would need to remove all fencing to accommodate this making my property more vulnerable). They will undoubtedly lose value in their property by removing the immediate on road parking outside. They may be forced to remove their front garden and replace with hard standing for parking at financial and environmental cost.</p> <p>3. Transparency: Neither the residents, management company nor council have been fully transparent about these proposals. The first amendment was proposed last year (during the pandemic!). Neither they nor their immediate neighbour received ANY notification regarding the proposal. They believe it was considered a fait accompli.</p> <p>4. They are seeking legal representation to further challenge this proposed TRO as they believe it is unfair to them and fellow New Road residents and more importantly has no evidential basis to ensure the safety of any local residents (irrespective of whether they reside in Spring Meadows or not). The council should be focussing its energies elsewhere to improve the community, its cleanliness and safety.</p>	<p>subject to any restriction required under Town and Country Planning Act and not the Highway Authority.</p> <p>The proposal are community led proposals applied for under a scheme operated by the County Council to respond positively to local public concerns about how roads are used by traffic in their respective areas. The application was supported by residents , their visitors , service personnel, care staff and Midhurst Town Council. The proposal were advertised on the County Council’s website, in the local press, notices were posted on street. In addition, since the start of the pandemic a copy of the order is posted to properties immediately abutting the proposed parking restrictions.</p> <p>Street cleaning is the responsibility of the District Council and concerns cleanliness should be referred to Chichester District Council. West Sussex County Council’s Road Safety Team works closely with Sussex Police on road safety and invests casualty reduction schemes.</p>