

Appendix B Objections - Compton

Objection/Comments	Comments from Director of Highways Transport & Planning
<p><u>Compton Parish Council</u></p> <p>The proposal is not supported by the Compton Parish Council for the following reasons.</p> <p>School Lane is a single lane cul-de-sac access to Compton and Up Marden School (approximate attendance 90 pupils) and has only twelve residential dwellings.</p> <p>Parents of the school are requested not to drive in School Lane to deliver/collect children, the vast majority of parents support and observe this request.</p> <p>School Lane displays a warning traffic sign "School Access Please Keep Clear" which is generally respected throughout the school year.</p> <p>Within the last twelve months the Compton Parish Council, in conjunction with the School Management and Private Landowner, have provided a safe traffic free pedestrian way, at a significant cost, from the Compton Recreation Ground car park to the School premises,</p> <p>A "no parking" restriction would affect such short stay visits to residents by medical, carers, maintenance, postal, heating fuel providers, all of whom operate during the normal working day. Policing the restrictions in Compton would increase the work load of an authority already stretched.</p> <p>Alternatively, by reducing the restricted period with nominated time zones to drop off/collect periods, implies parking outside those time would be acceptable and would attract walking group vehicles for possibly three to four hours periods.</p> <p>If the restrictions are imposed, the yellow markings and compulsory signage would be most inappropriate to the image of a South Downs National Park village</p> <p>It is understood that the School has not been involved in requesting this restriction.</p> <p>In summary although the current system is not perfect, it works safely for the benefit of both residents and the school</p>	<p>Schools have requested additional support to help provide a safer access for school children. Compton School fully support the proposals. The School Keep Clear markings cover the minimum length allowed under the regulations and the time of operation (8am to 5pm Monday to Friday) has been proposed to ensure the normal school day is covered, and is consistent with the majority of other SKC proposals).</p>
<p><u>Resident of School Lane</u></p> <p>We object to the proposed restrictions. First, the blanket parking restrictions will make it impossible during normal day time hours on weekdays in the year to unload heavy shopping close to their house. Second, it will prevent normal daytime deliveries/collections and make it impossible for house removals.</p> <p>We understand that at the start and end of the School's day, eg 0800 to 0900 and 1500 to 1600, during term time, School Lane needs to be kept clear. A restriction limited to such times is understood and acceptable. But extending it</p>	<p>See above.</p>

<p>to 1700 on all weekdays will cause us great inconvenience; and there is no need for it. We strongly object.</p>	
<p><u>Resident of School Lane</u></p> <p>My objection is not to the School Keep Clear markings themselves, but to how the restrictions may be applied to the residents of School Lane, Compton. They need to know that they will be able to gain legitimate access to our properties without fear of prosecution.</p> <p>There are 3 houses in Old School House, all of which have pedestrian-only access, made via a gap in the flint wall which lies within the proposed School Keep Clear zone.</p> <p>When they need to unload heavy items from our vehicles (e.g. heavy shopping, furniture deliveries, or less often, removal vans) they would normally position the vehicle temporarily on the road by the gap in the wall. After the yellow zig zags are in place we would technically be in breach of the rules if we did this. They need to know that they can make legitimate use of the access area without fear of prosecution. Presumably exceptions for emergency vehicles are already included in the current regulations?</p> <p>We are all fully aware of the problems with cars cluttering up the end of School Lane, the problems for the school buses and other reasons why the School Keep Clear lines are being proposed. They understand this and avoid using the area at times when the school bus arrives, etc. and advise delivery drivers and tradesmen to do the same. They request that the signage that accompanies the yellow zig zags includes a caveat such as 'except unloading of goods' or 'residents' unloading excepted' or similar.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p><u>Resident of School Lane</u></p> <p>Whilst they accept the School Keep Clears proposal in principle they strongly object to the length of time such a restriction is intended to be enforced, namely between the hours of 8.00 am and 5.00 pm, without concessions.</p> <p>In view of the narrowness of School Lane as a highway, your proposed markings will be restricting their legal right of access at all times, to my property.</p> <p>They propose amendments to the proposed Order as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Priority is given to all residents having properties affected by the Order, and abutting School Lane, (being four (4) households) that during the restricted hours of your Order, their legal right to access is not withdrawn, in part or in whole. 2 That domestic vehicles of the said residents and their invitees and removal vehicles, are not penalised for the loading and unloading of goods. This latter concession does not include heavy goods vehicles over 7.5 tonnes who shall remain prohibited during restricted hours. 	<p>See above.</p>

Appendix B Objections – Loxwood

Objection/Comments	Comments from Director of Highways Transport & Planning
<p><u>Resident of Loxwood Road</u></p> <p>Advises that they drive their children to school in Loxwood as they live several miles away cannot walk safely (there are no pavements) and there is no bus service. Loxwood is quite a rural village school and a large proportion of the children who attend live in neighbouring villages and therefore have to travel by car. Already, it is nearly impossible to find somewhere to park to drop off and collect children. Some days they have to arrive 30 mins before school is finished just to get a safe parking space And already some people are inconsiderate and park across residents' driveways - but if this area of road (which is currently used for parking as there are no restrictions) is taken out then the problem will be even more exasperated. In fact, many of the school's teachers currently have to resort to parking in this zone because there is not enough space on the school's grounds for them to park. Drivers currently travel very, very slowly around Badgers Way as there is never much room so there really isn't much of a hazard.</p> <p>Whilst they do not object to the introduction of the small red zone shown on the plan as this is right outside of the school gate and where the highest concentration of children are, the second area towards Loxwood Pre-School shown in yellow on the plan is completely unnecessary - only a handful of children (just those who live in the few houses in that direction) go that way as the majority of children walk the other way to exit the estate of Nicholsfield.</p>	<p>Whilst the difficulties parents have in finding parking places is understood, this proposal is aimed at providing safer access to school for school children. The proposals aim to provide a space clear of parked vehicles immediately adjacent to both of the school gates for the Junior School and the Pre-School.</p>

Appendix B Objections – Midhurst C of E School

<p>Objection/Comments</p>	<p>Comments from Director of Highways Transport & Planning</p>
<p><u>Resident of Ashfield Road</u></p> <p>With respect to Ashfield Road, Midhurst C of E Primary school:</p> <p>The diagrams on pages 25 and 26 are inaccurate in their depiction of the existing "No Waiting" areas, marked in blue. However, both pages are equally inaccurate in this respect, and if the intent is to make no change to the "No Waiting" areas, and solely to add the "No Stopping" area marked in yellow the objection Number 1 is not relevant:</p> <p>1 – They object to any changes to the "No Waiting" areas marked in blue, these are currently entirely satisfactory (subject to objection Number 3);</p> <p>2 - The "No Stopping" area will, in my belief, make access around the school more dangerous as it will positively encourage parents to drive up to the gates, drop their children, and then engage in a dangerous 3-point-turn with infants around. Coincidentally (if proof were needed), an Environment Officer was actually present this morning (Feb 26) when a mother complained she could not easily access the front of the school and had park and then to walk 30 metres!</p> <p>3 – Notes that this area is the only school to have restriction from 08.00 to 18.00, Monday to Saturday. There seems to be no real justification for this and they object to this, especially as Traffic Wardens regularly come on Saturday when the school is closed, but are never to be seen when parents are clogging the entire area</p>	<p>Checks have confirmed that the existing markings shown in blue on pages 25 and 26 of the legal order are correct.</p> <p>1 No changes are proposed to the existing 'No waiting' areas.</p> <p>2 The changes are proposed to discourage long term parking. Introducing a TRO would enable enforcement where there are persistent offenders.</p> <p>3 No changes are proposed to the existing restrictions which are designed, in part, to keep the narrow junction clear of parked vehicles at the times when it is most likely to be needed.</p>