

WAVERLEY OFF-STREET PARKING PLACES ORDER – SUMMARY OF CORRESPONDENCE

Waverley has received 22 responses in respect of its Notice to propose changes to its Off-Street Parking Places Order.

Out of these:-

17 concern the proposal to introduce charges at Station Lane, Milford; 2 objections were received in respect of the increased charges and charging period; and 1 request has been received to extend the maximum stay restriction at the Library Car Park in Bramley to cover an additional parking area. A further two items were received of which one wanted clarification on land ownership at Beacon Hill. The final comment is considered to relate to recent proposals by the County Council.

Proposal	Copy of Objection
Beacon Hill Objection 1	Respondent:Mr P E I do not object to the new charges but as you have placed on the Waverley Web the site map of Beacon Hill car park I was under the impression that a section was Surrey land leased out to the local garage. If this is true the Co2 on lighting is on there property, over the last year the garage has moved the untaxed car to this position giving more parking spaces (? 35) max. Over the last 6 months 8 extra homes have been given building permission, this will require parking over night and I feel these will require parking permits to keep the locals happy. Please just update me on this situation as the bring site has been upgraded and the car park is tidy.
Response	The map has been revised to clarify the land in Waverley’s ownership. .
Bramley, Library Objection 2	Respondent: Bramley Parish Council Whilst Bramley Parish Council agree with the 2 hour restriction being placed on the parking spaces in front of Bramley library itself, we had assumed that the 2 hour restriction would also cover the 6 parking spaces in front of St Thomas More Church. There is currently a disabled place and an old Waverley 2 hour restriction notice at this location. If the restrictions change to allow 24 hour parking on these spaces, this will mean they will immediately be used long term by businesses and residents and therefore no longer support the library and shops as they do now (the 2 hour notice has some effect). Is there a good reason for this, and if not, can it be changed, please, so that the 6 spaces are included in the library order?
Response	Further discussions with Bramley Parish Council will take place to clarify the situation and explore the possibility of applying a maximum stay limit at the additional parking area.
Station Lane, Milford Objection 3	Respondent: Mr N P I strongly object to charges in Milford car park because I own the wine shop in parade that will be direct effect on my business to save money on charges they will park in front of the shop whole day. that becomes difficulty for customer who use lay bay parking in front of the shop who use our local shops regularly.

Objection 4	<p>Respondent: Mr P C I've worked at the meat & fish market church road Milford for 24 years and I cannot afford an annual parking fee of 500 pounds a year. I think that all the local shop workers should get a annual free permit</p>
Objection 5	<p>Respondent: The Witley and Milford Medical Partnership Witley & Milford Patient Participation Group is very perturbed that Waverley are planning to introduce charges at the Station Lane car park. As you will be aware this car park is situated next to the doctor's surgery and is used daily during the week by patients visiting the surgery. When checks on visitors to the car park were made during the current consultation period the majority of visitors wished it to remain as it is – free. We do concede that sometimes at peak times it can be difficult to park but are not convinced that charging will alleviate this without exacerbating the situation.</p> <p>If there has to be a charge, we are particularly concerned for patients by the charge being imposed after only one hour and strongly recommend that an initial time of two hours free parking is implemented. Whereas we would concede most visits are completed in one hour the most complex and vulnerable patients may well be at the surgery for longer for a multiple disciplinary visit. These patients, very often the elderly or infirm, should not be put to additional stress worrying about going over time in the car park or indeed feel pressurised to pay up front 'just in case'. The ticketing process itself will make more difficulties for the elderly and infirm patients.</p> <p>The surgery runs an assessment clinic at the end of the timed appointments session to enable all patients to be seen the same day if they deem it necessary. This is highly valued, particularly by mothers of babies and small children. Some of these patients may have to wait beyond an hour to be seen. Another group of patients we have identified as possibly needing more than one hour are new mothers attending baby clinics. These clinics provide valuable support to mothers and we are anxious that they should not be deterred from taking full advantage of the opportunity.</p> <p>The car park is also used by permanent staff of the surgery and visiting practitioners to the surgery. District Nurses are constantly in and out during the date and the 'No return within two hours' would have a serious impact on their essential service. There is nowhere else suitable for the staff to park. This could result in inappropriate parking elsewhere and a recruitment problem for the surgery. If a charge is introduced we strongly urge that some form of free permit is made available for the staff.</p> <p>We are disconcerted that such a short time limit has been given for consultation which has made it impossible for us to consult widely with patients on this matter. Despite this, members of the PPG have worked with other local organisations to monitor conditions at the car park and to interview users. As previously stated the majority of users wish it to remain as it is, a local amenity provided at public expense.</p>

	<p>Finally, there are two spaces in the car park marked in yellow as opposed to white lining. We are of the strong opinion that these should be proper disabled spaces. There are two, too small and not properly signed, disabled spaces in the lay-by outside the surgery which are inadequate for a busy surgery morning. It is also much safer for a disabled driver to get out of a car in the car park. We trust you will also give this aspect your urgent attention.</p>
<p>Objection 6</p>	<p>Respondent: Mr R J N</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The car park has served our customers for many years, many of who are retired on minimum pension, they visit the doctor, shop locally supporting the local business people, often like to chat due to possible loneliness filling in more than one hour of their day. Parking charges will put unnecessary pressure on them and negatively affect their daily routines. 2. Our own customers visit us because it is easy to park with no cost. I feel our business will be directly affected by car park charges. 3. The land was originally donated to the council in good will for the good of the local people, not with a view of being a profit making concern. 4. Employees who work in the shops directly opposite the car park - many of who are on minimum wage need to have parking facilities. If they were not provided with a free parking permit the charges will have a direct affect on their income and possibly drive them to look for other employment. This will make it difficult for local employers - especially where skilled workers are required - to find people to work for them. I strongly disagree to charging for parking on this site.
<p>Objection 7</p>	<p>Respondent: Mr D G</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed charges and parking restrictions at Station Road, Milford. This car park is vital for the businesses, shops and doctors surgery opposite and next to this car park. The new Tesco's and Secrett's both have their own large private free car parks and without free car parking for this parade of shops, trade is likely to suffer. The shops own a small layby at the front for 'quick' shoppers but, unfortunately if the car park charges this layby will be abused and the shop owners will have to start clamping vehicles which is the last thing we would want to do.</p> <p>I understand one of the proposals is to bring in a £500 charge for all day parking annually. Surely, the shop keepers, doctors, receptionists and nurses are not expected to meet this charge? Free parking for an hour or two once a day will not work either. Many shoppers, patients, shopkeepers and doctor surgery staff need to park several times a day. i.e. deliveries, home visits, surgery hours etc. My suggestion would be free permits for all shop staff, business workers and surgery staff. Up to 2 hours free parking with no limit if this is twice, three or four times a day. If anyone is to be penalised I would suggest this is the commuters who leave their cars in the car park all day while they travel up to London by train to work.</p> <p>I understand that originally the land for this car park was given to the people of Milford by Tony Laken, veterinary surgeon who lived at Old Hurst, the house adjoining the car park for the use of local people and I thought there was a covenant on this land.</p>

	<p>If permits, limited free parking and charges for all day parking is too difficult to manage, I strongly suggest that the car park should be left as it is at the moment. Free for the people of Milford.</p>
Objection 8	<p>Respondent: Mr M M We have never had to pay to park here. 1hour is not long enough if you have a doctors appointment and they are running late as usual.</p>
Objection 9	<p>Respondent: Mr D S I object on the grounds that people using the car park to drop off and pick up children from Milford Primary School, or those visiting the adjacent surgery will avoid paying the charges by parking in the street. The road through Milford can often become congested and this proposal will make matters worse, possibly leading to a serious accident. Why change something that has worked satisfactorily for years? We have lived in the area for over 25 years.</p>
Objection 10	<p>Respondent: Mrs J G I agree that the car park is sometimes full but feel that any charge would purely move people elsewhere and additionally that the resources required to set it up and monitor it would be unlikely to cover the parking fees accrued. If you do decide to charge, a two hour free parking agreement rather than one hour would help a great deal and I think most parking would be covered by that, particularly for patients visiting the surgery. I would also like to suggest that the two spaces delineated in yellow be marked as official disabled spaces</p>
Objection 11	<p>Respondent: Ms M G The car park should remain free of charge as it is widely used by both employees and visitors to the Dr's Surgery and employees and shoppers for the Local Shops. If charging were imposed the local shops would lose custom and employees, and the village would die, we need to promote our village centres not kill them off.</p>
Objection 12.	<p>Respondent: Mr P S I object to charges being imposed at Station Road Car Park in Milford as it will prejudice local shops and businesses.</p>
Objection 13	<p>Respondent: Councillor Elizabeth Cable Although this car park lies outside my ward, it is of relevance to many residents of Witley and Hambeldon because Milford is our local shopping centre. I understand that the proposal to introduce charging is based solely on considerations of good management: to ensure that the car park is always available for short term use and not filled by daily commuters or others needing to stay for a long time. This is verified by Waverley's finance department who say that "the charges are introduced purely as a management aid" and the consultation document which says "A charge will be introduced for parking at Station Lane, Milford to ensure that space is available for short term use". The aim is therefore not to raise revenue, although the rate of charge would be set to cover the costs of installation and enforcement. It follows that the arguments for and against the proposal rests mainly on whether intended short term users do find spaces available when they need them. During the consultation period I have been working with local people, interviewing a number of them myself, to monitor the usage of</p>

the car park at various times of day and to discover the views of those using the car park. The following comments are based on this experience.

Current usage and availability

The evidence indicates that the Milford car park is not currently much used by rail commuters. This may have happened in the past, especially when charges were first raised at Milford station. It may happen again. But currently it does not appear to be a problem.

The main users are

- patients and staff at the adjacent doctors' surgery
- mothers dropping children at school, and often calling at a local shop
- casual shoppers
- some local workers park here during the day
- very few rail commuters.

Turn-over is good, and the number of spaces available depends very much on the number of nurses and doctors on duty at the surgery and whether any special clinic is taking place. For example when 4 Doctors and two nurses are on duty people are sometimes unable to park and charging is not going to resolve this problem.

The case for free parking

The majority of local people would prefer the car park to remain as it is. If the system is working tolerably well, any change is likely to be for the worse. Only a very few said that they were willing to pay at all. The vast majority said that they would park elsewhere.

If charging is introduced, special arrangements would be needed to accommodate those working at the surgery, especially district and other nurses, who come and go at all times, and perhaps patients requiring a particularly long consultation or period of treatment.

One of Waverley core principles is to support and encourage the local economy, but the impact of parking charges on the local shops would be negative. Few people would wish that people are encouraged to use the new Tesco's which is already a threat to local business and has free parking.

Drivers would increasingly park in nearby residential roads. No impact statement has been provided by WBC, but most people interviewed said they would park elsewhere. This would cause other problems.

Although the cost of enforcement would theoretically be covered by the rate of charge, in practice it is unlikely that enforcement officers would visit this car park often, being some distance from Godalming the nearest town. Thus charging would be abused.

It would be difficult to cover the cost of installation and enforcement because charges would deter drivers from parking there long term at all.

The scale of charges and the extent of free parking

If charging is nevertheless introduced, for whatever reasons, then care must be taken to ensure that the scale of charges achieves the intended purpose and minimises the side effects.

	<p>Almost everyone considers that the initial free period should be 2 hours and not one. Either would serve to deter all-day commuters, but one hour would be insufficient for those attending clinics (baby, asthma, diabetic etc). It would also discourage local shopping, especially if combined with taking children to school or a visit to the surgery.</p> <p>'No return in two hours' is unrealistic for those like nurses, who come and go.</p> <p>A rate per hour (after the free period) might be better than a flat charge. Our evidence suggests that few people would pay £2.50, preferring to park in nearby streets.</p> <p><i>Disabled spaces</i></p> <p>Since the future of the car park is under consideration, the opportunity should be taken to provide two proper disabled spaces instead of the bays at present marked with yellow lines.</p>
Objection 14	<p>Respondent: Councillor Denis Leigh</p> <p>I am writing to you with my observations on the proposals for Station Lane, Milford car park in my capacity as one of the local Ward Councillors. I have attached a report detailing the results of car parking surveys giving the background, findings and conclusions. These form the basis for the following observations on the above proposals.</p> <p>The introduction of a 'free first hour' is beneficial, however, there will be a significant number of occasions when this time frame will be too short and adversely affect the local business community and young families who are all hard pressed financially at this time. I can support a free period of two hours as this would cover practically all of the users ' medical and shopping needs without adverse impact on the surgery, clinic and shops.</p> <p>The 'no return within two hours' condition needs to be removed as this prevents the surgery nurses carrying out their jobs efficiently. Free parking permits should be issued to all the surgery staff and the shop staff to ensure that they have the necessary flexibility to work efficiently (surgery staff) and their incomes are not penalised (surgery and shop staff).</p> <p>Our surveys have shown that there is no justification for 'churn' as the majority of users are already short stay (within two hours). I support long stay parking charges for those users not using the local facilities (e.g. commuters).</p> <p>As our findings appear to be 'at odds' with those of the Officers collected earlier in the year I believe the use of the car park should be kept under annual review because a significant change in the usage pattern could warrant further modification to what I am suggesting. I offer the above amendments for your consideration and adoption.</p>
Objection 15	<p>Respondent: Ms G M</p> <p>I am objecting to the proposed car parking charges in the Station Road car park in Milford. I believe that this should remain a free car park. With local shops fast disappearing, we should be doing all we can to support local traders by making it as easy as possible for people to park near the shops. I understand that the proposal is for the first hour to be free, but if shoppers are combining shopping with a visit to the doctor's surgery or dropping children at school they may need more than one hour.</p>
Objection 16	<p>Respondent: Witley Parish Council</p>

In order to be better informed and able to respond, Witley Parish Council have undertaken a survey of usage of the car park. We understand that WBC conducted a survey on the use of the car park on 24 October 2009. The report for this survey does not cover the use of the car park by either medical staff or patients visiting the medical practice adjacent to the site, or by mothers dropping off or collecting their children from Milford Infant School. This is explained by the fact that the survey was conducted on a Saturday, when usage of the car park is quite different to a weekday.

Survey of usage of the Car Park

WPC have conducted our own survey with two sessions on a Monday and Wednesday morning. In addition, several spot checks were undertaken at peak times over the last few weeks. We have the following observations:

The main users of this car park are the surgery staff and patients followed by shoppers, mothers for the school drop off and local shop workers. Others on the days of our visits included residents – two of whom appear to have no alternative parking: Lucks Yard staff and patients (patients are actively encouraged to park in the car park rather than on the Portsmouth Road); commuters and very few others.

Benefit of Proposal

Apart from the revenue raised for Waverley, there seems little benefit to the community. The level of proposed charging is less than the £5.00 daily parking charge at Milford Station, so is unlikely to deter the small number of rail commuters from parking at this site.

Adverse effects on Milford

The proposed charges will prove problematic for staff and patients at the medical centre. Some patients have to be seen by more than one discipline at the practice and may find themselves in the car park for more than an hour. Doctor's appointments occasionally run late. Medical staff are in and out all day visiting patients in the community - the no return proposal is not appropriate for them. Local traders will find it more difficult to attract employees. Our traders will only survive if we encourage the community to use them and free car parking encourages this.

WPC preference Our preference is that the car park should remain free of charge at all times. If any charge was to be introduced, a two hour free parking should be allowed with free parking permits for local residents, medical staff and employees of local businesses including the shops. All day Saturday should be free.

Reasons

We should be providing a service for our community and supporting local businesses and services. The majority of users of this car park are there for less than two hours. Those that are there for longer are either medical staff or shop workers. The proposed charges would be a disincentive for staff in these facilities, and may encourage them to seek employment in other areas. Anyone who is likely to be

	<p>parked for more than an hour would be likely to park elsewhere in the village where there are no parking restrictions. This would however cause congestion on roads through the village, such as on Portsmouth Road.</p> <p>This is the only car park close to our Jubilee Field, an area used for fetes, fairs, sporting events, circuses etc. Saturday should be free so villagers attending these community events can do so safely and not clog up the local roads for residents and other road users. If Waverley has to install equipment and police the car park, it will require considerable resources to do this. This car park will not generate enough revenue to maintain and police with a two hour free period and only £2.50 for the day.</p> <p>It is also understood that this land was given to the village for use by villagers by Mr Lakin a former Vet of this Parish and many older residents are appalled that charges should be applied to a gift to the village.</p> <p><u>Other points</u></p> <p>There are no reserved spaces in the car park for Blue Badge holders. There are two bays (nearest to the doctor's surgery) which are marked with yellow lines, but with no explanatory notices. We suggest that these are reserved for Blue Badge holders.</p> <p><u>WPC request</u></p> <p>We request that WBC does not introduce car parking charges at Station Lane, Milford. In our view this would be detrimental to the economy of the village and to the health services being provided for residents.</p>
Objection 17	<p>Respondent: Mr D D</p> <p>The Milford car parking charges in Church Road will inevitably lead to an overspill into the surrounding roads and other car parks in the village. The MVH committee is very worried that this will impact on the village hall car park as drivers seek alternative places to leave their cars, which will in turn inconvenience the users of the hall as they will find difficulty in parking when attending functions at the hall. In addition the existing car park is used by many people attending the local doctors surgery. We ask that the proposal be totally be reconsidered</p>
Objection 18	<p>Respondent: Mrs C M-M</p> <p>I object to any changes to this car park, the land was given to the people of Milford in I think the 1970's. This car park serves the Dr's, the shops & parents with children at Milford first school. We have some workers both at the surgery and the shops in the parade who park there on days they work, these are not high wage earners and give a service to the village. Village life means that most require a car and we want people to shop and support the local traders, this I believe would be threatened if you start charging.</p>
Objection 19	<p>Respondent: Mrs R K</p> <p>I work at Milford crossroads surgery, right next to the car park. Our patients and staff all use the car park as there are no other facilities. The patients need a 2 hour free stay, and there needs to be some arrangement for staff - the nurses and receptionists do not earn enough to be paying daily car parking charges. Original planning permission for the surgery was presumably dependant on the availability of parking (as the surgery has none of it's own) - so please don't take it away.</p>

<p>Response</p>	<p>The land was transferred from SCC to Hambledon RDC in 1971 for £7,000. It then passed to Waverley BC when it took over from Hambledon RDC. There is nothing in the transfer document restricting the use of the land to a free car park or applying a charge to car parking.</p> <p>WBC acknowledges the concerns expressed by local residents and traders, and by visitors, users and staff at the local doctor's surgery in Milford. However, it is also recognises that, due to the increase in use of this car park in recent years, there is a need to manage the Station Lane car park more actively, and that arrangements need to be formalised in order to achieve this.</p> <p>In response to the consultation feedback, the following amended approach should be implemented in respect of the car park at Station Lane, Milford:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Apply a nominal charge of 10p for up to two hours which will remove the need for a no return restriction and thereafter £1.50p per day b) Introduce a special annual permit for employees of businesses located in Milford at a cost of £86.00 c) Introduce two, properly marked and appropriately sized disabled bays within the car park d) Work with the County Council to impose waiting restrictions on the bays outside the shops to ensure these are protected for the short-term use of shoppers e) Review this situation 6 months after implementation
<p>Extension of the charging period to 7pm</p>	<p>Respondent: Mr P W</p> <p>Your stated reasons for charging between 6pm and 7pm are [a] in recognition of the use of car parks after 6pm and [b] that motorists have greater chance of finding a parking space. I don't think [b] applies in Godalming Town as I see plenty of spare capacity on my evening visits and the use after 6pm and beyond is because its free.</p> <p>Car Parks are for the parking of cars and roads for passing and re-passing. As the parking restrictions in Godalming High St end at 6pm. Who is going to pay a car park fee and walk to the High Street when you can park in the street for free. Someone I know who arrives home from work about 6pm in Croft Road is not going to pay the Croft Road parking fee when they can park outside the Chain Company building in Brighton Road on the single yellow line for free. It will only take one or two to start a trend and the road will become a car park causing obstruction to the flowing traffic. I trust you will consider these "knock on" effects and not deal with a car park matter which is primarily financial and thereby create problems for free flowing traffic around Godalming. Before introducing these regulations I suggest you look at the single yellow line regulations covering the "working day" and amend those before your car park regs create problems on the Highway. I think the Police will agree as you are going to create Highway problems outside your authority if you don't. Working together is the theme today and the Police wont want to be dealing with traffic problems in the High street or other roads where the highway restrictions end at 6pm and therefore outside of your staff's authority.</p>

Response	Under the draft Order, Croft Road car park's charges are to remain unchanged at 50p for an hour and £250 for an annual residents parking permit. This is not considered unreasonable, and it is not felt that the extension of the charging period until 7pm will force large numbers of cars onto nearby roads. However, although WBC does not have responsibility for the designation or enforcement of on-street parking restrictions, Officers will work with colleagues from Surrey County Council to ensure that any knock-on effects from the changes to this Council's off-street parking strategy are managed
Objection 20	Respondent: Mrs K G The current free parking on the High street is very popular with residents. Shoppers usually stay less than the 1 hour allowed (this limit is regularly policed and enforced by the CSO) so turnover of spaces is reasonable, and the free parking encourages shoppers to use local shops. Local businesses are struggling to survive in the tough economic conditions and the new charges will discourage 'impulse' shopping. It certainly will with me.
Response	This comment appears to relate to on-street parking, which is not covered within this consultation, and is not a responsibility of this Council.
Changes to the charges at car parks in Godalming Objection 21	Respondent: Mr P R The unique character of Godalming High Street, with its wonderful collection of small independent retailers, should be protected from the increasing competition posed by the online retailer. Online retailers have no local business rates or rent to pay, and have significantly reduced costs and reduced prices vis-a-vis local retailers. We should therefore be encouraging visitors to come to Godalming and to spend money to help these small and often struggling businesses to survive. The proposed increases in parking charges will further deter shoppers from visiting the Town Centre, and will encourage them to stay at home and get more bang for their buck shopping online. Godalming High Street will be in danger of becoming a ghost-town as more and more businesses close. I think this is very disappointing that Waverley Council are going to deter additional customers from visiting our town centre and I therefore oppose these changes to the parking regulations.
Response	Although some car park charges are increasing under the proposals, the charges at Crown Court, (which is the largest car park in Godalming, and is conveniently located for the High Street), are remaining unchanged, at 60p per hour for the first 4 hours.
Permission to operate a pay and display car park at Lucks Green, Cranleigh Objection 22	Respondent: Mrs B W I have a good many concerns over your proposals of turning Legion Court into a Pay & Display car park. As my neighbours and I live here, how will we be catered for? As our front doors open out onto the car park, will we be given a designated parking space each? I would like to know who actually owns Legion Court car park, because I have been told several times by different local people that the car park was given to the village a long time ago. So surely it is common land and nobody should be able to stick a charge for parking on it.

Response	The proposals for Lucks Green are intended to address some local issues of conflict of use between residents, traders and shoppers. The detailed proposals would be developed in close liaison with all stakeholders and would first need to be the subject of a formal application to the Secretary of State to formalise the historic use of this piece of common land as a car park.
-----------------	--