

Summary of Objections - First Traffic Regulation Order Promoted in September 2017

ERP 'C'

URN	Objector Address	Objections Summary	Themes	EHC Response	Officer decision: accede / part accede / overrule / refer
21	Barrells Down Road	Totally against proposal. The car parking in Barrells Down Road is very difficult and congested already. The council needs to be more proactive in seeking infrastructure improvements to accommodate Stortford Fields development.	restrict parking near home	proposals do not affect this part of barrels down road; therefore no impact	overrule
45	Barrells Down Road	Cars parked on either side of steep driveway restrict visibility as we exit our property. Currently we are able to speak to our neighbours and ask them or their visitors to move so that we can get out of our drive safely. This will not be possible with business season permit holders who work in the town; the council's proposal combined with the new local property development on and off Dane O'Coys Road makes safety a major concern; the plans increase the chance of an accident on our area; we currently see cars parked out of bay and this is likely to occur more frequently; we find the council's communication of its plans and intentions vague and insufficient: firstly the intimation that you communicated your top line intentions to the local Residents' Association but did not secure their approval or take into account their contributions, comments and feedback; secondly we feel the council is deliberately attempting to obfuscate its long term intentions for business permit parking in the Chantry area by not providing guidance on its upper limit of business permits in the Zone, leaving residents concerned about a "slippery slope" where the number would increase overtime with no consultation by the council.	restrict access to driveway; EHC communication; floodgates risk more business permits	no material impact to residents' access to driveways is anticipated: one of the conditions of the business permits is that users will not obstruct driveways; EHC consulted via Traffic Regulation Order; EHC will monitor and formally review scheme six months post implementation to ensure it operates effectively	overrule
46	Barrells Down Road	it is unclear why the council would seek to encourage commercial vehicle parking in residential streets ; the letter suggested we should be aware of the proposal - we were not aware; Grange Paddocks car park would surely be a sensible option for commercial vehicles or the Goods Yard; introducing 50 additional season tickets is going to create significant traffic congestion particularly at peak time - the current parking arrangements require residents to have to pull in and out of streets and back up as there are insufficient gaps for passing; any additional parking of commercial vehicles is going to cause more problems and create potential hazards as some drivers will go up on pavements. We suggest a review of the proposal.	restrict access to driveway; vehicle congestion and safety.	no material impact to residents' access to driveways is anticipated: one of the conditions of the business permits is that users will not obstruct driveways; the small number of additional vehicles expected will not compromise safety or significantly increase vehicle movements	overrule
15	Barrells Down Road	Currently find it difficult to park near home due to health problems and in light of existing parking congestion; allowing non residents to park would make the parking problems worse. Many neighbourly residents nearby are elderly and to cause them to walk further will cause problems.	restrict parking near home; cause harm to elderly residents	proposals do not affect this part of barrels down road; therefore no impact	Objection withdrawn
36	Barrells Down Road	A number of houses in this road do not have off street parking or only space for one vehicle; I am puzzled why the cost of a business season ticket in Barrells Down Road is cheaper than Chantry Road where a greater percentage of houses have off street parking; I hope I have misunderstood the process and that fewer permits for BDR will be issued than those for roads with a greater proportion of off street parking.	restrict parking near home	proposals do not affect this part of barrels down road; therefore no impact	Objection withdrawn
20	Chantry Close	Only "Private cars" can be permitted. Does not want to look out of window at industrial vans.	Commercial vehicle eyesore	only vehicles permitted will be those as per any resident permit. Commercial vehicles are not included in the proposal, no impact to amenity of area	overrule
2	Chantry Close	The entrance to Chantry Close is narrow and can restrict large vehicles passing. Residents entering Chantry Close are required on occasion to reverse onto Chantry Road when meeting vehicles head on. Safety considerations must be given to residents.	vehicle movement safety	the extra controls of DYL will maintain access at all times	overrule
22	Chantry Close	Strongly object - non residential parking will introduce further discontent and inconvenience to the residents; we do not want our narrow streets to be subjected to further restriction by parked business vehicles for five days a week. Street parking is no longer the solution as the council will issue more season tickets than there are spaces available. The need is for something that will last well into the future of Bishop's Stortford.	restrict parking near home; inconvenience residents;	the extra controls of DYL will maintain access at all times; the parking will be restricted to the entry road and will be no more greater than 50% of this proposed parking bays on this stretch of road; therefore minimal impact to current parking arrangements in the close	overrule
1	Chantry Road	The resident has no off road parking and business season permit parking will restrict in ability to park. The bottom section of Chantry Road is already congested with Chantry Resident Permit Parking residents who travel from other RPZ roads to be closer to the town facilities	restrict parking near home	this is more likely to occur than not particular in light of loss of parking due to DYL implementation and due to increased competition for spaces as business season permit holders seek to park towards bottom section of Chantry Road, closer to the town. A modification will maintain the status quo	accede - modify bay = limit mixed use parking between junctions of Grays Court (opposite 20 Chantry Road) to Cricketfield Lane where there is sufficient road space to accommodate in excess of 28 vehicles (excluding driveways) and maintain status quo in area of concern.
43	Chantry Road	The proposal does little to reduce the anticipated congestion expected with the massive housing development; other candidates should include Grange Paddocks car park, railway station and site at Old River Way; additional business season permit parking will occur at the Hadham Road junction due to the proximity to the town causing drivers to mount the pavement when passing as there will be fewer unoccupied parking spaces available to use; if season ticket spaces are located further up Chantry Road we will be back to the situation before the resident permit parking scheme was introduced.	pedestrian safety; create competition for spaces among residents	There is no evidence to suggest safety will be compromised as DYL protect the junction; one of the conditions of the business permits is that users will not obstruct driveways; the proportion of extra cars will be minimal impact: the current occupancy is under 40%.	overrule

5	Chantry Road	Objects to two aspects of the proposal regarding Chantry Road: the extension of the Double Yellow Lines and allowing business season permits into the road. The resident purchased the property to be close to the town centre and to be able to park outside, to receive visitors and tradesman. I foresee no parking availability for myself or visitors should Business permits be introduced and intend returning resident permit in protest.	restrict parking near home; DYL extend not appropriate	one of the conditions of the business permits is that users will not obstruct driveways; the proportion of extra cars will be minimal impact - current occupancy is under 40%; implementation of DYL at the request of residents and council members in response to safety concerns.	overrule
40	Chantry Road	I recognise there is a serious parking and major traffic problem in Bishop's Stortford. 1. many permit holders from Hadham Road park in Chantry Road often for two weeks continuously. 2. there has been a lot of disinformation about the proposal: the council advise they have discussed with Chantry Community Association however the CCA deny there has been any formal consultation process - the note on lamp columns suggests 5 permits available for Chantry Road compared to the CCA autumn newsletter stating 15 permits maximum; 3. the council will come under pressure to extend to business permit period to weekends, penalising residents further; 4. fed up with the continual squeezing of additional income from the Chantry Road residents. More car parks need to be built in Bishop's Stortford.	EHC communication; floodgates risk extend business permits to weekends.	EHC consulted via Traffic Regulation Order; the terms of use are defined in the Traffic Regulation Order and operate Monday to Friday only thus ensuring spaces are available to residents and visitors during weekend periods.	overrule
34	Chantry Road	The proposal to extend the Double Yellow Lines from Hadham Road junction in Chantry Road an additional 10 metres in inadequate in that the end of the parking bay is too close to Hadham Road and is insufficient to address safety concerns - vehicles can be forced into the centre of Chantry Road to the detriment of drivers and pedestrians. There can also be congestion when drivers park on the other side of the road as sometimes happens in the evenings; I request the council considers extending the DYL to original pre Resident Permit Parking scheme location i.e. just northwest of 6 Chantry Road; should the scheme proceed there is a risk of a similar situation of Hadham Road / Chantry Road at the Cricketfield Lane due to spaces being occupied and reduced options for motorists to pull in; the council may seek to issue additional business permits without further reference to residents for consultation.	Safety DYL bottom Chantry Road; congestion and safety j/w Cricketfield	There is no evidence to suggest safety will be compromised as DYL protect the junction	overrule
30	Chantry Road	The proposal refers to a maximum of 50 business season tickets in issue with an option to vary without the need to advertise another TRO - what is to stop it issuing tickets on Saturdays or Sundays?; who is going to police the hours (8am - 6pm); not all residents in Chantry Road have drives and tradesmen who need access to their vehicles may not be able to park near the homes they are working on; residents are now being asked to share their roads with others who don't necessarily respect the environment EG historical experiences of non residents littering streets; there is a hazard for drivers near the j/w with Hadham Road and the proposal to increase the double yellow lines is not enough and vehicles will still mount the pavement which is dangerous for pedestrians including school children.	floodgates risk more business permits including Saturday and Sunday; restrict parking near home; non resident anti social behaviour; pedestrian safety.	the terms of use are defined in the Traffic Regulation Order and operate Monday to Friday only ensuring spaces are available to residents and visitors during weekends; the 50% minimum buffer in relation to residents / business season permits will ensure residents are able to park near home and sufficient space will be available for vehicles and pedestrians to pass; business season permits will only be issued to employees of registered businesses with agreement to abide by the terms of use or risk withdrawal of permit	overrule
12	Chantry Road	It is often impossible to find parking within 50-60 yards of the resident's home. Transporting children to different schools at various times of the morning will likely mean no place to return to park close to home. Elderly relatives supporting childcare needs will similarly be affected and any excessive distance to walk would impact greatly on their ability to assist and result in a great loss for the family as assistance would no longer be possible. Consideration should be given to provision of decent size multi storey car park. Request: 1. Season tickets only be valid between junctions of Pleasant Road and Cricketfield Lane; 2. season tickets only valid between 09.30 & 17:45 hours.	restrict parking near home; excessive distance to walk for elderly relatives with loss of family assistance	EHC data confirms an average of 40 % occupancy, therefore minimal impact to current parking arrangements anticipated	overrule
39	Chantry Road	The council identifying roads as "under used parking spaces" and selling them to businesses in the town whilst turning down another 200 spaces in another part of town seems strange; the proposal to extend the Double Yellow Lines 10 metres at the junction of Hadham Road is not sufficient and extra cars will park closer to this junction due to the proximity to the town creating further congestion; when residents wish to have workmen they will be unable to park nearby; the council will make another £250,000 in total from parking in a residential area.	Safety DYL bottom Chantry Road; congestion and safety j/w Cricketfield; restrict parking for workmen	there is no evidence to suggest safety will be compromised as DYL protect the junction near Hadham Road and no impacts are foreseen at Cricketfield Lane junction where existing DYL in situ	overrule
6	Chantry Road	Concerned about the detrimental impact to residents in light of proposal: extension of double yellow lines, risk of driveway being obstructed in the context of emergency situation. Due to the proximity of residence to Hadham Road it is likely the availability of parking will be compromised with additional vehicles (business permits) parked. Requests advisory white line be marked on road surface (previously refused) to more effectively delineate parking spaces and reduce residents' frustration and inconvenience.	restrict access to driveway in context emergency vehicles; restrict parking near home	this is more likely to occur than not particular in light of loss of parking due to DYL implementation and due to increased competition for spaces as business season permit holders seek to park towards the bottom section of Chantry Road, closer to the town. A modification will maintain the status quo	accede - modify bay = limit mixed use parking between junctions of Grays Court (opposite 20 Chantry Road) to Cricketfield Lane where there is sufficient road space to accommodate in excess of 28 vehicles (excluding driveways) and maintain status quo in area of concern.

3	Chantry Road	Business season permit users will affect safety of the road as currently the road is safe and pleasant for users. An increased footfall would also potentially increase crime in the road. Business permit holders will no doubt park right up to the entrance of driveway. Concerned that the Chantry Road junction with Cricketfield may become a safety concern should occupancy increase.	road safety; increase in crime; restrict access to driveway; top end Chantry (j/w Cricketfield) safety concern re increased occupancy	there is no evidence to suggest this will be the case as DYL protect the junction; one of the conditions of use for business permits is that users will be required to agree not to obstruct driveways and any failure may result in permit withdrawal; the proportion of extra cars will be minimal impact - EHC occupancy survey data confirms under 40%	overrule
35	Chantry Road	I endorse the proposal to increase the Double Yellow Lines to allow traffic to negotiate this junction more safely; I do not agree with introducing limited parking for non residents in Chantry Road - it would not be acceptable for residents to purchase a permit if potentially they were unable to park outside their houses at certain times of the day or week.	restrict parking near home	the proportion of extra cars will be of minimal impact to residents - occupancy under 40%	overrule
42	Chantry Road	The proposal will not help carers visiting 4 times daily if they have to search for a parking place; the proposal to introduce 10 metres of Double Yellow Lines is totally inadequate from a safety perspective.	Restrict parking for nurses, carers etc; Safety DYL bottom Chantry Road	the proportion of extra cars will be minimal impact - EHC occupancy survey data confirms under 40%	overrule
10	Elm Road	Concerned the pre Resident Permit Zone parking problems will return as Elm Road is one of the nearest roads to North Street with bad parking manners and occasional unpleasant non resident comments when asked not to block driveway. It is likely inconsiderate parking practices will return. The survey data is insufficient and a minimum of fifty would be a more accurate method. As an elderly resident it is important to be able to park close to home in context of carrying shopping, large items or elderly relatives who are unable to make use of sloping driveway. The impact to nurses, carers and health visitors may be compromised. A more obvious solution would be preferred and more appealing.	restrict access to driveway; anti social responses from non residents; MM survey data insufficient; restrict parking for nurses, carers etc.	this is more likely to occur than not due to the density of properties and construction of driveways where clear demarcation points in respect of dropped kerb structures are not present e.g. low level kerbstones and access points to frontages where inconsiderate parking may flow; modify proposal and restrict to specific area on opposite side better suited and with capacity exists	accede in part: after considering comments from residents it is accepted there is a risk to residents in that they may not be able to park easily close to home due to the proximity of the parking bay on south west side in relation to the town in that business permit holders would seek to park as close to the town as possible for convenience and in consideration of the multiple needs of residents in respect of vehicle use throughout the day; modify proposal to limit mixed use parking to north east side of Elm Road only (between properties 14 - 42)
38	Elm Road	The proposal is likely to cause significant distress, be detrimental and return residents to the chaos of the days before the resident scheme was introduced; the notion of spare capacity as described in the council's report does not acknowledge the individual needs of residents to park near their homes in respect of mobility issues, transporting young children and their belongings to homes; residents working from home are required to make business trips and will lose valuable time searching for spaces to park unoccupied by business season ticket holders; residents are already squeezed into a smaller portion of the street for their own parking and that of their visitors and trades people; the risk of residents displaced to other B7 roads thus creating a problem elsewhere; Half Acres and Northgate End residents regularly use Elm Road; neighbour and I have less than 11 metres of on street parking between dropped kerbs so when used by other permit holders it will be difficult to accommodate resident needs.	restrict access to driveway; restrict parking near home; MM survey data outdated	EHC to modify proposal and restrict to specific areas more suitable; MM data considered adequate to support the proposal and supported by EHC data gathered in early 2017	accede in part: after considering comments from residents it is accepted there is a risk to residents in that they may not be able to park easily close to home due to the proximity of the parking bay on south west side in relation to the town in that business permit holders would seek to park as close to the town as possible for convenience and in consideration of the multiple needs of residents in respect of vehicle use throughout the day; modify proposal to limit mixed use parking to north east side of Elm Road only (between properties 14 - 42)
11	Elm Road	It is anticipated in short time any available spaces in Elm Road will disappear. Should the scheme proceed, the council must ensure the total number of spaces for business season permits does not exceed the number of spaces available on an average day.	restrict parking near home	EHC data confirms an average of 30 % occupancy at present time; however following objections from other residents EHDC seeks to modify the design to only allow parking where there is sufficient capacity and minimise perceived impact to residents	accede in part: after considering comments from residents it is accepted there is a risk to residents in that they may not be able to park easily close to home due to the proximity of the parking bay on south west side in relation to the town in that business permit holders would seek to park as close to the town as possible for convenience and in consideration of the multiple needs of residents in respect of vehicle use throughout the day; modify proposal to limit mixed use parking to north east side of Elm Road only (between properties 14 - 42)
33	Elm Road	Elm Road is the closest road to the town and as it is flat it will attract the most number of people with business permits; the report details 36 permit holder parking bays and I would dispute this there are a number of driveways with dropped kerbs where access is required; allowing business season permits will increase the risk of inconsiderate parking as happened recently when unable to get out of driveway until 11pm; it is inconceivable that the council feels they can sell the same space twice; H Bars could be introduced to the dropped kerbs to reduce the risk of inconsiderate parking.	restrict parking near home (nearer Rye Street); data disputed; restrict access to driveway	EHC survey evidence confirms average 30 % occupancy at present time; however considering detailed objections EHC intends to modify the design to only allow parking where there is sufficient capacity and minimise perceived impact to residents	accede in part: after considering comments from residents it is accepted there is a risk to residents in that they may not be able to park easily close to home due to the proximity of the parking bay on south west side in relation to the town in that business permit holders would seek to park as close to the town as possible for convenience and in consideration of the multiple needs of residents in respect of vehicle use throughout the day; modify proposal to limit mixed use parking to north east side of Elm Road only (between properties 14 - 42)

17	Elm Road	Concerned that as Elm Road is flat and closest to the town it will attract the most number of people with business season tickets and there will not be enough space for residents and visitors to park; the study report online details Elm Road having 36 permit holder parking bays (with dropped kerbs accounted for), however this is disputed as there the dropped kerb driveways require access and data collected by resident disagrees; the impact of business season permit users on parking availability will be to the detriment as two vehicle household with only one off street parking place. Consideration should be given to a Park & Ride service to improve access to the town as long term solution.	restrict parking near home (nearer Rye Street); data disputed; restrict access to driveway	EHC survey evidence confirms average 30 % occupancy at present time; however considering detailed objections EHC intends to modify the design to only allow parking where there is sufficient capacity and minimise perceived impact to residents	accede in part: after considering comments from residents it is accepted there is a risk to residents in that they may not be able to park easily close to home due to the proximity of the parking bay on south west side in relation to the town in that business permit holders would seek to park as close to the town as possible for convenience and in consideration of the multiple needs of residents in respect of vehicle use throughout the day; modify proposal to limit mixed use parking to north east side of Elm Road only (between properties 14 - 42)
41	Elm Road	Business season permit users will migrate to Elm Road as it is flat and close to the town not leaving enough space for residents and visitors to park; the council's study details Elm Road as having 36 permit holder parking bays which is in dispute as there are a number of dropped kerbs with access requirements; during the day the risk of inconsiderate parking would only increase affecting ability of residents to park anywhere legally or unable to access driveway; suggests Park & Ride service to improve access to the town.	restrict parking near home (nearer Rye Street); data disputed; restrict access to driveway	EHC survey evidence confirms average 30 % occupancy at present time; however considering detailed objections EHC intends to modify the design to only allow parking where there is sufficient capacity and minimise perceived impact to residents	accede in part: after considering comments from residents it is accepted there is a risk to residents in that they may not be able to park easily close to home due to the proximity of the parking bay on south west side in relation to the town in that business permit holders would seek to park as close to the town as possible for convenience and in consideration of the multiple needs of residents in respect of vehicle use throughout the day; modify proposal to limit mixed use parking to north east side of Elm Road only (between properties 14 - 42)
31	Elm Road	The proposal to sell business season tickets at £600 each is "gold" for the council. How will the council resist adding more that the proposed 50 permits into our streets?; What methodology was used to establish the figure of 50 - over what period and by whom?; on the northern end of Elm Road there are approximately 16 households and only 5 spaces available due to dropped kerbs; the proposal does not provide residents with a reasonable chance to park close to their homes.	restrict parking near home (nearer Rye Street); data disputed	EHC survey evidence confirms average 30 % occupancy at present time; however considering detailed objections EHC intends to modify the design to only allow parking where there is sufficient capacity in order to minimise impact to residents	accede in part: after considering comments from residents it is accepted there is a risk to residents in that they may not be able to park easily close to home due to the proximity of the parking bay on south west side in relation to the town in that business permit holders would seek to park as close to the town as possible for convenience and in consideration of the multiple needs of residents in respect of vehicle use throughout the day; modify proposal to limit mixed use parking to north east side of Elm Road only (between properties 14 - 42)
32	Elm Road	Mott MacDonald survey data from 2016 outdated as one house converted to two houses with two dropped spaces replacing former one. Therefore reduced number of available road spaces from the 31 estimated by MM.	data disputed	EHC survey evidence confirms average 30 % occupancy at present time; however considering detailed objections EHC intends to modify the design to only allow parking where there is sufficient capacity and minimise perceived impact to residents	accede in part: after considering comments from residents it is accepted there is a risk to residents in that they may not be able to park easily close to home due to the proximity of the parking bay on south west side in relation to the town in that business permit holders would seek to park as close to the town as possible for convenience and in consideration of the multiple needs of residents in respect of vehicle use throughout the day; modify proposal to limit mixed use parking to north east side of Elm Road only (between properties 14 - 42)
48	Hadham Road	The two proposals (introduce business permits and extend the double yellow lines in Chantry Road may seriously impact on our ability to park within a reasonable distance of our property; many residents in Hadham Road do not have driveways and we bought our property in 2015 partly on the basis that EHDC would protect our rights to park our vehicle within a reasonable distance of our property; I do not see any need to amend the positioning of the double yellow lines; I suggest a. business permits be restricted to the end of Chantry nearest Cricketfield Lane where any significant number of spaces may be found - to help to maintain spaces for Hadham Rd residents; b. reduce the number of business permits; c. leave the DYL where they are.	restrict parking near home; do not extend DYL in Chantry Road	the proposal to extend the DYL is safety related in response to concerns expressed by residents and council member	accede in part - modify bay = limit mixed use parking between junctions of Grays Court (opposite 20 Chantry Road to Cricketfield Lane) to maintain the status quo in this area

25	Lindsey Road	Strongly object for the following reasons:1. when resident permit parking was introduced is was under the guise of preventing non residents parking; 2. with double yellow lines in many of the B7 roads the parkins spaces are already limited and residents & visitors find it difficult to park near their homes now; 3. the council's claim that the scheme will be managed will not be possible in a meaningful way and there will be nothing that can be done once business season tickets are sold; 4. Whilst Lindsey Road is not included in the proposal, there will be an impact as residents in other roads will inevitably try to find spaces in Lindsey Road if they cannot park in their roads; 5. Even if there are spaces, certain gaps are needed to allow vehicles to pull in; 6. there is a serious safety issue if residential roads are full of cars - lack of visibility for residents pulling out of their drives and vehicles traversing the roads, most importantly for the many children in the neighbourhood and attending local schools when crossing the road; 7. residents should be allowed to live in peace and harmony and should be able to park outside or near to their homes as possible; 8. we don't want our neighbourhood turned into a car park.	restrict parking near home; impact on residents due to displacement of vehicles; safety; restrict access to driveway; turn street into car park	there is adequate parking in all adjoining roads, therefore of little or no impact on Lindsey Road or amenity; minimal extra vehicle movements expected	overrule
19	Lindsey Road	There are currently parking and safety concerns in respect of the design of the resident permit parking scheme in that parking bays are present on both sides of the road. Some parking bays should be removed from outside properties with driveways to prevent parking on the road and make the road safer. The gradient of the road does not assist. The more cars you allow to park on Lindsey Road the more cars that will fight for the places. Requests the council introduces a policy whereby residents with driveways are not permitted to park their car on the road outside houses that do not have driveways to improve parking availability for those residents with no driveways.	restrict access to driveway; create competition for spaces among residents	there is adequate parking in all adjoining roads, therefore of little or no impact on Lindsey Road or amenity; minimal extra vehicle movements expected	overrule
8	Lindsey Road	Whilst not directly impacted concerned increased parking for business season permit users could open the floodgates and change the appearance of the area over time. The Council should instead fund adequate parking within the town proportionate to the needs of businesses there. Lindsey Road is already busy with pedestrian and vehicle movements and any additional parking pressures increases the prospect of accidents.	damage to amenity of area; floodgates risk more business permits; safety	there is adequate parking in all adjoining roads, therefore of little or no impact on Lindsey Road or amenity; minimal extra vehicle movements are expected	overrule
7	Lindsey Road	Concerned about the knock on effect of Business permits in adjoining roads as residents, with insufficient parking now, are pushed further up Lindsey Road. The council's statement that residents are the priority is not supported by the proposal and the introduction of Business parking may jeopardise the current parking position.	restrict parking near home due to displacement	there is adequate parking in all adjoining roads, therefore of little or no impact on Lindsey Road	overrule
9	Pinelands	Currently struggles with parking availability at the top of Pinelands due to the nature of the road and the limited space between properties. When cars are parked they block access to the driveway. Concerned this may be exacerbated with the introduction of business permits. .	restrict access to driveway	EHC data confirms occupancy of road space less than 30% therefore minimal impact on residents is envisaged	overrule
16	Pinelands	Cannot understand why Grange Paddocks car park, which has spare daily capacity, is not used rather than Pinelands; Frere Court attracts a lot of additional traffic with large lorries reversing up the narrow road; Frere Court has continual stream of ambulances, doctors, care workers, small busses, taxis etc and is located on a very dangerous bend; the proposed double yellow lines outside neighbour properties will prevent builders, window cleaners, service engineers etc; only two business season tickets should be allowed.	large vehicles and dangerous bend; DYL prevent tradesman parking	the introduction of DYL will improve safety for residents and facilitate vehicle movements; the number of permits issued in the proposed section will be no greater that 50% of available space - therefore minimal impact to residents	overrule
44	Pinelands	Currently large vehicles are required to reverse up or down the road - the turning area at the top of the road is not big enough for large vehicles; there is already quite a bit of parking along the entrance to Pinelands - two mail vans park there daily and B7 permit holders park whilst visiting the vets in Lindsey Road; the corner outside "Frere Court" entrance is a steepish hill and when snow and ice is present it has prevented residents from getting cars to driveways; 1a and 1b Pinelands have short steep driveways and the proposal to introduce Double Yellow Lines outside their homes would prevent their visitors from parking and leave no room for delivery lorries, window cleaners, scaffolding lorries etc; if Pinelands must be used for business parking it must be for 2 cars only maximum.	large vehicle movement difficulty; restrict parking near home; restrict parking for tradesmen	the introduction of DYL will improve safety for residents and facilitate vehicle movements; the number of permits issued in the proposed section will be no greater that 50% of available space - therefore minimal impact to residents	overrule
27	Pinelands	The proposal would involve a conflict of interests between residents and business users and cause anxiety among residents in that the Order prioritises the interests of private business users; the proposal will transform affected areas and impact on the interests of residents and street facility; full consultation has not taken place but rather minimal contact compared with detailed proposals produced in consultation with businesses; the council's letter refers to "inner" and "outer" zones which are not mentioned in the Order - which confuses the position; the proposal would reintroduce extensive non resident parking and the double yellow lines proposed would severely inhibit street facility for residents 1A and 1B; the risk of obstruction to traffic flows would increase as motorists attempted to park in the proposed parking bay and there could be a risk to road safety in respect of young children walking along narrow pavements; the proposal is prejudicial and impractical and a major departure from the existing resident permit parking scheme.	conflict residents / business permit holders; EHC communication; restrict parking for residents; road safety - pedestrians	the introduction of DYL will improve safety for residents and facilitate vehicle movements; the number of permits issued in the proposed section will be no greater that 50% of available space - therefore minimal impact to residents	overrule

13	Pinelands	1. disappointed the council seeks to develop a commercial parking opportunity and deface a road with yellow lines and create additional traffic that should remain a sanctuary; 2. there will be no room for visitors to park outside the property; 3. the existing traffic the road already contends with (large HGV vehicles (Bidvest etc), refuge and recycling), Frere Court Home workers and ambulances; 4. cannot understand why Grange Paddocks car park is not used as under capacity currently to avoid congestion in residential road.	restrict parking near home; restrict parking for visitors; damage to amenity of area; large vehicle movement difficulty; road safety - pedestrians	the introduction of DYL will improve safety for residents and facilitate vehicle movements; the number of permits issued in the proposed section will be no greater than 50% of available space - therefore minimal impact to residents	overrule
37	Pinelands	Concerned about the proposal impacting on the character and safety of Pinelands; additional traffic will add noise and risk impacting the setting in this relatively quiet street suitable for the many young children; the occupancy assessment suggests a capacity of 30 permit holder spaces which is overstated due to the many dropped kerbs; the section of proposed parking for business permits is already a difficult stretch for residents and additional parking would only make worse; visibility around the bend section is poor and drivers may be forced to reverse or move to the other side of the road.	restrict parking near home; restrict parking for visitors; damage to amenity of area; large vehicle movement difficulty; road safety - pedestrians	the introduction of DYL will improve safety for residents and facilitate vehicle movements; the number of permits issued in the proposed section will be no greater than 50% of available space - therefore minimal impact to residents	overrule
47	Robert Wallace	writing on behalf of the CCA Committee: at an informal meeting with Cllr Jones on 20/02/17 we discussed a number of parking / road safety issues which are of concern to residents; we expressed reservations about the scope of the Mott MacDonald study data (gathered on one Monday morning and afternoon in February) and the conclusions which appear to have been drawn from it; we made it clear that further exploration of the "shared use" scheme would need a comprehensive survey of parking bay usage and should also seek and accommodate the views of residents. we conclude the MM study formed the basis of the decision to include proposed roads, however Rye Street, Chantry Close were not included and Barrells Down Road was considered unsuitable; the MM study was conducted one weekday and one weekend (the Monday was in the first full week of the May Day holiday and is popular for without school children age to take holiday: the study provides neither a current nor comprehensive picture of parking bay usage by residents; the working pattern of residents has not been taken into account, neither the MM study or 6 February 2017 council provide statistics for parking bay occupation after 4pm; inconsiderate parking by business permit holders may result in reduced sight lines or could prevent ingress / egress to properties; a number of residents have complained to us about such parking.	communication; Mott MacDonald survey data query (Barrells Down Road unsuitable) and unrepresentative due to bank holiday proximity); residents' needs not taken into account; safety; access to driveways; number of residents have complained to CCA regarding EHC proposal	EHC gathered survey evidence in early 2017 (appendix 1) to support the proposal and following consideration of residents' objections and comments elements have been accepted as relevant and worthy of action leading to a reduction in the number of permits to be offered and modification to design in Elm Road and Chantry Road - in those areas close to the town. The revisions are intended to fully address the concerns of affected residents.	overrule
4	Rye Street	The quality of life has significantly improved since the introduction of permit parking and business permit season permits would return residents to the previous unacceptable position. The results of the survey are not statistically significant as they were carried out in the first week of May 2016 (a bank holiday week). Many residents work from home and require constant access from their homes: the inconvenience of having to drive round the area to seek another parking space because spaces are occupied cannot be contemplated. The proposal is a money making scheme which takes little or no account of the needs of residents. Better utilisation of existing parking (Old Goods Yard), Grange Paddocks car park, development of multi storey car park at the train station is needed.	Mott MacDonald survey not relevant; restrict parking near home	EHC confirms occupancy levels below 25% with average 10 spaces available	overrule
14	Rye Street	The proposal will potentially deny residents parking spaces and offer lower standard; Grange Paddocks car park should be considered as 50% occupied typically currently to reduce the inconvenience of dual occupancy in Rye Street; a lack of enforcement in the road, as is believe to be the case, will cause issues for local residents; the statements about the maximum number of permits is vague and there is no information regarding where the proposed revenue will go; the proposal will increase traffic flow on an already busy road and must be considered in light of the proposed Herts County Council pedestrian crossing (the scheme fails on improving safety and improving the on street facilities to residents); no consideration of the impact of new residential developments in the area; the view of the Chantry Residents Association are not reflected by all residents; there is no benefit for local residents and a public meeting should be held.	restrict parking near home; increase traffic flow; no benefit to local residents	East Herts data confirms occupancy levels below 25% with an average 10 spaces available; minimal impact in traffic flows; benefits of proposal will be felt town wide as there will be additional spaces in the car parks for visitors and residents	overrule
29	Rye Street	The proposal is detrimental to local residents as it would reduce the number of spaces available and reduce the chance of parking near your house; the service road section of Rye Street provides parking for those Rye Street residents living 91 - 105 therefore it is particularly inappropriate to seek to introduce business permits; two new large houses are being build opposite and they will require parking for their visitors; Grange Paddocks car park is very empty during the working day and business permits should be issued for this car park instead of along residential streets.	restrict parking near home	East Herts data confirms occupancy levels below 25% with average 10 spaces available; minimal impact in traffic flows; benefits of proposal will be felt town wide as there will be additional spaces in the car parks for visitors and residents	overrule
24	Rye Street	Object on basis of safety: the proposed Zebra crossing possibly directly opposite my driveway may make reversing out of driveway difficult particularly when cars are parked either side on the road. The drive is sloped and the road narrow which means reversing potentially into on coming cars. Business season ticket parking increases the risk of cars being parked either side of drive. Visibility is very restricted and it's difficult to reverse. There is insufficient space between certain driveways for non residents to park: has this been factored in? Grange Park and Grange Paddocks car park have available parking and should be considered.	safety: reversing out of driveway; restrict access to driveway	East Herts data confirms occupancy levels below 25% with average 10 spaces available; minimal impact in traffic flows; benefits of proposal will be felt town wide as there will be additional spaces in the car parks for visitors and residents	overrule

26	Rye Street	Strongly object to "on sell our permits to commuters and businesses"; businesses should park in a car park. It is not the responsibility of residents to make way for business season ticket holder parking on their residential streets. There are 12 homes in Rye Street (Service Road area) and four properties (107,109, 127, 129) with unsuitable for parking leaving 8 available spaces. The council proposes 5 business season ticket holders with only 8 suitable parking spaces available - insufficient number for our visitors. In addition other Rye Street residents park in the road. Grange Paddocks car park should be considered. The idea is morally wrong. Consideration to the provision of a Park & Ride service at A120/Tesco to assist and alleviate pollution levels in the town.	restrict parking for visitors	East Herts data shows occupancy levels below 25% with average 10 spaces available; minimal impact in traffic flows; benefits of proposal will be felt town wide as there will be additional spaces in the car parks for visitors and residents	overrule
18	Rye Street	Grange Paddocks should be considered for business season permits as never anywhere near full with at least twenty spaces available all day; allowing strangers to park outside a resident's property will encourage friction between two parties; residents pulling out of their drive have great difficulty in seeing other vehicles and the proposal will increase the chance of accidents especially if children are travelling with bicycles. Consideration should be given to use of Northgate End car park, the multi storey and the area currently restricted opposite the Bishop's Stortford Social Club as the road is wide.	restrict access to driveway; risk of harm to children	East Herts data confirms occupancy levels below 25% with average 10 spaces available; minimal impact in traffic flows; benefits of proposal will be felt town wide as there will be additional spaces in the car parks for visitors and residents	overrule
28	Rye Street	Residents have already paid for their resident permits and are now being told they can only park outside their homes freely for two days a week and business parking will be allowed 5 days a week; the proposal is illogical in that residents pay for permits and council tax; the Grange Paddocks car park is underused and residential areas are not appropriate for businesses; there is no benefit to me as a resident.	restrict parking near home; no benefit	East Herts data confirms occupancy levels below 25% with average 10 spaces available; minimal impact in traffic flows; benefits of proposal will be felt town wide as there will be additional spaces in the car parks for visitors and residents	overrule
23	Willow Close	Concerned the proposal may return the roads to pre Residents Permit Parking status with safety compromised and vehicles forced to mount pavement in some places in Chantry Road and Elm Road. The proposal is a money making scheme with risk of scheme being rolled out to other roads ("the number of permits may be varied") that exonerates the council from providing car parking facilities for visitors and workers in the town. Does not want the local streets to become a car park again. Parking problems are going to get worse and with thousands of new homes planned new infrastructure is required.	safety: force vehicles to mount pavement; turn streets into car park	There are controls in the administration of the scheme; benefits of proposal will be felt town wide as there will be additional spaces in the car parks for visitors and residents	overrule