

**SOUTH ESSEX PARKING PARTNERSHIP  
(TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS) SUB COMMITTEE**

Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> July 2025

**AGENDA ITEM**

**Subject**

The Essex County Council (Chelmsford City) (Prohibition of Waiting, Loading and Stopping) and (On-Street Parking Places) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Amendment No.66) Order 202\*

Relating to Mill Lane, The Square, Back Lane, Cambridge Close, Austen Drive and Swan Lane, Stock.

**Report by**

Andrew Clay - South Essex Parking Partnership TRO Manager

**Enquiries contact:** Nick Binder South Essex Parking Partnership Services Manager, 01245 606303, [nick.binder@chelmsford.gov.uk](mailto:nick.binder@chelmsford.gov.uk)

**Purpose**

To report the receipt of representations made on part of The Essex County Council (Chelmsford City) (Prohibition of Waiting, Loading and Stopping) and (On-Street Parking Places) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Amendment No.66) Order 202\*

**Options**

The Joint Committee has the following options available:

1. to agree that the proposed Order be made as advertised.
2. to agree that the proposed Order be made subject to modifications which result in less restrictive provisions or reduced scope; or
3. to agree that the proposed Order should be withdrawn in its entirety.

**Recommendation**

1. The Order should be withdrawn in its entirety; and
2. The people making representations be advised accordingly.

**Consulters:** South Essex Parking Partnership

**Policies and Strategies**

The report considers the South Essex Parking Partnership Document setting out how the SEPP will deal with requests for parking restrictions requiring TROs.

Report	
<b>1</b>	<b>Background</b>
1.1	<p>An application form from Stock Parish Council (SPC) was received by the South Essex Parking Partnership (SEPP) in May 2024. The application consisted of 10 locations within the centre of the village. These were the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) High Street / The Paddock junction</li> <li>2) High Street / The Square junction (northern)</li> <li>3) High Street / The Square (southern)</li> <li>4) Swan Lane</li> <li>5) High Street / Back Lane junction</li> <li>6) Back Lane / Cambridge Close junction</li> <li>7) Austen Drive / Cambridge Close junction</li> <li>8) The Square / Mill Road junction</li> <li>9) High Street / Mill Road junction</li> <li>10) Mill Road (from The Bear PH and No. 22 to opposite No. 40)</li> </ol>
1.2	<p>Concerns were raised by SPC regarding obstructive parking in Mill Lane, The Square, Back Lane, Cambridge Close, Austen Drive and Swan Lane. It has been stated that vehicles frequently park causing access and egress issues, particularly for larger vehicles. In addition, sight lines when exiting and entering junctions without restrictions, are hindered by parked vehicles.</p>
1.3	<p>Concerns were also raised by SPC regarding obstructive parking outside of the school entrance. Vehicles parking in Swan Lane at school dropping off and picking up times cause congestion, access and egress issues, particularly for larger vehicles and hinder sight lines for pedestrians crossing Swan Lane as well as creating conflict with vehicles travelling in opposite directions.</p>
1.4	<p>During the formal consultation Stock Primary School stated the following.  <i>Before outlining our objections to the proposals, we would like to make it very clear that the school has never approached Essex County Council regarding parking in the village. The school has been named in the proposals without our permission. In view of this it should be struck out and made very clear that these proposals have not come as consequence of actions or proposals by the school. Please can you confirm when this has been actioned.</i></p>
1.5	<p>SPC stated that the village of Stock has a lack of parking restrictions particularly on junctions and a blind bend. It is stated that vehicles parking in these locations cause obstruction of sightlines and footway, also hinder traffic flow. Additionally, it is stated that vehicles parking near junctions cause traffic to disobey other traffic signs. The applicant stated that parked vehicles cause access issues for emergency services and waste collection.</p>
1.6	<p>An email was received from the Chelmsford Waste Team stating that inconsiderate parking is an ongoing issue around Mill Road, Swan Lane and The Square.</p>

1.7	<p>SPC completed a village survey in January 2024. The results of Question 8 showed that 377 out of 462 respondents found parking in the village centre/school a cause for concern. Question 9 asked residents their thoughts on the introduction of parking restrictions in the village. According to the results, 53.6% of those that completed the survey wanted restrictions in the village and 42% wanted restrictions around the local School. It should be noted however that residents were not given specific details on what or where restrictions would be placed.</p>
1.8	<p>The entrance to Stock Primary School is located on Swan Lane. There is existing 'School Keep Clear' markings outside the school however, these are only advisory, not enforceable.</p>
1.9	<p>SEPP have been in negotiations with the school to take part in one of SEPPs 3PR school initiatives to reduce parking issues around the school. According to Essex Highways, the statistics they hold suggest that around 75% of pupils live outside the village. Therefore, most pupils will be travelling to school by car. This demographic has the potential for a positive impact from a SEPP initiative such as 'Park and Stride'. The Village Hall has been identified as a potential location for this, as there is sufficient parking available and would be approximately 500 metres away from the school.</p>
1.10	<p>Considering the application from SPC and the photographic evidence provided, as well as the site visits carried out by SEPP Technicians and their observations, the SEPP Joint Committee Member and Lead Officer for Chelmsford agreed to proceed with a proposed scheme for further parking restrictions in Stock in order for the issues raised by SPC to be formally consulted on and provide anyone an opportunity to formally state their opinions and the impact it could have on the village.</p>
1.11	<p>Funding approval for £10,000 was gained however this amount was also to cover any possible re-advertising. It should be noted that the SEPP is self-funded. A proposal for double yellow lines on junctions and in various locations, as well as making the advisory School Keep Clear marking enforceable was then advertised.</p>
1.12	<p><b>SEPP Policy – 1.6</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that all requests for a parking restriction will carry some form of merit and may be beneficial to the particular area. The requests will be submitted for a variety of reasons and depending on the circumstance will be considered as a high or low funding priority to the Partnership. As the amount of funding available for new schemes is limited it is the intention of this policy to provide a criterion, which if met, will be considered a high priority scheme for the Partnership and therefore stand a greater chance of receiving the available funding. Schemes that do not meet all the criteria can still be progressed and considered by the Joint Committee, but schemes with a higher priority will take precedence. All schemes will be subject to available funding.</p> <p><b>SEPP Policy – 7.1</b></p> <p>The SEPP will receive all parking restriction requests that do not meet the</p>

1.13	<p>criterion of ECC safety and congestion policies, detailed above. Although these schemes do not meet the ECC criteria the Partnership may decide to implement parking restrictions to improve safety and sight lines, if the Partnership consider that the restriction will be beneficial to the area.</p>
<b>2</b>	<b>Funding</b>
2.1	The cost of the scheme was estimated at £10,000.
2.2	On 15 November 2024 funding was agreed to proceed with the necessary Traffic Regulation Order.
<b>3</b>	<b>Formal Consultation</b>
3.1	<p>The proposed Order was originally advertised in the Essex Chronicle on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2025 and on site from 19<sup>th</sup> February to 17<sup>th</sup> March 2025 under Sections 1(1), 2(1) to (3), 4(1), 4(2), 32, 35, 45, 46, 49 and 53 and Parts III and IV of schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Copies of Chelmsford Amendment No.66 were sent to the SEPP's list of consultees, Chelmsford Council, relevant councillors and Town and Parish Councils and put on the Chelmsford City Council website.</p>
3.2	<p>When the proposed Order was published on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2025 a 21-day period of formal public consultation commenced. All representations received during this period are listed on this report, together with the comments of the Technician.</p>
3.3	<p>The proposed Order is for Double Yellow Lines in various locations in Mill Road, The Square, Back Lane, Cambridge Close and Austen Drive, and No Stopping on Entrance Markings Mon-Fri 8-9.30 &amp; 2.30-4pm in Swan Lane.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>SEPP Technicians response to objections</b>
4.1	<p>Obstructive parking hinders sight lines at junctions and bends, particularly for larger vehicles, as well as access and egress to properties. The Chelmsford Waste Team have stated poor parking is an ongoing issue especially in Mill Road, Swan Lane and The Square. Emergency vehicles would face the same issues too. On occasions larger vehicles have been forced onto the wrong side of the junction in Mill Road when trying to exit into the High Street because of parked vehicles. If residents do not believe larger vehicles should be entering the centre of the village does this include the refuse lorry, delivery vehicles and fire engines.</p>
4.2	<p>The proposal seeks to improve sightlines for all road users at junctions, better facilitate the passage of traffic and enforce Rule 243 of the Highway Code. Part of Rule 243 of the Highway Code states 'Do not stop or park within 10 metres of a junction. Therefore, the suggestion that a lesser length of yellow lines at junctions would be against what the Highway Code states. Parking in certain areas in The Square on both sides of the carriageway would simply cause obstruction. Section 22 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 makes it an offence for the person in charge to leave a vehicle, or trailer, on a road in such a position, or condition, as to cause a danger to other road users and can be enforced by the Police.</p>

4.3	<p><b><i>It is not possible to have resident, or business permits for yellow lines?</i></b></p> <p>Yellow lines apply to all. It is also not possible to provide enough permit bays within the village for the number of residents and businesses that would require a permit. The lining and signing for parking bays would have a significant environmental impact on the village. However, any yellow lines would be painted 50mm wide to reduce the environmental impact. Double yellow lines do not require signs as they are operational 24/7 and therefore have little environmental impact.</p>
4.4	<p>It is not possible to have echelon parking bays in the High Street as there is insufficient carriageway width. It would also not be permitted by the highway authority (ECC) as there would be vehicles reversing onto a busy road and causing a safety issue.</p>
4.5	<p>Not parking at a junction is a fundamental part of road safety. Not parking across an entrance is also fundamental as access and egress to a property should always be maintained. The highway is intended for the purposes of passing and repassing and that no right of parking exists. Parking provision is therefore a concession and, however desirable, should not be at the expense of the purpose of the highway. Where it is safe, and desirable parking can be allowed. It is the driver's responsibility to park their vehicle in safe location and position. If an incident occurs due to a vehicle being left in an unsafe location, then the driver of that vehicle is responsible.</p>
4.6	<p>The proposed double yellow lines protect junctions, bends and entrances to properties. It is irrelevant of who the vehicle belongs to and what time they are parked as obstruction and vehicles parked in dangerous locations can occur at any time. Safety is not time and vehicle related. In addition, the proposal will protect entrances to private and business properties.</p>
4.7	<p>The proposed restrictions outside the school will provide clear sight lines for parents and children when crossing the road outside the school and give drivers clear sight lines of pedestrians. It will also prevent vehicles from causing an obstruction to all road users during the busy drop off and pick up times.</p>
4.8	<p>Any requests for the 'Stopping Up' of public highway would need to be directed to Essex County Council, who are the highway authority. The SEPP would not considered times restrictions on junctions. Safety is not time and vehicle related. It should be noted that the locations and lengths of the proposed yellow lines have come from Stock Parish Council (SPC) who requested the SEPP to carry out a consultation. It was highlighted to the SPC that any proposal would be met with a lot of objections.</p>
4.9	<p>SEPP wrote to residents and business in the affected roads, notices have been erected on street furniture within the affected roads, an advert placed in the Essex Chronicle at the start of the consultation, and the Parish Council held a meeting in the coffee shop in the first week of the 21-day consultation. This is how a consultation is carried out and where anyone has a chance to state their</p>

	views and opinions. The SEPP is also aware of the Parish Council communicating with residents last year regarding parking restrictions in the village. From that the Parish Council approached the SEPP with a request and proposed scheme which has been consulted on.
4.10	SEPP is self-funded and not funded by taxpayers. The SEPP implement maintain, and enforce on-street parking restrictions, it has no other function. All other highway related matters are the responsibility of Essex County Council (Essex Highways). For example, speed limits and cameras, pedestrian crossings, traffic calming measures, potholes and surfacing, all road markings and signs, apart from lining and signing for parking restrictions.
4.11	The use of the village hall car park needs to be used as much as possible by school parents, local workers and visitors to the village, to alleviate the pressure on parking in the centre of the village to ensure the village can continue to thrive whilst maintain a degree of access and sight lines.
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
5.1	Following the formal consultation 134 representations were received with 3 supporting and 130 objecting with 1 comment. A petition consisting of 562 signatures were also received on 12 <sup>th</sup> March 2025.
5.2	<p>The SEPP Joint Committee Member, Lead Officer for Chelmsford and the SEPP TRO Team have considered all the representations and comments.</p> <p>The proposals aim to improve some of the reported issues but it is clear from the number of objections received, the proposed scheme is not supported and will have an impact on the residents and businesses within the area.</p> <p>The SEPP Sub Committee do have the option to reduce the scheme to protect only the junctions, but we consider applying this measure will still have an impact and displace vehicles into the areas where SEPP also proposed yellow lines to counter act this action. Therefore we feel that all stakeholders need to fully understand and realise any changes and the impact any changes to the proposal will have before a reduction to the Order can be made. Therefore the recommendation to the SEPP Sub Committee is to withdraw the Order in its entirety.</p> <p>This formal consultation has raised awareness about parking in the village and also provides an opportunity for Stock Parish Council to continue to engage with Stock Primary School, school parents, residents, and businesses to work together to review the proposal and to consider alternative options such as a reduction to the original proposed scheme. SEPP will also continue to liaise with the Parish Council to advise on the feasibility of any proposals.</p> <p>It also important to note, that all stakeholders need to be aware that parking within 10 meters of a Junction is in breach of Rule 243 of the Highway Code which can still be enforced by the Police. It is the driver's responsibility to park their vehicle in a safe location and position.</p>

	List of Appendices
	Appendix 1 – Summary of objections or support and Technicians comments

### **Appendix 1 – Representations & Technician Response**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Representation</b>	<b>SEPP Technician Response</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Swan Lane – 19/02/2025</b></p> <p>I email in relation to the proposed parking restrictions for Stock village around the primary school and The Square</p> <p>I do not support these proposals.</p> <p>Re the proposals for Swan Lane to deal with the school drop off and pick up; by its very nature, drop off and pick up usually involves a vehicle stopping for a very short period of time - so unless you have an enforcement officer present throughout the proposed period of “no stopping between 8am-9.30am &amp; 2.30-4pm” each and every weekday, these restrictions will be pointless.</p> <p>Re the proposals for the other areas (The Square and surrounding areas), making these “No Waiting at Any Time” will have a devastating effect on local businesses. Living in such a rural area with many roads having no pavements or safe walkways, driving to local amenities is a necessity rather than a luxury. As walking, for many, isn’t an option, not being able to park in the village would mean we’d drive elsewhere - and local businesses suffering as a result.</p> <p>The existing double yellow lines in the village (that are situated on various junctions) are never “policed” so I would respectfully suggest you start with enforcing these and, more importantly, concentrate on the issue of the speed vehicles travel through the village at. This is something I know the overwhelming majority of local residents want addressed - rather than preventing them from being able to drive to buy a pint of milk.</p> <p>With both of the above, the High Street itself has no (or minimal) restrictions so all these restrictions will do, if implemented, is force vehicles to stop / park on the main thoroughfare - causing even more congestion and inconvenience than there currently is.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



		This is an extremely damaging and ill thought out plan which needs to be scrapped immediately and is in no way what local residents had in mind when liaising with the Parish Council about parking issues in the village.	
2	Support	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock – 19/02/2025</b></p> <p>These Proposals have LONG been overdue, especially around the Area of the Village School where cars are parked on the Pavements and across Drives plus reversing into residents drives, Also Children running in the Road where an accident is waiting to happen??</p> <p>There is a Car park in the Village Hall that should be more utilised for the above. Totally agree to these changes.</p>	Support noted
3	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of High Street, Stock – 19/02/2025</b></p> <p>Hi there, I've received letter from yourselves about Amendment No.66 Order 202 for parking restrictions in stock. I live at number XX on high street and I park outside the shop as I have no driveway. So I object to this proposal as it would take away me being able to park anywhere if this proposal went forward, I wouldn't be able park a safe distance from my home as I have toddler and it wouldn't be any help to me. So yes, it would have a negative impact for myself and I think the whole of stock if this went forward.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
4	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of High Street, Stock – 19/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed parking restrictions in Back Lane, which were outlined in your recent notice dated 20<sup>th</sup> February 2025. As a resident of this area, (the rear entrance to my house is in Back Lane), I believe the proposed changes will have a significant negative impact on both the local community and some residents who rely on street parking for themselves and, moreover, their visitors.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned about the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Limited Parking Availability:</b> The proposed restrictions will significantly reduce the available road parking, making it even more difficult for residents and visitors to find parking near their homes. This is especially problematic considering the already high demand for parking in our neighbourhood.</li> </ol>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>2. <b>Inconvenience for Residents:</b> Many residents do not have access to off-street parking for family and friends. The new restrictions would force us to park further away from our homes, leading to unnecessary inconvenience and safety concerns, especially for elderly or disabled individuals.</p> <p>3. <b>Impact on Local Businesses:</b> Several local businesses rely on the availability of parking for their customers. The proposed restrictions could deter people from shopping in the area, which may harm these businesses and have broader negative economic consequences for the local community.</p> <p>4. <b>Lack of Consultation with Residents:</b> It appears that there has been limited consultation with local residents about the proposed changes. A more inclusive and transparent process would allow for a better understanding of the potential impact on the community, and I urge the council to engage with residents before making any final decisions.</p> <p><b>Given these proposals are primarily to deter parents from parking up/dropping off their children at the back entrance to the local nearby primary school on school days, I kindly request that the council re-evaluate the proposed parking restrictions namely:</b></p> <p><b>From,</b></p> <p><b>‘NO WAITING AT ANY TIME’</b></p> <p><b>And consider alternative measures such as,</b></p> <p><b>‘NO WAITING MONDAY TO FRIDAY BETWEEN THE HOURS OF 8AM TO 9.30AM AND 2 30PM TO 4PM.</b></p> <p><b>Which is similar wording proposal for the front entrance of the school in Swan Lane, (Map title TQ690 987)</b></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><b>This wording amendment I believe, would address the needs of the community without causing undue hardship.</b> I would also appreciate the opportunity to participate in further discussions regarding this matter.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your response and to a resolution that serves the best interests of all residents in Back Lane, Stock.</p>	
5	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated 20/02/2025</b></p> <p>SEPP, I write in relation to your recently published amendment (#66) to parking in Stock. I live at XX Mill Road and would like to object to the wholesale removal of parking spaces along the section of Mill Road outside of #15. This clearly has quite an impact on #15 and also on the cluster of residential properties in the immediate vicinity (#22, #24, #30, #32 and #34). This stretch of Mill Road is often highly congested due to many cars being parked here by those using the facilities of The Bear pub, however, taking away all parking would have quite impact on access to the properties referenced. One measure that would have limited impact on your congestion alleviation measures, without unduly penalising this group of local residents, would be to support a small number of residents only parking spaces outside of #15 where the road is wider (opposite the turning into Bakers Field). Whilst this would narrow the road it would make it no narrower than the nearby section of Mill Road where current proposals are to support parking on both sides of the carriageway.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
6	Objection	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> Email from resident of Common Lane dated 21/02/2025</b></p> <p>I refer to your letter dated 18 February. I support the proposal and strongly believe it should be extended to the stretch of Mill Road nearest to The Square. The obstructive parking by parents in this road to drop off/pick up their children causes the same problems as in Austen Drive, Back Lane, Cambridge Close, Mill Lane etc. i.e., access and egress issues. I am particularly concerned that emergency vehicles are currently not be able to drive from the main road down Mill Road due to parking on a blind bend at a narrow part of Mill Road. Additionally, the lack of pavement in this area makes it particularly dangerous for pedestrians walking around parked cars.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>I hope the proposed parking restrictions will be enforced, as without enforcement the changes will be ineffective.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Email from resident of Common Lane dated 21/02/2025</b></p> <p>Thank you for this clarification. Accordingly, I would like to object to the proposal in its current form as I strongly believe it should be amended to include Mill Road, for the reasons given in my email below.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Well Lane dated 22/02/2025</b></p> <p>I have seen the proposals for the parking and waiting restrictions. Whilst I appreciate some measures are required, I think that the proposal is totally over the top and will massively impact businesses in the village, in particular the shops and the D&amp;B. It could prove detrimental enough for them to close and our village would be a poorer place without them. I am sure these measures will also affect parking for the school and although the impact will be less the Bear will also feel the affect.</p> <p>Has any thought been given to how elderly or infirm people will be able to access the area?</p> <p>Will the parish council support a reduced version of the parking measures?</p> <p>Clearly if implemented it will push parking further down Mill Road and will also impact those that live on or around the square that do not have off street parking.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
<b>8</b>	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated 22/02/2025</b></p> <p>As a resident of Stock, I would like to see the proposal amended so that MILL ROAD and THE SQUARE, STOCK, stay as they are without Parking Restrictions.</p> <p>There are many elderly people living in these areas, some with walking difficulties and have no other place to park within a reasonable distance.</p> <p>Also there are businesses in this area that elderly people rely on and the businesses need customer parking to survive. I believe restrictions in this area will kill the Village as we know it.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		Regarding cars parked in these areas, it slows the traffic down, making it much safer for pedestrians, as in some of these areas there are no pavements.	
9	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of High Street dated 22/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to register my objection to the proposed Yellow Lines in Stock , Essex.</p> <p>I live in the High Street and am concerned for the local businesses/shops in Stock if no parking is allowed in the centre of the village.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
10	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated 24/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing with disbelief regarding the new parking proposals in the village of Stock.</p> <p>I cannot see how these proposals benefit many residents of Stock other than the NIMBY parish councillor behind the proposal. It's a coincidence that there are double lines proposed at the end of his drive.</p> <p>Yes, there are normally a lot of cars parked in the area however this does not cause a safety issue. In fact it probably minimises accidents because people drive through slowly and carefully.</p> <p>There are businesses and residential homes in the proposed parking restriction area which will be severely detrimentally impacted.</p> <p>By all means put restrictions outside of the school however imposing yellow lines through the village will cause parents with young children to walk through parts of the village where no pathways exist (outside Bakers Field for example). The presence of cars currently creates a pseudo path between them and the buildings.</p> <p>These proposals do not affect me personally at present although will do when businesses in the village are forced to close or when people park on both sides of the road in other areas causing dangerous hazards.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>An example of this is Mill Road and Common Rd; where double parking happens now (occasionally when the village is busy) it is not only dangerous for residents to exit their driveways but also so narrow that emergency vehicles would not be able to access.</p> <p>Is it a coincidence that these proposals are being made now, so soon after the passing of the councillor, Ian Grundy, and his well-respected views?</p>	
11	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Billericay dated 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>To whom it may concern regarding the ridiculous proposals of no parking anywhere in Stock Village!</p> <p>I drive to the village to use the shops and restaurants as I live “down the hill” and the speed of drivers up and down the hill, the narrow width and often overgrown pavement mean it is not safe to walk up and down the hill.</p> <p>Whilst i agree that the parking around the entrance to Stock School is not safe, I do not believe the proposed double yellow lines around the whole of the village will solve the issue. All they will do is move the problem further round into Dakyn Drive and make the situation much worse.</p> <p>Double yellow lines in and around the square will damage trade, who will they even load and upload their vehicles, and will only cause further traffic issue in other areas of the village like Dakyn Drive which is not even mentioned on the proposed idea but is by far the most dangerous road at school drop off and pick up.</p> <p>Where are the residents of the square, mill road and high street who have no driveways meant to park?</p> <p>I do believe lines should be put on the corners and road junctions, to improve sight lines. And they should definitely be put on Mill Road in the area of Bakers Field as this is a blind bend and people park dangerously and speed way too fast. Stock School needs to deal with the bad drivers and parkers, this is not new, it was an issue when my children were there many years ago, but to penalise and destroy the village trades because of half a dozen bad drivers is ludicrous.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		Make the square one way? Entrance only from mill road, exit onto stock road by the bus stop, entrance opposite Budgens with left turn only at the top. This will make the cars flow easier around the square, allowing for parking still for the businesses.	
12	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email dated 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>I write regarding serious concerns regarding safety issues surrounding the proposed parking restrictions in Stock, Essex.</p> <p>We own several properties in Stock for letting purposes and also have a strong personal connection with the village. I was born and raised here and my parents have lived in Stock for most of their lives. As a landlord, we are very concerned regarding the proposed parking restrictions. I have attended most of the Parish council meetings last year and have listened to some compelling arguments in favour of traffic calming measures in the village, which I whole heartedly support. However, I am very concerned that the proposed parking restrictions will be counter productive to the safety of residents in the village. At the moment, the parking on the curve at the High Street end of Mill Road restricts the width of the road, but slows the vehicles down. The speed at which the vehicles can pass through this “physical barrier” will never cause serious injury should a pedestrian be struck. If this “physical barrier” is removed through the application of double yellow lines, the traffic will be able to pass through at much higher speeds which will cause serious injury to pedestrians if struck. This site is immediately before access to the square where there are many pedestrians.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed yellow lines at the junction of Mill Road and the High Street. It has been argued that these are necessary on safety grounds. This junction is an obtuse angle junction and the parked cars do not restrict visibility in any way. The road is wide enough for vehicles to pass easily, except for the pinch point outside the Village store, which I agree needs looking at. I am not aware that there have been any accidents at this junction. There was concern that vehicles were still attempting to turn right despite signage forbidding this. Putting double yellow lines down will not stop this. If anything it will make it easier as there will be much more room to get a better view past the house on the right which does restrict the view. The residents in the cottages at the end of Mill Road will have nowhere to park on street for several hundred yards. There is parking at</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>the rear of these cottages, but is it rarely used as access out on to the main road is very hazardous with extremely restricted views in both directions. I am concerned that if their on street parking is revoked, they will have no option but to park at the rear of these cottages. I am very sure that very soon there will be a serious accident when exiting this parking area.</p> <p>Whilst I accept that the parking situation is not ideal, the fact remains that the current situation does slow the traffic down. This is a quaint little village. Unfortunately parking issues are a common factor of quaint villages but I think that we have to accept that this is part of modern village life. I believe that, apart from the obvious eyesore of yellow lines plastered around the village, that this will have a detrimental effect on businesses in the village and the safety of residents. I propose that the parish council should have a more cautious approach to this issue, and strongly recommend that the parking restrictions, certainly in Mill Road, be reconsidered on safety grounds.</p> <p>Many thanks and kind regards</p>	
13	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Swan Lane – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am the owner of XX Swan Lane and I am directly affected by the above proposals and have at no time received any notification from yourselves regarding this matter. I am writing in response to a copy of the notification sent to a neighbour and brought to my attention by them.</p> <p>Whilst safety is of paramount importance, a blanket prohibition of parking in the suggested areas is not a satisfactory and balanced solution to the problem in the village. The current situation with no designated parking causes people to leave their vehicles in a non-structured way, anywhere they can find a space and results in cars being left in potentially dangerous position.</p> <p>As in Central London or most congested areas a combination of parking restrictions and clearly marked acceptable and safe parking spaces is a far more satisfactory solution and I would urge the South Essex Parking Partnership to reconsider their proposal and develop a plan to include as many safe parking spaces for local residents, business owners and visitors as possible.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



		<p>As previously mentioned my property is at 2 Swan Lane and this proposal would prohibit me parking outside with no viable nearby alternative which would result in a significant reduction in the resale value. A designated safe space outside would ensure that parking is carried out responsibly and safely without the possibility of 3 cars using the area at school drop off times which happens currently and proposes significant risk to pedestrians.</p> <p>With the above in mind I would ask you amend the proposal to one that not only considers safety but also the residents, visitors and business owners of our village.</p>	
14	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> Email from resident of The Square – 26/02/2025</b>  I have been told of the yellow lines that are going to be put in the square Stock my postcode is CMXXXX I have had no consultation about this and want to know what right you have in pushing this on to me without running it past the residents first, absolutely disgrace by the council using our tax money without no consultation I will be approaching the local News Papers about this and I would like you to hold any decision and come down to meet the residents we had a meeting last night in the local coffee shop with over 100 residents and all were totally discusted by the way you have approached this.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Email from resident of The Square – 27/02/2025</b>  Thanks for your returned e-mail please note I <b>DO NOT</b> want a yellow line across my drive</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
15	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Lane – 26/02/2025</b>  We're writing to express our concern for the proposed parking restrictions in Stock, which appear to serve the interests of a select few rather than the wider community.</p> <p>It is deeply concerning that these proposals, which will have a significant negative impact on local residents and businesses, seem to be driven by a single parish councillor's personal agenda. It is difficult to ignore the striking coincidence that double yellow lines are set to be placed directly outside his own private road...</p> <p>Local businesses and homes in the affected areas will suffer tremendously from these restrictions. While sensible measures outside the school may be justifiable, extending yellow lines throughout the village will only push parking elsewhere,</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>forcing parents with young children to walk through areas with no footpaths. In addition displaced parking from the centre of the Village will create dangerous congestion elsewhere and will inevitably affect us all when local businesses struggle to survive. We cannot understand how this proposal has even been tabled when it is clearly at odds with the best interests of the Village.</p> <p>We urge you to reconsider these plans and prioritise solutions that genuinely benefit Stock's residents and businesses, rather than catering to individual preferences. We look forward to your response.</p>	
16	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock Road – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>I wish to register that I am vehemently opposed to the aforementioned proposal for Stock village.</p> <p>I do not feel that Stock Parish Council has been transparent with giving out information on their proposals or consulted with residents adequately before pushing ahead to this stage. I regularly visit the local shops and hostelrys and yet I was totally unaware of the scheme until a local business owner highlighted the plan on a "Stock Village" social media group a few days ago.</p> <p>I have been a Stock resident since 2012 and the fact that there is a proper thriving village centre and sense of community is one of the biggest attractions. The proposals in their current form will lead to business closures as people will no longer be able to pop up to the village by car to do their shopping, visit the hairdressers or enjoy a pub lunch. Not everyone that frequents the local businesses lives within easy walking distance, or are physically able to walk. There are elderly or disabled residents who need to be able to park close to the amenities and I know of several whose only daily interaction is being able to park by the local cafe or a pub and pop in for a drink and a chat!</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines will only push the parking into other parts of the village, solving nothing, and the lack of parked vehicles to navigate will undoubtedly encourage cars to drive faster through the village than they already do.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>The Square is busy around school drop off and pick up times but it is manageable, and it's the same situation around the majority of village and town schools throughout the County.</p> <p>If this proposal is implemented it will have a very detrimental effect on the house prices of all residents directly impacted by the double yellow lines. If local businesses are forced to close and Stock loses "it's heart" that will have a negative impact on property prices for all residents.</p>	
17	Objection	<p><b>Email from local business – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>Without parking in Stock Village, local businesses will face serious challenges. We frequently drive through the village for both business and leisure, and without the ability to park near or outside places like Dandelion and Burdock, Stock Florist, or The Hoop pub, we would have no choice but to go elsewhere. The square is small, but cars have always parked there, and as a lifelong resident and former Stock Village school attendee, I can assure you it has never been unsafe, if that is the concern. Parking is essential to maintaining the village's charm and vibrant community.</p> <p>As the owners of XXXXXXXXXX, a daycare and boarding business with many local clients, we rely on the ability to park outside or close to owners' homes for safety. This is crucial, not only for the animals being picked up but also for the dogs already in our care.</p> <p>We strongly oppose the proposed parking restrictions and request that they be reconsidered. Instead, we suggest using the funding for a speed camera or speeding restrictions on the B1007 through the village.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
18	Objection	<p><b>Letter from resident of Cambridge Close – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>There are a number of parking issues that concern the residents and commercial premises in Stock.</p> <p>Our reply only addresses those issues which affect the residents of Austen Drive and Cambridge Close.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>The main issue for the residents of these roads is the 'school run'. Twice a day on school days our lives are blighted by the number of vehicles, poor parking, waiting with engines running and the road congestion.</p> <p>We avoid leaving our house by car in the periods of 8:30 to 8:45am and 2:30 to 3:00pm because the stream of cars entering Back Lane prevents anyone from leaving without delay.</p> <p>In addition, we have to advise any visitors not to arrive between 8:45 to 9:00 am or 3:15 to 3:30pm because the number of vehicles exiting Black Lane might result in serious delays. For example, 30 parents exiting Back Lane in 30 vehicles at approx. 3:30pm has an impact as vehicles wanting to enter Back Lane queue into the High Street. There is a further potential problem in that emergency vehicles' access to Back Lane, Austen Drive, Cambridge Close at these times is severely compromised as the Back Lane access to the High Street is single track, prohibiting two way traffic.</p> <p>The proposal as submitted is welcome but only addresses part of the problem. The 'No Waiting at any time' in Back Lane, Austen Drive and Cambridge Close will address sight lines when exiting Cambridge Close into Back Lane but will not overcome the problems of the 'school run'.</p> <p>We propose that further restrictions are implemented for Cambridge Close and Austen Drive in the areas not covered by the No Waiting proposal above. These restrictions should be of the form 'No Waiting, School Days 8:15-9:15am and 2.30-3:30pm'. Residents without off road parking could be allowed a resident's permit to retain parking outside their own property.</p>	
19	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>I have received a letter regarding the suggested changes to stopping/waiting within the village.</p> <p>I understand the logic raised by Stock Primary School and SPC in regard to obstructive parking outside the school on Swan Lane and proposal to introduce no waiting/stopping. This is quite common and I note the primary school in Ramsden heath already has this.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>In regard to other observations from SPC on the 'other roads', I do not recognise their concerns or understand who in the village has highlighted this to SPC and as such object to the proposed changes. Speaking as a resident and with a young child in the Primary School who we walk to school with each day, please see comments below for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If anything the cars parked in the square slow the traffic, I would be more concerned with speeding if these restrictions were introduced.</li> <li>• Restrictions would be a detrimental impact to the businesses in the area should they be introduced.</li> <li>• Restrictions would congest other areas in the village, SPC would be better advised to try and develop additional Car parking facilities close to the square.</li> <li>• I am not aware of any incidents in suggested roads to warrant change, has SPC listed any?</li> <li>• I am more concerned with the dangers of speeding in the village and would welcome the progressed a 20mph zone through the centre of the village (where cars often speed) and potentially upgrade of the zebra crossing outside Budgens (where cars regularly fail to stop!!!!) to a Pelican crossing would be vastly superior initiative and improve car safety in the village more than the proposed plans.</li> </ul>	
20	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of The Square – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>Dear Essex County Council,</p> <p>I am the owner of number XX The Square in Stock, CM4 XXX (photo of the property below). I am concerned about the effect that Amendment No 66, Order 202 will have on my ability to park one vehicle outside my house.</p> <p>I have lived at No XX The Square since XXXX, and have always been able to park my car outside the house (as shown). Please can you verify exactly what impact these proposals will have on residents of the square to park vehicles. Will the council make any provision for residents to park during the day and school drop</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>off times (ie a residents only parking arrangement ?)</p> <p>I do agree that during certain times during the day, traffic in and around the village is busy and there are no speed cameras in Stock to penalise cars travelling at more than 30 miles ph.</p> <p>There are many elderly residents living in cottages in and around the village, who I assume will be deeply impacted by these changes, plus the impact on local businesses in Stock. I myself have limited mobility and am retired. I therefore rely on my car to have a good quality of life, which includes the ability to park where I do.</p> <p>Please can you clarify this situation for me</p>	
21	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Margaretting – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am hugely opposed to the SEPP proposal in Stock Village.</p> <p>I've live in Margaretting but have had X children go through Stock Village Primary School for over 10 years.</p> <p>I've always parked on Swan Lane to do the school run &amp; never blocked anyone's driveway, caused a nuisance or blocked traffic or tractors from passing in those 10 years. I always park with consideration to home owners on Swan Lane.</p> <p>The school run is such a small window in the day that I don't understand why the parking restrictions are to be imposed now after so many years?</p> <p>There are parking issues around every single primary school in Essex. Especially in a small village setting. It's been the same story forever!</p> <p>I have other children to transport to &amp; from school &amp; the ease of parking close to the primary school is the difference between arriving on time or my daughter getting a late mark every day &amp; having her education time reduced.</p> <p>Education time which is something that we are now fined for, for being missed or having rammed down our throats. Decide what's best!</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>The only thing the proposal will do is push parking problems outside of the restrictions increasing issues &amp; causing further frustration to neighbours &amp; parents.</p> <p>I often park in &amp; around the Square to use the local businesses such as the coffee shop, florist, hairdressers &amp; pubs. With these park restrictions it will put off visitors to the small village &amp; put tremendous strain on the lovely local independent businesses &amp; bring an already tiny Village to it's knees unnecessarily. And as if life isn't hard enough as it is right now.</p> <p>I have signed the local petition &amp; I hope the proposal is dropped. It's nonsense to start with!</p>	
22	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Well Lane – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>I object, in the strongest possible way, to all the proposed yellow lines and parking restrictions in Stock.</p> <p>This has been in response to a small number of residents with vested interests. These will destroy the village centre and potentially ruin the businesses that are vital to many in the village (I have no personal interest in any). In addition, they will NOT make the village any safer and in the case of Mill Road less parking will simply allow motorists to go faster on the stretch with no pavement putting pedestrians at serious risk of harm.</p> <p>A totally disproportionate response to what is largely an issue at school drop off/ pick ups effecting only a few residents.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
23	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of The Square – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>As a resident of The Square, I understand the need to address the current parking and congestion issues. However, I have not been consulted at any point about my views.</p> <p>My first concern is that local businesses that are at the heart of the village community will suffer significantly under the proposed changes. This applies particularly to the Dandelion and Burdock cafe, The Bear and the two convenience stores.</p> <p>My second concern is where residents will be able to park their cars at least close to their homes.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>My third concern is that speeding is likely to increase given that there will be no parked cars to act as a slowing down measure.</p> <p>I am aware that at least two residents' requests for information at the planning stage, received no response or acknowledgement. I expect at least a stay of the planning application so that residents are properly and systematically consulted about their views.</p>	
24	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Common Road – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing as a resident of Stock Village (XX Common Road) and wish to voice my concerns and wholehearted opposition to the above mentioned proposal. This would be severally detrimental to both businesses and residents of the “square” and all surrounding areas of the village.</p> <p>There are, I’m sure, a myriad of other solutions that could be implemented as an alternative to this proposal and more time, thought and effort should be given to these prior to forcing through this unworkable and damaging proposal .</p> <p>Concentrating efforts on reducing speed through and in the village should be the number one priority.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
25	Objection	<p><b>Email from local business – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>I’m messaging in the hope that with enough voices we can rightfully oppose the proposed parking regulations in stock village. I am a sole trader working out of the xxxxx xxxxx in stock. I like the vast majority of the village resident's am incredibly worried for the impact that this ill thought out decision will have on my business. Taking away all/majority of the parking is effectively stopping me and others from continuing to trade. There is no other parking within a suitable distance that will be able to contain the amount of cars that you suddenly wish to displace. That is also not to mention our disabled clients that hugely rely on our current close parking options. My clientele will be forced to travel to other xxxxx where parking is readily available which is incredibly damaging to my business . The xxxxx xxxxx currently is part of a lovely community within stock, including other shops that make the village what it is. Take away the shops and pubs and what is left ? What you wish to enforce benefits the few but hurts the majority. I find the entire plans short sighted and narrow minded and fail to understand how it benefits anyone in the long run. It is a busy village because it’s a successful village, which very few small independent businesses can attest to in the current climate. I really</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



		hope that for the sake of this and all of the residents that the correct decision is reached and this serious threat to our livelihoods is stopped.	
26	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Lilystone Close – 26/02/2025</b>  This is a response to your consultation, details above, which closes on 14 March.</p> <p>I have reviewed the documentation on Chelmsford Council's website and am writing to object to this part of the proposal:</p> <p><b>Effect of the Order:</b> To propose parking restrictions on the following lengths of roads in the City of Chelmsford as specified below.</p> <p><b>1. To introduce 'No Waiting at Any Time'.</b></p> <p><b>Mill Road, Stock</b>  <b>South &amp; Southwest sides</b> – from its junction with High Street eastwards and south-eastwards to the property boundary of Stock Village Shop and No.8A Mill Road.  <b>Southwest side</b> – from the property boundary of Nos.22 &amp; 24 Mill Road south-eastwards for 79 metres.  <b>Northeast side</b> – from its junction with High Street south-eastwards for 53 metres.  <b>Northeast side</b> – from a point 67 metres southeast of its junction with High Street south-eastwards for 85 metres. Map tiles TQ685 987 &amp; TQ690 987</p> <p><b>The Square, Stock</b>  <b>Southeast side</b> – from its junction with Mill Road north-eastwards for 10 metres.  <b>Southeast side</b> – from a point 23 metres northeast of its junction with Mill Road north-eastwards for 12 metres.  <b>Southeast side</b> – from a point 70 metres northeast of its junction with Mill Road north-eastwards for 8 metres.  <b>Southeast side</b> – from a point 17 metres southwest of its north-eastern junction with High Street south-westwards for 13 metres.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

	<p><b>Northwest side</b> – from its junction with Mill Road north-eastwards for 7 metres.</p> <p><b>Northwest side</b> – from a point 12 metres northeast of its junction with Mill Road north-eastwards for 10 metres.</p> <p><b>Northwest &amp; Southwest sides</b> – from a point 38 metres northeast of its junction with Mill Road north-eastwards and northwards for 20 metres.</p> <p><b>Southwest side</b> – from its south-western junction with High Street south-eastwards for 6.5 metres.</p> <p><b>Northeast sides &amp; Northwest sides</b> - from a point 7 metres southwest of its north-eastern junction with High Street south-westwards and north-westwards for 70 metres. Map tile TQ690 987</p> <p><b>Back Lane, Stock</b></p> <p><b>Southwest side</b> – from its junction with High Street north-westwards for 14 metres.</p> <p><b>North side</b> – from a point 24 metres east of its junction with Cambridge Close westwards for 38 metres. Map tile TQ685 987</p> <p><b>Cambridge Close, Stock</b></p> <p><b>Both sides</b> – from its junction with Back Lane northwards for 10 metres.</p> <p><b>Both sides</b> – from a point 10 metres northwest of its junction with Austen Drive south-eastwards and southwards for 24 metres. Map tile TQ685 987</p> <p><b>Austen Drive, Stock</b></p> <p><b>Both sides</b> – from its junction with Cambridge Close north-eastwards for 10 metres. Map tile TQ685 987</p> <p>My reasons for objecting to these proposals are:</p> <p>1. Impact on the character of village life: preventing parking on these roads will significantly reduce the footfall to the local Stock village shop and the Budgens shop. These are small shops that people use for convenience: because they can walk to them, or can park close by and pop in for a few items. If people can no</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>longer park close to these shops, they will only be used by people within walking distance. That is likely to mean that they will end up closing as they will lose much custom. If these shops close this will have a detrimental effect on Stock village.</p> <p>I would add that I could walk to the shops but I live in Lilystone Close. The road between my house and the village has seen one tragic death in recent years and multiple traffic accidents. The Council has allowed the verge to extend past the back line - there are branches, leaves, debris and dirt covering the pavement meaning it is not wide enough to walk with a buggy or holding my child's hand. Therefore I drive to the local shops but if I cannot park close to them it is no longer a convenient trip and I am more likely to go elsewhere.</p> <p>2. Impact on other amenities in the village: similar to the above objection, if people cannot park close to the Dandelion and Burdock cafe or the Stock florist or hairdressers these venues will again only be used by those who can walk to them. This is unlikely to be sufficient numbers of people to make these businesses viable. If these businesses close it will similarly have a negative impact on the character of the village. Ditto for the local pubs. Yes, The Bear and The Harvard have their own car parks but there are not enough spaces in them in relation to the number of tables. People simply will stop visiting.</p> <p>3. Linked to the above objections, if no one can park at any time outside these businesses, how are their suppliers supposed to deliver to them? Dandelion and Burdock has regular supplies of food. The drivers won't be able to park so how is the shop to be supplied? It looks like there is the odd space left in the restrictions around The Square but the likelihood of those spaces being free when the delivery van arrives seems low...</p> <p>4. The junction between Back Lane and the High Street is a blind bend and can only be used by cars going in one direction at a time. The potential safety issue is not parked cars in Cambridge Close and Austen Drive 50 metres away. Why don't the Council make the Back Lane/High Street junction one way only? That would have the effect of improving safety as cars wouldn't be trying to access the road</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>from different directions at the same time. It would reduce congestion on the High Street as traffic backs up waiting to turn into or out of Back Lane. And it would likely also reduce traffic in Back Lane and surrounding streets because a one way system will take longer for people to navigate meaning they chose not to go that way. I'm sure the residents of these roads that object to people parking near their houses because of "safety concerns" would find the inconvenience of a one way system a small price to pay for safer streets.</p> <p>5. There is a school in the middle of the parking restrictions. Many children attend the school from outside the village. If parking restrictions make it impossible to park near the school, what consideration has been given to the impact this will have on parents' school choices? If parents from outside the village are deterred from sending their children there, how long before the school does not have sufficient children to be viable?</p> <p>6. There is a library also in the middle of the parking restrictions at the school. Signage tells visitors they cannot use the school car park. If they can also not park close by in the village, then that is another local amenity that seems likely to become unviable to maintain - again having a detrimental impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>7. It is unrealistic to expect people to park in the village hall car park at the other end of the village - so far away it isn't even visible on the maps submitted as part of this proposal... The village hall carpark is also often full!! It isn't big enough to support the amount of traffic that would be displaced if everyone who usually parks in the village is directed to the village hall car park instead. What analysis has been done of the volume of cars that park in the village, and whether the village hall carpark could actually support those additional cars at specific periods of the day? I'd add that given two cars cannot enter/exit the car park at the same time, this is going to lead to queues and traffic jams on a road that very quickly leads onto the main B road between Chelmsford and Billericay/Basildon. I've sat waiting to turn into the carpark for ages if I'm unlucky enough to arrive when people are leaving an event at the village hall. Luckily I've been on my own but in</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>future when I've got scores of parents in cars behind me also waiting to turn into the carpark, or come out of it, it is completely impractical. You would have to ensure that it was not one way only at the entrance/exit.</p> <p>Grateful if you could consider these objections when you come to consider this application.</p>	
27	Objection	<p><b>Email from local resident – 26/02/2025</b></p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed parking restrictions for Stock Village. Stock is a thriving village with a strong, supportive community.</p> <p>The proposed extent of yellow lines would be very damaging to all the local businesses.</p> <p>Stock C of E Primary School is a very good school - a high percentage of children travel in to school from outside the village.</p> <p>School traffic is inevitable near any school.</p> <p>The school is working hard to ensure polite parking and has adopted the 3PR rules with banners, etc near the entrance.</p> <p>The "school run " is for approximately 40 minutes a day, 40 weeks a year. The rest of the time the school is the "perfect neighbour".</p> <p>If the children who live outside the village don't come to Stock School, like local businesses, the school will be at risk of being forced to close.</p> <p>What will the Village become with a failing school and failing businesses?</p> <p>Maybe additional village parking can be found? The BT area at Bakersfield?</p> <p>All the people I know who live in and around The Square understand, accept and work with the current parking situation without any problems.</p> <p>Please, please don't choose "tidy streets " over a "thriving village".</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
28	Objection	<p><b>Email from local resident – 27/02/2025</b></p> <p>Please accept this email as my objection to the planned yellow lines in Stock village.</p> <p>Having lived in/around the Square for over 10 years I have never seen or heard of any accidents and if anything the proposed plans will only encourage speeding through certain parts of the Square.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>The proposal will cripple the heart of the village and the community that lives in it, encourage speeding where there is openness. It will also impact the few independent businesses we have.</p> <p>Whilst 'some' of the planned yellow lines make sense the majority don't so a common sense approach would be best.</p>	
29	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of High Street – 27/02/2025</b></p> <p>We are against the proposed parking restrictions proposal dated 20th February 2025 for the following reasons:-</p> <p>*Excessive parking restrictions especially around the Square will cause parking problems for residents, visitors to shops pubs and other businesses as well as school drop offs and pick ups as will just move parking congestion problems elsewhere.</p> <p>*Effectively clearing the Square of parked vehicles would encourage faster moving traffic around the Square with potential pedestrian safety issues (as there's no doorways) and the Square will become a "rat-run" for speeding traffic to Mill Road. At present the number of parked vehicles acts as an effective traffic calming measure.</p> <p>*A concern was raised about access and egress issues particularly for larger vehicles... Drivers of larger vehicles should bear in mind that the centre of Stock is small village environment so they should be encouraged to avoid the area around the square, or make their deliveries using smaller vehicles.</p> <p>*It is likely that some free parking spaces are used by commuters travelling by bus to Billericay railway station, therefore rather than introduce full parking restrictions at all times by the introduction of double yellow lines; introduce limited parking durations e.g. 30 minutes, or restrict parking during particular times of the day.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>* If double yellow lines are utilised at all they should be at short sections at corners of road junctions, along with the usual zigzag road markings by the school entrance.</p>	
30	Objection	<p><b>Email from local business – 27/02/2025</b>  <b>Subject: Complaint Regarding Yellow Lines in Stock Village</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally raise a complaint regarding the recent suggestion of yellow lines in Stock Village under amendment no66, order 202.</p> <p>As both a business owner and a resident of this community, I, along with many other villagers, have significant concerns about the impact these markings will have on parking, accessibility, and the general convenience of local residents and businesses.</p> <p>My biggest grievance is the lack of proper consultation with local residents before the changes were applied for.</p> <p>The addition of these yellow lines will no doubt lead to many issues, including:</p> <p>A reduction in available parking for residents, particularly those without private driveways.</p> <p>Difficulty for visitors and local business patrons, which may negatively impact trade and community engagement.</p> <p>Limited alternative parking spaces, causing unnecessary congestion in surrounding areas.</p> <p>As a small independent retailer my own personal concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Reduced Customer Parking</b> – As a small business, I rely on customers being able to park nearby. If double yellow lines prevent parking, customers may choose to go elsewhere where parking is more convenient.</li> <li>2. <b>Impact on Deliveries</b> – My business depends on supplier deliveries, who will struggle and may even refuse delivery if loading and unloading areas are restricted.</li> </ol>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>3. <b>Customer Parking</b> - Customers will face difficulty finding legal stopping places, leading to delays or extra costs to my business</p> <p>4. <b>Loss of Passing Trade</b> – My shop benefits from impulse visits by passing motorists. If parking is not available, potential customers may drive past without stopping.</p> <p>5. <b>Inconvenience for Elderly and Disabled Customers</b> – Our small village business caters for our local community, including elderly or disabled customers who rely on close parking access. Restrictions could discourage them from visiting.</p> <p>6. <b>Effect on Business Reputation</b> – If parking is consistently difficult, word of mouth may deter customers, reducing footfall and long-term business viability.</p> <p>7. <b>Shift to Larger Competitors</b> – If parking restrictions push customers towards larger supermarkets or shopping centres with ample free parking, small independent businesses may struggle to compete.</p> <p>While we understand that traffic regulations and road safety measures are important, we believe that a more balanced approach should have been considered. Therefore, we kindly request that the council review this matter, consider alternative solutions, and engage in meaningful consultation with the residents of Stock Village to address our concerns.</p> <p>We would appreciate an opportunity to discuss this issue further and explore potential solutions that better serve both traffic management and community needs. Please advise on the next steps and any possible avenues for appeal or review.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your prompt response.</p>	
31	Objection	<p><b>Email from school parent – 27/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed implementation of no parking or waiting restrictions in the vicinity and nearby roads of Stock C of E Primary School. As a working parent of X children attending the school, I am deeply</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



		<p>concerned about the detrimental impact these restrictions will have on my ability to safely and efficiently drop off and collect my children.</p> <p>My primary objection stems from the significant increase in logistical challenges this proposal will create for working parents like myself. Currently, the existing parking situation, while sometimes congested, allows for a relatively manageable drop-off and pick-up routine. The proposed restrictions will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Force parents to park at a considerable distance from the school: This will necessitate longer walking times, particularly challenging with young children, heavy school bags, and in adverse weather conditions.</li> <li>• Create safety risks: Increased walking distances, especially during peak school hours, will expose children to greater traffic hazards and potential accidents particularly on very narrow pavements within Stock</li> <li>• Disrupt working schedules: The added time required to walk to and from the school will inevitably lead to delays in reaching workplaces, potentially impacting job security and productivity.</li> <li>• Disproportionately affect parents with multiple children or disabilities: Those with more than one child or those with mobility issues will be particularly disadvantaged by the increased walking distances.</li> <li>• Potentially increase congestion in other areas: Parents will be forced to park in further away residential streets, moving the problem, not solving it.</li> </ul> <p>I understand the council's desire to improve traffic flow and safety around the school. However, I believe this proposal fails to consider the practical realities faced by working parents.</p> <p>I request that the council seriously consider my objections and explore alternative solutions that balance the needs of all stakeholders, including working parents. I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss my concerns further and contribute to a more practical and equitable solution.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	
32	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road – 27/02/2025</b></p> <p>I live at XX Mill Road, Stock and am directly impacted by the proposed changes to parking restrictions in the village.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the</p>

		<p>I agree that some new parking restrictions are required. It is currently dangerous when trying to turn into The Square from the High Street as vehicles can obstruct the road and make it difficult to get out of the flow of traffic on the High Street. Yellow lines are already in place but there is poor compliance. Extending the yellow lines would be advantageous.</p> <p>I welcome some restrictions outside my property as vehicles regularly restrict access to my parking bay, block my gate and otherwise park inconsiderately. The new proposals leave parking places available outside houses on The Square but none next to `15, 30, 32 and 34 Mill Road. Could we have residents only parking bays? I would be willing to pay for visitors parking in such bays. Without this I wonder how I am going to manage trades people, shopping deliveries and visitors who may be disabled and/or with young children? Please consider the practicalities for residents. As a conservation area it is right that the safety and amenity for everyone is considered but residents are important parties to protecting the area and its quiet residential nature.</p> <p>Finally, none of this will work for anyone's benefit without enforcement.</p> <p>I look forward to your thoughts on these questions.</p>	SEPP Technician response.
33	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident – 27/02/2025</b></p> <p>Please kindly note my objection to the proposed changes to parking restrictions in stock</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
34	Objection	<p><b>Email dated – 27/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to express my concern about the about the above proposals.</p> <p>They do seem to be somewhat of an overreaction to the current problem and one that would appear to adversely affect those residents and businesses located in and around The Square. I'm quite sure it will affect each of them to a significant extent and I would hope that that there can be some modification of the proposals to take into consideration the points raised by them. I'm sure you would already be aware of the concerns they will all have raised.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

35	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Meadowgate dated – 28/02/2025</b>  I have some objections regarding the parking restrictions proposed in stock village and the surrounding roads.</p> <p>I am a mother of XX children all aged X and under and X of my children currently attend stock school and stock pre school. I live at XX Meadowgate, Stock, CM4 XXX. I have tried to walk to school with my XX children and it is simply to dangerous and puts them at risk due to speeding cars and there not being pavements all the way from my house to the school. For safety I choose to drive to school and I park respectively on roads surrounding the school, I do not block driveways, I do not park on or near corners, my parking and driving speed is respectful to residents who live near the school. I do not park in the village hall as stock road is also dangerous with cars speeding through and even with pavements it is simply not safe with XX young children to walk to school with no reduced speed limits or speeds cameras since the death of a child.</p> <p>Safety is the objection for me. To summarise I believe the parking restrictions will prevent childrens parents and myself from parking near to school, making more children walk along dangerous roads and therefore putting young lives at risk.</p> <p>On an additional note, our wonderful small businesses in the village will suffer if parking was restricted in the square. It will stop less able residents of the village popping to the shops for essential items or enjoying company and a cup at the village cafe.</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
36	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock Road dated – 28/02/2025</b>  I have recently been informed of the proposed changes to parking restrictions in and around the village of Stock and I must say I am appalled!  Very strict parking restrictions will, I think, kill the village as we know it Local businesses will suffer traffic will speed up (just as we are trying to lower speed limits within the village) and the village life as we know it will disappear I have been a resident close to the high st for XX years and I strongly oppose these proposals</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

37	<b>Objection</b>	<p>In relation to the letter I received regarding amendments to parking areas in Stock (Amendment No.66, Order 202), I would like to give my feedback as a resident of Stock Village (XX, High Street).</p> <p>Firstly, <u>my overall position is to reject any and all changes</u> and keep things as they currently are. I fully understand that that the Parish Council and yourselves are reacting to a small number of complaints raised about the current situation, but I cannot see how making parents and children walk further, along narrow roads will assist with their safety and likewise, the businesses around the square are the lifeblood of our village and will be severely impacted by any parking restrictions imposed, similarly for the immediate residents.</p> <p>Secondly, If we are unable to retain the status quo in the village, then we could potentially accept a much-reduced level of restrictions, as per the attached PDF, showing where Yellow lines could be enforced, without putting schoolchildren at more risk, or harming the local businesses. (YELLOW – supported from your plan, BLACK – removed from your plan) (Attached in Appendix 3)</p> <p>Lastly, as you will gather from the first two points, I fully object to the current SEPP plan in circulation. My only other suggestions to assist with any parking issues is to either;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand the car park at the village hall and instigate a “walking train” for the schoolchildren from there</li> <li>• Amend some of the current parallel parking bays along the High Street, around the memorial, to be diagonal “pull in” bays, effectively doubling the amount of parking bays available and not affecting the square or the side roads around it.</li> </ul> <p>Speeding is a much more concerning issue for safety within the village than parking, and I do feel that is where we need assistance from the larger authorities, especially after the tragic death last year of a schoolboy. The proposed restrictions will place more schoolchildren walking along roads for longer, at peak traffic times and therefore cannot be acceptable.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
----	------------------	--	---

		Again, I appreciate the support you have shown the Parish Council and spending time creating the proposal issued, however, this is unfortunately like using a sledgehammer to crack a walnut and will do far more harm to our small village than just leaving things as they are, or using one of the suggestions contained above.	
38	Objection	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> Email from resident of High Street dated – 28/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to strongly oppose the parking restrictions in Stock Village. We have lived in the centre of the village for over XX years, currently in a terraced cottage on the High Street (No XXX, CM4 XXX) and rely on available parking in and around the square on a daily basis. We are extremely concerned about the negative impact on house prices, the impact to our local shops and businesses, and we believe that removing parked cars in the centre of the village will just speed up the traffic in these areas. The school parking is an inconvenience, however this only impacts us twice a day for short periods of time and we manage this. Our local village school is highly valued and if you live in a small village this type of issue is to be expected. We do not want the look, feel and heart of our village spoilt and strongly request that this proposal is scrapped. Please look at the speed of vehicles passing through our village</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Email from resident of High Street dated – 28/02/2025</b></p> <p>Following on, please listen to us, as residents we were not directly approached or consulted about this</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
39	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 28/02/2025</b></p> <p>This week, I and many other villagers attended meetings to discuss the plans recently made available to us regarding possible changes to “on-street parking / waiting / stopping” in Stock village.</p> <p>As a result of a generalised questionnaire on traffic through Stock, the plans which have now been put forward by SEPP will have a deleterious effect on so many aspects of village life.</p> <p>Many people and businesses will suffer as a result of parking being “shifted” unnecessarily to other roads and lanes in Stock.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>The “shifting” itself would cause parking problems for residents in other parts of Stock.</p> <p>In two very well-attended recent meetings in the village it was felt that there had been very little discussion between the villagers and the council before moves were put in place for a “village plan”.</p> <p>As the plan stands, I would oppose it.</p> <p>The need for reduced traffic speeds on Stock Road High Street and “no-parking” yellow line restrictions at the Mill Rd and The Square entry to the High St are however, paramount, to ensure the safety of car drivers and pedestrians in those areas.</p> <p>No one at the meetings could recall ANY pedestrian accidents in The Square or lower Mill Road in their lifetimes. Driving is very low speed and drivers are sensible - the village producing its own “traffic - calming” system.</p> <p>Any change to that by a major removal of temporary car-parking facilities in lower Mill Rd and The Square would inevitably produce increased traffic speeds on narrow roads and a much increased risk of pedestrian accidents.</p> <p>I hope further discussions will help to resolve the issues sensitively and sensibly, without changing the nature of what many regard as Essex’s “ jewel-in-the-crown” village.</p>	
40	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Dakyn Drive dated – 28/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objections to the above Order, as it seems that it has not been thought out and that those proposing and drafting it may not have a full knowledge of the situation in Stock.</p> <p>Within the Square and its immediate vicinity there are nine businesses of whom only two have car parks, and of these two, one of the car parks is not adequate. For the other businesses the ability for their customers to park in their vicinity is essential and the loss would have a serious effect on their income with the potential to cause them to close and thus putting not only the owners out of work, but also their staff. The nearest car park to The Square is at the Village Hall in</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>Common Road which is 0.2 miles or 0.4 kilometres away. Not everyone who visits the businesses in or around The Square is in a position to walk from their home or from the Village Hall car park, as some live some distance from the centre of Stock and by parking in the Village Hall car park it would create an unnecessary journey for them.</p> <p>No consideration seems to have been given to the residents who live in the areas effected by the parking restrictions, as not all have off-street parking. No thought has been given to trades people or visitors to those people who would be compelled to park on the highway.</p> <p>No-one denies that Stock has a parking problem, but by introducing the proposed restrictions it will not make things easier, but cause other problems which have clearly not been foreseen, such as driving businesses out of the village and thus destroying the community spirit of Stock.</p> <p>I feel that all the funds that has been allocated to this would be far better spent on getting a 20 m.p.h. speed limit on the B1007 through Stock.</p>	
41	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of The Square dated – 28/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am reaching out through this email to voice my concerns about the stock parking restrictions. Having been a resident in the square for the last XX years, I have found our local community to be exceptionally welcoming.</p> <p>I am worried that these restrictions will cause considerable frustration, especially since there is already a parking shortage for both residents and businesses. I struggle to find parking about 50% of the time. If these measures are implemented, it would hinder my ability, and that of other residents to park outside our homes for loading and unloading including businesses. Our community has cultivated a mutual understanding of each other's parking needs and available spaces.</p> <p>This situation would introduce unnecessary stress into my daily life, as I would constantly be anxious about locating parking near my property. Furthermore, it could have implications for my insurance, particularly given the rising rates of car theft.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>I have also discussed this issue with fellow residents, especially older members of our community, who share concerns about the added stress this will bring to their daily routines. The vehicles currently parked in designated spaces contribute to slower traffic for drivers outside of Stock. Adding double yellow lines and removing cars parked in the square and surrounding areas will likely result in an increase in speeding.</p> <p>The primary concern is along the road by the high street, just outside Budgens. I believe that installing speed cameras or lowering the speed limit to 20 mph would significantly improve safety in this area. Additionally, clearer signage should be placed to inform visitors about the village car park, as well as to alert parents of children attending the local</p>	
42	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 01/03/2025</b></p> <p>As a long time resident of Stock, <b>I would like to see the proposal amended so that MILL ROAD and THE SQUARE, STOCK , stay as they are without Parking Restrictions.</b></p> <p>The Village of Stock has many elderly people living here, many of them rely on daily visits from Carers, District Nurses and family to make sure they are cared for and are able to stay in their own homes and not be a burden on the NHS. The proposed restriction would impact deeply on them if there are no places to park within a reasonable distance.</p> <p>The local business in this area are also relied on by not only the elderly, many with walking difficulties, but by many families living in Stock. Without adequate parking, the local business will, I am sure, be unable to survive and therefore close, killing our beautiful Village as we know it.</p> <p>By having cars parked in these areas, it does slow the traffic down, making it safer for pedestrians, especially as in some of the areas there are no pavements.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
43	Support	<p><b>Email dated – 02/03/2025</b></p> <p>100% agree with proposed parking restrictions in Stock.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
44	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated – 02/03/2025</b></p> <p>I refer to your recent letter dated 18th February. Showing the plans regarding STOCK village parking, prohibition of waiting amendment number 66 order 202.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the</p>



		<p>Although We have no overall objection to the plan as it will make Stock a safer place for road users. We do have questions regarding two aspects.</p> <p>1/. We notice that down Mill Road from the centre of the village to the catholic church on one side of the road we shall have double yellow lines Surely that will mean that all the traffic that presently parks on the areas that will become non parking will just move further down the road past the Catholic Church and park and this will make a serious problem for us of trying to get out of our shared drive onto the road even worse. We would oppose this situation should it ever arise.</p> <p>2.how is the completed overall plan to be enforced once live. We have seen Double Yellow lines placed at the far end of the Square near access to the main road only for them to be ignored by road users.</p> <p>We are really not NIMBYS but are concerned about a carefully thought out scheme making a serious and dangerous problem even worse in one area</p>	SEPP Technician response.
45	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of High Street dated – 02/03/2025</b></p> <p>We are writing to object to the full-scale parking restrictions proposed for Stock Village by South Essex Parking Partnership.</p> <p>As residents since C XXXX, both as householders, and myself having run a business on XXXXXXXX for XXXXX years, we have been very aware and used to the need for residents, business owners, users of the School and those visiting our wonderful local shops and businesses to be able to park as a vital part of their lives.</p> <p>Yes, at times it can be difficult, but we have always believed that the needs of the many have been best served by maintaining the status-quo and a willingness to compromise in order that Stock functions optimally in the interests of all concerned.</p> <p>We agree with many of your proposals, but firmly object to the 'sledgehammer' proposals the SEPP have submitted, as they would be damaging to the heart and soul of this vibrant Village.</p> <p>We have attached an edited image taken from your plan, with amendments made removing parking restrictions indicated in either black or yellow denoting what we</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>feel would be a much more suitable compromise, with priority to safety concerns involving lines of sight for motorists and pedestrians alike.</p> <p>We would also like to draw on your experience by suggesting that some of these areas could be subject to limited waiting time orders, or with restrictions of 'no waiting' for short periods, perhaps of 30 minutes, an hour, or two hours, to ease the problem of commuters parking all day and taking a bus to Billericay Station and such. Perhaps restrictions could also be reduced in the evenings, say from 6 pm, well after school hours, and outside of main commuter times when they are less needed.</p> <p>As I worked at the shop at XXXXX for XX years, on the corner 'pinch point' I did observe the problem of large vehicles being impeded directly outside our shop. It was far more obvious that this problem was <u>only</u> due to the traffic island having been lengthened needlessly, whereas it was at some time up until around the very early eighties, a smaller island at the tip of the junction, denoting the junction, and helping to prevent motorists from turning right (not allowed). We wholeheartedly believe that cars being parked between The shop at 8 Mill road and the High Street West bound has slowed traffic considerably, and I was not aware of any pedestrian collisions in all my time there. We agree with 'No waiting at any time' at the tip of the junction, which is eminently needed.</p> <p>If all or most cars parking is removed along Mill Road to the High Street, we have no doubt that traffic will be able to proceed at much more dangerous speeds, and that there WILL be accidents.</p> <p>In summary, please stop vehicles parking on junction corners, please stop people from parking all day, (we have a Village Hall car park suited for those parking to work in businesses during the day) and let's markedly improve things without killing our much loved Village centre.</p>	
46	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of The Square dated – 28/02/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed implementation of double yellow lines in Stock Village. As a resident of Stock for XX years and the owner of XXXX</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the</p>

	<p>on High Street for XX, I am deeply concerned about the impact this decision will have on our village, its residents, and its businesses.</p> <p>Misleading Survey and Lack of Clarity</p> <p>While the recent parking survey indicated a desire for change, I believe it was misleading in its execution. Nowhere in the survey was it made clear that double yellow lines would be the proposed solution. Instead, the community overwhelmingly supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to the two hazardous zebra crossings</li> <li>• A village-wide speed reduction to 20 mph</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, the timing of the survey was problematic. It was conducted shortly after a tragic accident involving a young boy, when emotions were understandably heightened. This could have influenced the responses, yet at no point were yellow lines mentioned as the primary solution.</p> <p>The Village's Unique Character and the Impact on Businesses</p> <p>Stock is a vibrant, small village that thrives due to its strong community and diverse local businesses, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four pubs</li> <li>• A five-star hotel and wedding venue</li> <li>• Two convenience shops</li> <li>• A hairdresser, florist, kitchen design shop</li> <li>• An outstanding school, doctors' surgery, and village hall</li> </ul> <p>These businesses rely on parking availability for customers, deliveries, and staff. The addition of double yellow lines in the village square will severely impact trade,</p>	<p>SEPP Technician response.</p>
--	---	----------------------------------

		<p>discouraging visitors and making deliveries near impossible. With over 3,000 hospitality businesses expected to close this year due to rising costs, this decision could be devastating.</p> <p>Community Concerns and Recent Improvements</p> <p>Having attended both the Stock Parish Council meeting and the resident/business owners' meeting at Dandelion, I can confirm that there is widespread opposition to the yellow lines. Concerns raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents losing the ability to park near their own homes, affecting property values.</li> <li>• Delivery vehicles struggling to access businesses, disrupting operations.</li> <li>• Traffic congestion simply being displaced elsewhere, rather than solved.</li> <li>• An increase in speeding through the village, as parked cars naturally slow down traffic.</li> </ul> <p>Since these meetings, I have already seen major improvements in congestion around the school, thanks to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More parents parking in the village hall and walking down</li> <li>• The school installing "No Parking Zone" banners</li> </ul> <p>This demonstrates that positive change is possible without the need for yellow lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Better Solution – Time for Community-Led Improvements</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stock is a strong, self-sufficient community that has shown it can make effective changes without drastic measures. Instead of yellow lines, I suggest:</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implementing more signage directing people to the large village hall car park</li> <li>2. Focusing on speed reduction and safer pedestrian crossings as the community originally requested</li> <li>3. Giving the village time to adapt and continue improving congestion naturally</li> </ol> <p>I urge the council to reconsider the yellow line proposal and allow the village to implement its own agreed-upon measures before making permanent changes that could damage businesses and the local economy.</p> <p>I appreciate your time in reviewing this objection and look forward to your response.</p> <p>See Appendix 2</p>	
47	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of The Square dated – 03/03/2025</b></p> <p>I object to the proposed parking restrictions in and around the square (see ref above) The residents of Stock will be greatly affected. Where do we and those who visit us park. My daughter visits with a XX baby!</p> <p>During my XX years of living in Stock with sadness I have seen the number of businesses diminish and believe those that are operating need to be encouraged. The community spirit in Stock is strong and engendered by local business. The proposed restrictions will put pressure and stress regarding deliveries and customers access.</p> <p>My biggest concern is one of democratic process. We the residents who actually live in Stock and will be most affected have had no say at all in the process to</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		date. There has been no transparency or consultation in any form. I have not received any correspondence whatsoever.	
48	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of The Square dated – 03/03/2025</b></p> <p>I object to the proposed parking restrictions in and around the square (see ref above) The residents of Stock will be greatly affected. Where do we and those who visit us park. My daughter visits with a XX baby!</p> <p>During my XX years of living in Stock with sadness I have seen the number of businesses diminish and believe those that are operating need to be encouraged. The community spirit in Stock is strong and engendered by local business. The proposed restrictions will put pressure and stress regarding deliveries and customers access.</p> <p>My biggest concern is one of democratic process. We the residents who actually live in Stock and will be most affected have had no say at all in the process to date. There has been no transparency or consultation in any form. I have not received any correspondence whatsoever.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
49	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of The Square dated – 03/03/2025</b></p> <p>Further to receipt of the proposed plans above we would like it noted that we strongly oppose the plan of double yellow lines being placed around the village. As a resident of XX The Square we regularly experience inconsiderate parking to the point where sometimes the access and egress imposed often reaches the point that we cannot enter our property due to parked vehicles completely blocking access - sometimes for several hours. Removing existing parking places around the village will undoubtedly make this situation so very much worse for example current residents who will no longer be able to park outside their homes needing someone else. We understand the above plans were proposed after the village signed a survey regarding speeding in the village. There was overwhelming support for the speed in the village to be reduced to 20 miles per hour after a fatal accident that tragically resulted in a young boy from our village losing his life which both shook and united the whole community in grief. Included in the survey was a very unspecific question asking if there was a problem with parking congestion in the village. The majority who signed this petition would no doubt agree that there are potential hotspot times where congestion is high, however the petition/survey never ever mentioned double</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>yellow lines dotted around the village - had it done so a more accurate response would have been reported back and would not have resulted in this proposal. To think creating less parking for residents, the school, visitors and businesses would improve this situation is incomprehensible. We love the village of Stock and support all our local business and feel extremely worried that these parking restrictions will have not only a detrimental effect to ourselves and fellow residents but also local businesses. We live in the middle of a selection of XX cottages that regularly experience incidents of inconsiderate parking whereby our family and grandchildren in pushchairs cannot access our home without lifting prams over cars and this is only when it is possible and this is regular. Our neighbour was unable to attend a hospital appointment as he could not get out of his gate due to a large vehicle that was parked completely over and within centimetres of his gate for several house and he was too frail to climb over the garden wall (I have photo evidence of this). My neighbour at Number X The Square experienced issues only last week after returning to her home after major surgery in Southend Hospital was unable to easily enter her gate as a large car had blocked most of the gate - feeling frail and poorly had to squeeze through a small gap to access her own home. These are just a couple of examples but there are endless occurrences of this. When we purchased our house we were fully aware that there was no private parking however we could never ever have imagined the distress caused by some inconsideration drivers. Not being able to access your own home can surely not be acceptable in anyone's opinion? Additionally, we believe that clearing the roads would increase the speed of some vehicles travelling through the Square and Mill Road as the lack of congestion will give them a free way to speed – this is evident early in the morning when roads are clearer. We would prefer slow manoeuvring vehicles through the village rather than speeding vehicles.</p> <p>At the Stock Parish Council meeting on 25th February, where an overwhelming number of villagers attended, we listened to many anxious residents of all ages and anxious business owners who raised the serious concerns of the future of their businesses should these plans go ahead. We felt listened to by the Parish Council and it was suggested by them to raise our objections in writing and include some potential solutions which we have suggested below:</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Resident parking permits - whilst I appreciate this is not a solution for the whole village it would most definitely be a solution for residents' experiencing blocked access to homes as detailed above.</p> <p>Purchasing residents' permits could also create a revenue. We would happily pay for the peace of mind that we will always be able to access our home - this should surely be a given and every home owners rights?</p> <p>Clearer signs for use of the Village Car Park for visitors to the village which is currently underused. Suggestion from the meeting that the parking bays outside the Hoop be made diagonal creating more parking spaces - excellent idea</p> <p>Potential alternative routes for heavy load vehicles</p> <p>Please - we beg you, before you go ahead with these plans to take into account how vulnerable our village is feeling right now. Huge decisions are being made that will greatly impact the quality of life for the residents who live here and our thriving businesses which keep our little community alive and so special. If these plans go ahead it will almost certainly devalue our homes and result in business closures, and Stock potentially becoming a desolate ghost-village with empty premises which cannot be positive for any community.</p> <p>Thanking you in advance for your considerations.</p>	
50	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 03/03/2025</b></p> <p>My name is XXXXXXXXXX I live in Stock re the proposed yellow lines which is proposed in our village do you realise the damage this will do to the trades people in Stock I think it's common knowledge that the people who have instigated this terrible plan are the only people who will benefit from this I think you should think very carefull about this plan</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
51	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated – 03/03/2025</b></p> <p>Please note my opposition and concerns regarding the proposed yellow lines and parking restrictions in the village of Stock, Essex.</p> <p>I completely object to the proposed yellow lines for a variety of reasons.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Stock for over XX years and I live on Mill Road in the centre of the village. The speed at which vehicles currently travel along our roads is alarming and my daughter who is a wheelchair user is already in considerable danger when using the roadways around our village. Taking away the very things (parked cars) that naturally slow the flow of traffic will only exacerbate the</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



		<p>problem. Although the proposed yellow lines will unlikely be outside of our house, the thought of loading my daughter in and out of her Motability vehicle straight into what will almost certainly be faster moving traffic fills me with horror. The lack of parked cars along stretches of roads in and around the centre of the village will surely only encourage motorists to speed unhindered. As, I believe, our main concern is the speed at which vehicles are travelling along our roads, removing the very things that naturally slow them down is absurd.</p> <p>My disabled daughter requires 24 hour care and is totally reliant on others to provide all her needs. It is imperative that her nursing and care staff are able to safely park in close proximity.</p> <p>My elderly father who visits us on a regular basis will also be at an unfair disadvantage as he too has mobility problems and would find walking longer distances challenging. The lack of adequate street lighting will make walking to and from the centre of village outside of daylight hours dangerous for the many elderly, disabled and young children/people who rely on the local shops and visit relatives.</p> <p>I believe the yellow lines will change our village irreversibly, directly effecting local businesses and the residents who rely on parking in the centre of our village. We should value the small businesses and local residents who have traded and lived in our special village for many years and not penalise them by making life ever more difficult just because a small minority seemingly are unable to parks their cars in a safe manor.</p>	
52	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of The Square dated – 03/03/2025</b></p> <p>This letter constitutes a formal objection to the proposed implementation of double yellow lines/no wait zones in Stock Village, Mill Lane, Back Lane and Cambridge Close, near Stock C of E Primary School. I am a parent of children attending Stock Primary School, and strongly believe that this proposal will severely compromise the safety of our children, particularly given the tragic recent history of a child fatality in this vicinity.</p> <p>My primary concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Increased Danger on Narrow Pavements:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The pavements on Stock Road are already exceptionally narrow, especially during school drop-off and pick-up times.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The proposed double yellow lines within the village and surrounding roads will force parents and children to park much further away from the school, leading to increased foot traffic on these already congested pavements.</li> <li>○ This will create a dangerous bottleneck, forcing children to walk in closer proximity to moving vehicles, significantly increasing the risk of accidents.</li> <li>○ The tragic loss of a child who was hit by a car along Stock Road serves as a stark reminder of the inherent dangers present on these narrow streets.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Reduced Visibility and Increased Congestion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dispersing parked cars further away will lead to parents and children crossing the road at more varied and less predictable points.</li> <li>○ This will reduce visibility for drivers and increase the likelihood of collisions, particularly for young children who may be difficult to see.</li> <li>○ The increased distances that parents and children will need to travel will also increase the amount of time that they are exposed to traffic.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>I request an immediate review of this proposal in light of the serious safety concerns raised. I also request that the council take into consideration the history of the area, and the fact that a child has already died due to the dangers present. As a parent, I implore the council to prioritize the safety of our children and reconsider this incredibly dangerous proposal.</p>	
53	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 03/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed additional parking restrictions referenced in the plans relating to Chelmsford Amendment No.66.</p> <p>Firstly, the concerns raised to you (SEPP) by Stock Parish Council (SPC), and the basis for these proposed changes, have not been generated or contextualised in any way through meaningful, robust or proper consultation with village residents and users. At no point during this process have SPC attempted to fairly or robustly consult villagers in their plans (outside of a survey that I believe has been referenced in their application and, in my professional opinion as a marketing</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

	<p>consultant, failed in almost every regard from a research standards and best practice point of view) or engage us with them in draft stages. For this reason, and from the outset, I believe the entire proposal to be undermined and therefore rendered unfeasible.</p> <p>As an impacted resident, I have written to SPC on three separate occasions since July 2024 requesting the proposed plans be shared in draft. I, and it would appear others who have also requested to view them, have been unable to obtain a copy or invited to view them in a designated public office or space. I strongly believe this has led to the significant negative impact of the proposed plans on residents, local businesses and village users having been entirely and deliberately overlooked by SPC.</p> <p>As a central village resident with no off-street parking, viable on street parking options will be quantifiably and heavily reduced by these proposed changes which will result directly in greater difficulties parking for ourselves as residents, for multiple other residents in a similar position or those with limited off-street parking and multiple cars (of which there are several in the impacted areas) and for visitors to residents and businesses in the village. The potential further negative impact on the value of our properties and reduced trade for local businesses is a significant and widely shared concern amongst affected villagers and the community. To my knowledge, none of these matters have received the due diligence they rightly deserve in the process of constructing a proposal of this kind and SPC have categorically failed to demonstrate any understanding or investment in alternative solutions.</p> <p>Furthermore, I believe the proposed changes to reduce on-street parking in the roads outlined will simply displace parked vehicles to other locations throughout the village. For this reason, I do not believe this to be a solution to the concerns SPC have raised, and that underpin this application, but rather that it will create further and additional issues of the nature described in your letter at other junctions and locations across the village. In addition, I believe the removal of parked cars on certain roads and junctions that act as a visual and physical</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>deterrent to speeding in the village actively goes against any efforts to tackle the very real issue of drivers exceeding the speed limit on our roads to date.</p> <p>In summary, I trust the quantifiable and unavoidable negative impact on a disproportionate percentage of entirely overlooked central village residents and users should result in the immediate withdrawal of this proposal.</p> <p>Proper consultation and engagement with village matters such as this on behalf of SPC would be welcome in future given their role and function as a representative body.</p>	
54	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from school parent dated – 03/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing as a parent of a Year X child who attends Stock Primary School. As a non-resident, I drive my child to school and have always parked respectfully in the village square.</p> <p>I would like to express my concerns regarding the proposed parking restrictions in Stock Village and respectfully object to them for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Safety Concerns: Dispersing parents from parking in the village square (and surrounding roads) to the village hall car park would increase the volume of children crossing at the Zebra crossing located by The Baker's Arms public house. I believe that this would necessitate an additional crossing lollipop person, to ensure children's safety. Betty, our current lollipop lady cannot be in two places at once.</p> <p>2. Space Limitations: The village hall car park should primarily serve hall users. School pickups could impact access for those attending events or activities at the hall. Additionally, Friday afternoons often see pub patrons parking in the car park, which would further complicate school pickup.</p> <p>3. Accessibility for Disabled Individuals:</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>My mother, a blue badge holder, often assists with child care and completes the school run. She finds the school's entrance and exit challenging and therefore relies on parking within the village square for ease of access when dropping off our child. The impact of these restrictions on those with disabilities must be carefully considered. I am not aware of any disability bay in the square.</p> <p>4. Damage to the local economy: School parents contribute significantly to the local economy by frequenting shops, cafes, and pubs. Preventing us from parking conveniently could deter us from using these local amenities. This in turn will have a detrimental impact on the local economy.</p> <p>5. Aesthetics Stock is a beautiful village in its current form and it will no longer retain its beauty with the addition of yellow lines painted on every road and restriction zone signs everywhere.</p>	
55	Objection	<p><b>Email from relative of Stock resident dated – 03/03/2025</b> I am writing to express my objection to the proposed additional parking restrictions referenced in the plans relating to Chelmsford Amendment No.66.</p> <p>I am a frequent visitor to Stock Village as my daughter and her family are central village residents with no off street parking. The viable on street parking options will be heavily reduced by the proposed changes which will result in greater difficulty parking for myself as a visitor and my daughter as a resident. I also feel the proposed changes will negatively impact businesses in the village.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
56	Objection	<p><b>Email from relative of Stock resident dated – 03/03/2025</b> I am writing in response to the letter regarding the proposed parking restrictions under the above order. As a resident of XX The Square, Stock, Essex, I am directly affected by these changes, which would have a significant impact on my daily life.</p> <p>I wish to formally object to the proposal for the following reasons:</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Loss of Parking Near My Property:</b> The proposal states "No waiting at any time" outside my property. If implemented, this would mean I would be unable to park outside or anywhere near my home, causing significant inconvenience.</li> <li>• <b>Negative Impact on Local Businesses &amp; Residents:</b> Businesses in Stock Village rely on street parking for their customers. Removing this parking could severely impact trade and create difficulties for both business owners and residents.</li> <li>• <b>Pedestrian Safety Concerns:</b> Currently, parked vehicles in and around The Square help slow down traffic. Removing them could lead to increased vehicle speeds, posing a serious risk to pedestrians and increasing the likelihood of road traffic collisions.</li> <li>• <b>Disproportionate Impact on Elderly and Disabled Residents:</b> Many residents, particularly those who are elderly or have mobility issues, rely on nearby parking to access their homes safely. The proposed restrictions would create unnecessary hardship for those who cannot walk long distances.</li> <li>• <b>Lack of Adequate Consultation:</b> I am concerned that this proposal has been introduced without sufficient engagement with the local community. Residents and businesses should have had the opportunity to provide input before such significant changes were considered.</li> <li>• <b>Potential Decline in Property Value:</b> The removal of accessible parking could negatively impact property values in the area, making homes less attractive to potential buyers who rely on nearby parking.</li> </ul> <p><b>Parking Displacement Issues:</b> If these restrictions are introduced, vehicles will be forced further up Mill Road, causing additional disruption to residents in other parts of Stock.</p> <p>I urge for this this proposal to be reconsidered and explore alternative solutions that consider the village and residents</p>	
57	Objection	Email from resident of Stock dated – 03/03/2025	Objection noted.

	<p>I am writing in response to the letter regarding the proposed parking restrictions under the above order. As a resident of XX, Stock, Essex, I am directly affected by these changes, as will the life of the village, it's residents, visitors and businesses. I have lived in the village for XX years and this proposal has not been properly thought through!</p> <p>I understand that some of the junctions could do with better marking and certainly vehicles are sometimes parked on corners which can restrict vision. Those corners outside of The Bear public house are the obvious ones. I also agree that directly outside of the school entrance would benefit from additional protection. I wish to formally object to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Loss of Parking outside my son's house in The Square:</b> The proposal states "No waiting at any time" outside his property with yellow lines across his entrance. Visitors generally respect that you don't park across someones entrance so why bother marking it. Furthermore, it allows me to park across it when visiting and not occupying another valuable space.</li> <li>• <b>Negative Impact on Local Businesses &amp; Residents:</b> Businesses in Stock Village rely on street parking for their customers. Removing this parking could severely impact trade and create difficulties for both business owners and residents.</li> <li>• <b>Pedestrian Safety Concerns:</b> Currently, parked vehicles in and around The Square help slow down traffic. Removing them could lead to increased vehicle speeds, posing a serious risk to pedestrians and increasing the likelihood of road traffic collisions. As I mentioned, I have lived in the village for XX years and it was worse walking my children to school when there was less parking, as vehicles used to drive too fast through the village as there was little restriction.</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, the school relies on a large number of children commuting from surrounding areas and it is much safer for them to park in the village and walk to school that risk their lives walking down the High Street from</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>the Village Hall. The High Street should be a monitored 10 or 15 mph through the village!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Disproportionate Impact on Elderly and Disabled Residents:</b> Many residents, particularly those who are elderly or have mobility issues, rely on nearby parking to access their homes safely. The proposed restrictions would create unnecessary hardship for those who cannot walk long distances.</li> <li>• <b>Lack of Adequate Consultation:</b> I am concerned that this proposal has been introduced without sufficient engagement with the local community. Residents and businesses should have had the opportunity to provide input before such significant changes were considered. I'd like to understand why the Parish Council did not fully consult the residents before engaging this work.</li> <li>• <b>Remember it is a Village:</b> The removal of accessible parking could negatively impact on the very attractiveness of the village. It's not a town, it needs parking to keep it alive and functional.</li> <li>• <b>Parking Displacement Issues:</b> If these restrictions are introduced, vehicles will be forced further up Mill Road and surrounding streets, causing additional disruption to residents in other parts of Stock.</li> </ul> <p>At a recent meeting following this announcement, nearly 100 residents met and agreed that no one had been consulted and none of those present felt that these proposals were appropriate or helpful and, that these should be reconsidered, with proper consultation and better regard to safety.</p>	
58	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Well Lane dated – 05/03/2025</b></p> <p>I write to comment on the above orders.</p> <p>Undoubtedly at times parking in the central area of Stock become congested at busy times. School, drop off and pick up hours are busy as they are in many places and there is a clear issue with all day, or longer, parking by drivers leaving their vehicles whilst they travel on into Billericay, London or elsewhere. Their</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



		<p>needs to be a balance between managing the parking and the wider well being of the village especially allowing the businesses to continue to flourish and central residents to park. There is a danger that too drastic action to address parking will have a damaging effect on the village overall.</p> <p>A better approach would be to ban parking in appropriate locations for one hour a day, as many places do successfully, with exemptions for residents to park outside their properties. This would flush out all day parkers, reduce parking congestion and have the least damaging impact on the businesses which are very important to the village.</p> <p>I know that the proposal now on the table goes far beyond any that the Parish Council expected or wanted when they passed on the initial concerns about parking. The approach should be to start with the minimum restrictions needed, they can always be revisited if the problem persists, rather than over react and cause more widespread damage to Stock.</p>	
59	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Well Lane dated – 05/03/2025</b></p> <p>We have looked at the proposal of enforcing almost totally no waiting at anytime throughout our village Stock with interest and quite honestly, disbelief. We feel the proposal has gone overboard and for the reasons as outlined below.</p> <p>We have not been party to the minutes of the Stock Parish Council as they are cited as the culprits by raising, and quite justly, concerns regarding obstructive parking. We, as residents of the village, do get rather fed up with the amount of cars parked either for the day or in dangerous positions, without any concern for people that actually live and around the area.</p> <p>Understandably, junctions should always be left clear but in reality they are not particularly when school time is out or delivery vehicles park in Stock. This should be addressed.</p> <p>However, in particular Mill Road into Stock Road, the main road to Billericay there are residential properties which, if they have a car, need to park it somewhere. Also the village shop, shops, Budgens on the main road and the</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>café in Stock square are reliant on their customers and if no waiting at any time comes into force, then they will lose business.</p> <p>Mill Road is also used daily by non-residents parking for the day whilst they work elsewhere. This causes frustration for (local) drivers as it narrows the roadway as people park on both sides.</p> <p>The school run is always a nightmare for Back Lane and some people, the minority, are not courteous with their parking. However, this is for 38/39 weeks of the year and not all day.</p> <p>Obviously here junctions should be kept clear especially for safety reasons so do agree that there should be no waiting at any time at these strategic points, especially if children are walking.</p> <p>With regard the Square, we feel it would be better, even if all dangerous junctions do have the no waiting at any time enforced to concur with the Highway code rule 243, that local residents are given space to park with access to their residencies and with businesses (which are clearly needed in the village), it should be considered that a timed parking restriction would suffice. Elsewhere, also timed parking restrictions would stop all day, long term parking and still allow the residents/customers/visitors of the Square and Mill Road to be able to park in vicinity and access shops.</p> <p>Therefore, as above, we object in part and hope these comments will be taken into consideration as we feel this needs further discussion and deliberation for the harmony and prosperity of Stock village going forward.</p>	
60	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Well Lane dated – 06/03/2025</b></p> <p>We would like to oppose strongly the proposed parking restrictions in Stock.</p> <p>In our opinion these restrictions will merely change one problem for another in that removing parked cars will allow greater speed through the village from some traffic.</p> <p>It would also be detrimental to the local businesses.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		Residents with street parking only will be disadvantaged as available parking space will be greatly reduced. We believe that for these reasons the plan as it stands is unsuitable.	
61	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated – 06/03/2025</b></p> <p>Further to your Notice concerning the above proposed restrictions I would like the following information, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (Fol), to be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How many personal injury/Killed or Serious Injury (PI/KSI) accidents have occurred at the following locations:</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Square, the whole of the Square,</li> <li>The Square at its junction with Mill Road,</li> <li>Mill Road at its junction with High Street Stock</li> <li>Mill Road from Highfield House to its junction with the Square Stock.</li> </ol> <p>As you are probably aware, at the meeting of Stock Parish Council of the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2025, the above matter was discussed. At this meeting Councillor XX stated that a number of vehicles parked in Mill Road had been damaged by passing vehicles (damage only accidents). My question is, is there any empirical evidence to back this statement up, if so, once again I request the information under the Freedom of Information Act, if this information if not recorded or available is his statement just hearsay?</p> <p>Has Stock Parish Council/Essex County Council (SPC/ECC) carried out any parking surveys prior to proposing these restrictions. If SPC/ECC have carried out the surveys, once again I would like the information to be provided under the Freedom of Information Act. If parking surveys have not been carried out, how are SPC/ECC able to assess what affect the proposed restriction will have on</p>	

		<p>residential parking, business parking and general visitor parking to the area. Surely, this should be carried out before any proposals are developed.</p> <p>I have lived in XX Mill Road for XX years and have never seen or heard of any PI/KSI's at the locations proposed under your proposed restriction which would indicate to me that the area is safe for both pedestrians and vehicles and until the above requested information has been provided and parking surveys have been carried out I object to any of the proposed restrictions in Mill Road and The Square Stock.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you</p>	
62	Objection	<p><b>Email from Stock Primary School dated – 06/03/2025</b>  <b>Headteacher and Governors' Response to the South Essex Parking Partnership proposals to introduce parking restrictions in Swan Lane, Mill Road, The Square, Back Lane, Cambridge Close and Austen Drive in Stock.</b></p> <p>We believe that the proposals to introduce parking restrictions on the above-named roads is flawed and excessive and will have a serious and detrimental impact on life in the Stock village. In particular, restrictions around The Square may well see the end of some of the businesses as there will be no parking places for their customers and this will change the character of the village completely.</p> <p>Before outlining our objections to the proposals, we would like to make it very clear that the school has never approached Essex County Council regarding parking in the village. The school has been named in the proposals without our permission. In view of this it should be struck out and made very clear that these proposals have not come as consequence of actions or proposals by the school. Please can you confirm when this has been actioned.</p> <p>In the case of Stock Church of England Primary School, the objections to the proposals are as follows:</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

	<p>In 2023 the village was rocked by the death of XXXXXXXXXXXX who lived in the village and was killed in a road traffic accident as he walked along the path way adjacent to Stock Road (B1007) This also impacted very much on our school as XXXXXX was a former much-loved pupil of ours. His family and residents in the village have campaigned tirelessly for speed restrictions in the village. The school, therefore, feels that the focus should be on resolving speeding through Stock which is supported by the village and not on parking restrictions which very few support.</p> <p><b>Safety or inconvenience.</b> -The roads at the rear of the school - Back Lane, Cambridge Close and Austen Drive are quiet residential roads. It's inevitable that, due to their proximity to the school, parents park in these roads when dropping off and picking their children up from school. Introducing parking restrictions in these roads addresses the question of inconvenience and a source of frustration for our neighbours and not that of safety of vehicles and pedestrians passing through the village. We feel these restrictions are directly targeted at our parents. Whilst it is accepted that at pick up and drop off times there will be an increase in cars parking in this area we are talking about a period of approx 30/40 minutes at the beginning and end of the school day for 5 days a week over 38 weeks. Inconvenience appears to be being prioritised over safety.</p> <p><b>Limiting Parking for parents and their families</b> -Our concern is that introducing the restrictions around the centre of the village will simply push the parking issue further away and it does not offer a solution. As a result, our parents will then have to park further away and walk with young children along roads that don't always have footpaths, or along the Stock Road where the pavement is in poor condition; is often so over grown that a parent cannot walk hand in hand with their child and cars drive at speed thus creating a risk. This is why accessing and parking in the roads at the rear of the School is desirable; it is quieter and there is no need to cross the main road at all.</p> <p><b>Mill Road</b> - It is very worrying that parking restrictions along the length of Mill Road are proposed. In addition, to the issues this will cause the residents in that</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>road, our feeling is that a clear road would encourage people to drive at faster speeds whereas, whilst not everyone may like it, the parking means drivers have to slow down.</p> <p><b>Increased congestion in village</b> - Stock Road has already been identified as one of the busiest 'B' roads in the County. Cars and lorries use Stock High Street as a 'rat run' from the A12 to Billericay therefore the volume of cars and lorries speeding through the village will continue. Most of the families whose children attend Stock Primary School, but do not live in the village, come from the Billericay side of Stock. If they cannot park at the rear of the school off Back Lane this will lead to an increase of traffic passing through the village as they seek alternative parking thus aggravating this issue further and causing more congestion in the village at a peak time particularly around the junction with Swan Lane where Stock Road narrows.</p> <p><b>Narrow road and pathway</b> -Stock Road narrows considerably as it passes between two buildings where the manned zebra crossing is. Parents and governors have knowledge and experience of large vehicles such as buses and lorries clipping the kerb as they pass through. The path narrows to 1.2 meters by the zebra crossing waiting area and the shop front. Increased volumes of pedestrians due to having park further away and walk along this footpath could easily lead to a child or adult stepping into the road as they squeeze onto the narrowing path - this would be an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>The school objects to the proposals and believes that the consequences and implications of the parking restrictions have not been fully considered and, as such, there is no justification in implementing the proposals. The safety of our children is paramount and we feel the parking restrictions will push parents to park further away from the school, will increase risks and make walking into school more hazardous.</p>	
63	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 07/03/2025</b></p> <p>We are writing this email because although we understand the problems regarding parking in Stock especially in Mill Road. But we wouldn't want double</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the</p>

		<p>yellow lines, as we would be concerned how the businesses would survive, and the knock on effect if they did close.</p> <p>Why couldn't restricted parking be a possibility to avoid the all day parkers, for example no parking between 9:30-10 and 4:30-5, which hopefully won't effect businesses too much, or at least trial it.</p> <p>To summarise we are against having these proposals.</p>	SEPP Technician response.
64	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Well Lane dated – 09/03/2025</b></p> <p>As a life long Essex man of XX years, Stock was a dream aspiration and since 2018, it has been a dream realized. The attraction of Stock was, and still is, the four gastro pubs; the D&amp;B coffee shop; the spa hotel; the cricket green; the windmill; golf course; and bowling club. All are quintessentially the perfect English village. Any proposal that puts at risk any of those characteristics will destroy the attraction and the heart of the village. Stock through these characteristics attracts many visitors cars; cyclists; horse riders; and walkers; that keeps the village vibrant. Without the pubs, restaurants and shops, Stock will become another Ramsden Bell house, that is real estate with no features.</p> <p>Essex has a bad reputation but there are small pockets of wonder in Essex that can compete with the likes of Surrey, Hertfordshire and Buckinghamshire, Stock is one such place alongside the likes of Leigh on Sea, Hutton Mount, and Saffron Walden. Why would you want to destroy that? I am not sure what triggered this proposal but it is bad for the businesses, therefore bad for the residents and could destroy Stock has a successful village.</p> <p>Additionally, my XXX work in the pubs part time, I therefore on winter dark nights for safety drop them off and collect them, under this proposal their safety will be at risk (that is if the pubs are still in business).</p> <p>All businesses in this country since COVID have been in challenging times, more so since the recent budget, why add more risks to these businesses that have all done well to survive so far.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>However having said the above, I do think that the parking on the very end of Mill Road, joining the High Street (Stock Road) opposite the Harvard and Chalmers estate agents next to the bollards, is dangerous, as you can barely pass through and the road traffic is unsighted, so I would support no parking there but only there.</p> <p>Kindest Regards from someone that loves and is proud of Stock village,</p>	
65	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 09/03/2025</b></p> <p>The proposals for new parking restrictions in Stock are proving to be very unpopular, for many reasons.</p> <p>I object to the proposals mainly because I think that it will be highly inconvenient and even dangerous, for the parents of young children to have to park away from the school.</p> <p>There are no pavements in Mill Rd so it is not safe to park there and then walk to the school. Parking in the village hall car park then means a hazardous walk along the busy B1007, where there was a fatal accident recently.</p> <p>Even though the Square and immediate area gets a little congested during drop off and pick up times, I feel this is a small inconvenience for the residents to put up with, in order to keep the children safe.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
66	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 09/03/2025</b></p> <p>I believe that there are plans to introduce double yellow lines in Stock village.</p> <p>I would like to raise my strong objections to this proposal. I don't believe that this will be beneficial to the residents, businesses or village itself.</p> <p>Firstly my elderly parents live in The Square, with no off street parking. By taking away the little on street parking that there is, they will be unable to park their own car. They will be unable to unload shopping and in time probably sell their car causing them to become house bound and completely dependent on others. This will effect their mental health.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



		<p>There isn't sufficient parking at the moment, reducing it will not help - only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Secondly, Stock is a beautiful village with several successful businesses, reducing the parking will force residents and visitors of the village businesses to go elsewhere. I can't see the businesses being able to continue trading, once the footfall diminishes.</p> <p>Thirdly, I can't see the reasons for reducing the parking in the village. I believe it could increase drivers speed as the roads will be clearer. A child has already lost their life in the village due to bad driving, we don't want more. Surely traffic calming measures or a lower speed limit would be far more beneficial.</p> <p>Please listen to your residents.</p>	
67	Objection	<p><b>Email dated – 10/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to raise my deep concerns regarding the proposed parking restrictions in Stock Village.</p> <p>I have lived on &amp; off in the village for XX years, and have been alarmed at the steady decline of shops &amp; businesses in the village over the years. If these proposed parking restrictions are allowed to go ahead, it will be the end of the village community as we know it, and Stock will become just another dormitory town. It seems to me that no thought has been given as to how the shops and businesses will survive without nearby parking, or how the elderly and infirm and carers will be able to access their homes if they can't park close to their homes. The residents in the cottages at the end of Mill Road and junction of High Street will have nowhere to park, there is no alternative convenient parking. The road at this point is very wide, and cars parked there do not obstruct or heed the exit left onto the High Street, indeed, it is by far the easiest and safest way out of the village.</p> <p>In a small village like Stock there is bound to be some congestion at the school for a short period twice a day, how are the children to get safely to and from school if</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>mums can't park for a brief time in order to drop off, or pick up their children? Not every family lives within a convenient walking distance of the school</p> <p>There is also deep concern over speeding in the village, "slow down" signs and speed limits are all well and good, but can be ignored, but it is very difficult to speed when there are cars parked along the road, as far as I am aware, there have been no accidents due to parked cars.</p> <p>In conclusion, it seems that this proposal has not been thought through, regarding the impact on house prices, the effect on the residents in general and businesses in particular.</p> <p>Finally, why were we, the residents, not consulted directly about these proposals.</p>	
68	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Well Lane dated – 10/03/2025</b></p> <p>In relation to the proposed parking controls I would like to register my objection as a Stock resident. Undoubtedly there are some issues from time time in these areas and there will be a benefit to some parking controls but the current proposal is too far reaching. I list my specific points below:</p> <p><b>Safety</b> – the removal of cars parked in the square will lead to an increase in speed through this area, currently the parked cars help to reduce the speed of passing cars in what is an area where there are inevitably a number of pedestrians.</p> <p><b>Access</b> – It will become very difficult for elderly or infirm people to access the shops and other businesses in the centre of the village.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> – the proposed restrictions will make it very difficult for the businesses in the village to operate successfully. They have regular deliveries and need local people who appreciate the benefit of being able to park close by. If people cannot park they will just drive elsewhere.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p><b>Migration of School Traffic and general parking</b> – this will be pushed into other areas and will inevitably mean more children, parents and members of the public walking in areas where there are no defined pavements.</p> <p>Also those that currently park in these areas, due to proximity to their residences, will be pushed to occupy other parking in the village.</p> <p>Generally the current problems are managed quite well as they have been for many years. The addition of some parking restrictions on perhaps one side of some of these roads may be beneficial as that will assist the throughput of traffic.</p>	
69	Objection	<p><b>Email and letter from resident of Austen Drive dated – 10/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am fiercely opposed to double yellow lines in Stock Village, in particular the restrictions proposed for Austen Drive.</p> <p>My letter is attached.</p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns with regard to the proposed double yellow line parking restrictions which you are proposing to install in Cambridge Close and Austen Drive in Stock.</p> <p>I reside in Austen Drive so your proposed double yellow lines in the approach to Cambridge Close (from Back Lane) and on the corner of Cambridge Close and Austen Drive will cause enormous problems to me and to my neighbours in Austen Drive.</p> <p>I understand that the idea of double yellow lines has arisen due to excessive and extremely bad parking practice. These incidents <b>ONLY</b> occur during school drop off and pick up times. At these times, it is nearly always impossible to enter Austen Drive from Cambridge Close and on most days it is impossible for me to get off my drive. I am afraid that at school times cars are parked so badly that it would be impossible for an ambulance to get to Austen Drive.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>School cars are regularly parked on the pavement which means that pedestrians, some with prams and elderly people with wheelchairs are forced to go into the road.</p> <p>As the problems outlines above only occur at school times, may I suggest that the approach from Back Lane into Cambridge Close and the entire length of Austen Drive (8 houses) be the subject of "Restrictive Parking" i.e. no parking between 8.30 – 9.30 a.m. and between 2.30 – 3.30 p.m.</p> <p>The application of Restrictive Parking for the length of Austen Drive will alleviate all anxiety for the residents as they will have the knowledge that the obstructive parking and congestion and the inability to enter and leave Austen Drive at school times will be removed and access will be available for any carers or ambulance that might be called.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In addition, it would lead to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Reduced road danger from traffic</li> <li>* Lessen anti-social behaviour from inconsiderate parking and dangerous driving</li> <li>* Reduce congestion and pollution from vehicles waiting with their engines running</li> </ul> <p>I understand that parking for the parents of school children has been made available at the Car Parks at the Village Hall and also at the Bear P.H. which I hope will alleviate the congested parking problem in our lovely Village.</p> <p>Austen Drive, as you are probably aware, is a very narrow residential turning of small houses. As you enter the turning there are eight small houses on the left, all of which have only one off street parking place for their personal use and are served by a narrow pavement,</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>This means that any visitors, carers, etc, must park on the road. The road is narrow so it is impossible to park on both sides of the road. This, together with avoiding parking in front of someone's drive makes parking in Austen Drive very limited. The installation of double yellow lines will force the school traffic as well as visitors to drive further into Austen Drive where there is simply not sufficient parking. Safe parking in Austen Drive will not be sufficient to serve all the residents if yellow lines are installed, not to mention the school traffic.</p> <p><b>Austen Drive was simply not built wide enough to take street parking,</b> This comment was made recently by a Highway Inspector to a member of Stock Parish Council.</p> <p>Also bearing in mind the other proposed parking restrictions in the village, (particularly those affecting the businesses and pubs) we are concerned that drivers seeking a parking place nearby will seek parking in residential turnings, such as Austen Drive, further adding to the congestion and pollution.</p> <p>I am afraid that the suggestion to install double yellow lines in Stock will be out of keeping with the appearance of our lovely village, not to mention the problems and restrictions to the residents and their families.</p> <p>I would therefore seek you to consider the Restrictive Parking alternative. This practice has been adopted very successfully in many locations as it alleviates congested parking near schools and the possibility of accidents to children.</p>	
70	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 11/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposal for double yellow lines in Stock Village. As currently outlined, this proposal raises significant issues, particularly regarding its impact on residents and local businesses. The implementation of double yellow lines would likely hinder the daily lives of residents, increase the speed of which cars travel in the village and could jeopardise businesses in the village. Businesses in Stock village serve residents and visitors alike which is what creates the thriving village we love as a</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

	<p>community. These businesses alongside the community rely heavily on the availability of nearby parking.</p> <p>Having been a resident of Stock for XX years and a joint business owner for XX years in Stock (XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX, located in The Square Stock), I have honestly never witnessed or heard of an accident or safety concern directly caused by parked vehicles in the village. We have also raised X young children in Stock, and one of our XXXXXX has Special and Complex needs. I have never felt our roads unsafe. In fact, I strongly believe parked cars have helped to reduce speed, contributing to the safety of villagers and visitors. It stands to reason that the removal of these parked cars would not only negatively affect residents and how they come and go from their properties, but are also likely to lead to the closure of businesses that are already struggling in the current economic climate.</p> <p>As an active member of the community and a business owner in the village alongside my husband, I am acutely aware of the distress the double yellow lines proposal has caused in the community. Among them are people of all different ages, backgrounds and circumstances, including families with young children, carers of the elderly and disabled, and others who rely on nearby parking. The majority of which oppose the proposed yellow lines in Stock.</p> <p>I feel it is important to voice my concerns about the proposed introduction of double yellow lines in parts of our village. While I understand that traffic management is essential for safety, I believe this proposal could unintentionally create more harm than good for both our community and the local businesses that keep Stock vibrant.</p> <p>One of the key issues I see is the impact on our residents, particularly the elderly, disabled, and carers. For many people in our village, being able to park near their homes is not just a convenience—it's a necessity. Without this ability, they may face the dangerous prospect of walking distances from their homes, possibly carrying shopping or other heavy items, in poorly lit areas, with cars speeding</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>past. This is especially concerning when you consider the risks it poses to those who have mobility challenges or other vulnerabilities.</p> <p>On top of this, the proposed double yellow lines would also create challenges for the local businesses. We are more than just places to shop or eat—we are hubs where people meet, socialise, and support each other. If parking becomes more limited or difficult, it could impact the ability of our customers to visit, placing jobs at risk for our staff and ultimately threatening the livelihoods of many.</p> <p>A petition against the proposed yellow lines has gathered over 500 signatures, and a Facebook poll has shown that nearly 90% with over 200 participants of respondents are opposed to the introduction of double yellow lines. This strong opposition reflects the widespread concerns within our community.</p> <p>I respectfully request that you reconsider the proposed double yellow lines, as they are unlikely to improve safety and would instead create further problems, including increased speeding. With limited pathways in the village, the combination of speeding cars and double yellow lines is deeply concerning.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>	
71	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 11/03/2025</b></p> <p>I'd like to register my objection to the proposed parking restrictions detailed in the prohibition notice referenced above.</p> <p>I've attached a redacted version of the plan showing where I believe there should be parking restrictions, left as yellow and where they should be omitted, overwritten in black. (Attached in Appendix 3)</p> <p>Whilst I agree there should be some restrictions, particularly on pinch points and corners, the proposal does not take into account residents that have no off street parking and will disrupt/disadvantage the the local business owners.</p> <p>There are double yellow lines already in place, I've never seen these being enforced, or have heard of anyone receiving a ticket.</p> <p>The restrictions proposed are above and beyond what would be considered to be reasonable.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

72	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated – 11/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to object to the proposal for double yellow lines in Stock Village. As currently outlined, this proposal raises significant issues, particularly regarding its impact on residents and local businesses. The implementation of double yellow lines would likely hinder the daily lives of residents, including myself and my husband who live on Mill road. My husband has health issues and is unable to walk to the shops in the centre. I'm also concerned about the increase in speed of which cars travel in the village and could jeopardise safety and the trade of the businesses in the village.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
73	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from business owner dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally raise an objection to the proposed double yellow lines under SEPP in Stock village. As a resident and business owner in the village, I am deeply concerned about the detrimental effects the proposed yellow lines will have on our community, residents, and local businesses.</p> <p>The introduction of double yellow lines will likely significantly impact both the residents and businesses in the area. Many of our elderly residents have expressed their concern that they will be unable to easily access local shops and services, as the new restrictions will leave them with no option to park near essential services. This will only exacerbate the isolation felt by vulnerable members of our community.</p> <p>Additionally, the double yellow lines will likely increase car speeds, making our village a less safe environment for pedestrians, particularly those who rely on slower-moving traffic to navigate the area.</p> <p>Local businesses, including my own, are also at risk due to the lack of available parking. Customers who visit the village will struggle to find convenient places to park, potentially leading to a decrease in foot traffic. The resulting reduction in visitors will undermine the viability of businesses, and we fear that without the necessary support, many businesses could face closure, leading to redundancies and further economic decline in our village.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



		<p>In response to these concerns, I have started a petition which has already gathered over 500 signatures over just a few weeks, from concerned residents and business owners. This petition strongly opposes the proposed changes and demonstrates the wide-reaching impact the proposed double yellow lines will have on our community.</p> <p>I urge the Council to reconsider these proposals and engage with the local community to find a more suitable solution that supports both the residents and businesses in our village.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to hearing from you and hope for a positive resolution to this matter.</p>	
74	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I object to the extent of the proposed parking restriction in Mill Road and The Square as it will have a devastating impact on the shops, cafes and pubs which rely on passing trade. Some restrictions are required and my suggested solution is:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yellow lines on one side only of Mill Road from the junction with High Street to the footpath adjacent to the Catholic Church</li> <li>2. Yellow lines on one side only of The Square</li> <li>3. Parking in The Square and Mill Road opposite to the areas with yellow lines being restricted to residents and otherwise limited to 3 hours between 9 am and 5 p.m. (people working in businesses in Stock park their cars all day and they should be encouraged to park in the Village Hall)</li> </ol> <p>I object to the parking restrictions in Back Lane, Austen Drive and Cambridge Close as they are only congested during school drop off and pick up (approximately 1 hour per day) but the restrictions will severely impact the residents the other 23 hours and are disproportionate.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
75	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed double yellow lines in the Stock area. As someone who works in the community, I feel it is important to</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the</p>

		<p>highlight several points that may impact not only my livelihood but also the well-being of our customers and the local residents. I can do this as I have the privilege of talking to community members and customers in the XX almost every day.</p> <p>Firstly, parking outside our work premises Dandelion and Burdock is vital for many XX customers, some of whom are vulnerable and rely on the ability to park directly in front of the business or close to it. For these individuals, easy access is crucial, and removing the possibility of parking would create unnecessary hardship, particularly for those with mobility issues or those requiring more direct access.</p> <p>I also want to emphasize how much I love working in Stock. This community has been a big part of my life, and I take great pride in serving local residents.</p> <p>However, if the yellow lines are introduced, the potential loss of footfall would be damaging to the business. The ease of parking is a key factor in our success, and without that, it's highly likely that the business could close due to a significant drop in customers.</p> <p>I urge the council to reconsider these proposals of double yellow lines and engage with local businesses and residents to find a more balanced solution that ensures the safety of traffic while allowing access to the community.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	SEPP Technician response.
76	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Back Lane dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I live and we run a farming business at XXXXXXX Farm at the end of <b>Back Lane</b> in Stock and have done for XX years.</p> <p>We have and are experiencing ever increasing problems with parked vehicles down Back Lane which severely impact us, both on a personal and business level, and would therefore <b>agree with the proposed 'No waiting' designation in Back Lane.</b></p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

	<p>With regard to <b>The Square, Stock</b> - a 'no waiting designation' would have a detrimental effect on the shops and businesses which constitute the hub of the village.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> email dated 12/03/2025</b>  I should point out that I AGREE with the no parking in back lane which causes a problem with our business and personal traffic.  Please acknowledge!  I believe that stopping parking in the square will be detrimental to pubs and shops.  PLEASE Acknowledge CORRECT RECEIPT</p> <p><b>Response from the SEPP dated 12/03/2025</b>  As you have stated that the proposed restrictions in The Square will be detrimental to the shops and businesses your representation has been taken as an objection to the proposal on Chelmsford Amendment No.66. Your comments however have been recorded including your support for restrictions in Back Lane.</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup> email dated 12/03/2025</b>  As this has not been made clear in your letter then I would request that you take my email as an agreement. Perhaps a simple 'agree' or 'disagree' rather than a request for comments would be more appropriate.</p> <p><b>Response from the SEPP dated 12/03/2025</b>  It is confirmed that your representation has been recorded as support. Please note that the proposed restrictions for Back Lane only cover the junction with Cambridge Close and do not extend for the whole of Back Lane.</p> <p><b>4<sup>th</sup> email dated 13/03/2025</b>  I did not know that so the problem will just be moved further down the road! It will make back lane worse!  Please revert back to not supporting the proposal with notes for back lane and I thank you for pointing that out to me.</p>	
--	---	--

		<b>Response from the SEPP dated 13/03/2025</b> It is confirmed that your representation has now been recorded as an objection.	
77	Objection	<b>Email dated – 12/03/2025</b> I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed additional parking restrictions referenced in the plans relating to Chelmsford Amendment No.66.  Firstly, the concerns raised to you by Stock Parish Council (SPC), and the basis for these proposed changes, have not been generated or contextualised in any way through meaningful, robust, or proper consultation with village residents and users. At no point during this process have SPC attempted to consult villagers fairly or robustly in their plans. The questionnaire that this decision was made on, was not available widely and the question used for the basis of this consultation was misleading. For this reason, and from the outset, I believe the entire proposal to be undermined and therefore rendered unfeasible. As an impacted resident, as a family, we have written to SPC on three separate occasions since July 2024 requesting the proposed plans be shared in draft. It would appear others who have also requested to view them, have been unable to obtain a copy or invited to view them in a designated public office or space. I strongly believe this has led to the significant negative impact of the proposed plans on residents, local businesses and village users having been entirely and deliberately overlooked by SPC.  As a central village resident with no off-street parking, viable on street parking options will be quantifiably and heavily reduced by these proposed changes which will result directly in greater difficulties parking for ourselves as residents, for multiple other residents in a similar position or those with limited off-street parking and multiple cars (of which there are several in the impacted areas) and for visitors to residents and businesses in the village. The potential further negative impact on the value of our properties and reduced trade for local businesses is a significant and widely shared concern amongst affected villagers and the community. To my knowledge, none of these matters have received the due diligence they rightly deserve in the process of constructing a proposal of this kind	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>and SPC have categorically failed to demonstrate any understanding or investment in alternative solutions.</p> <p>Furthermore, I believe the proposed changes to reduce on-street parking in the roads outlined will simply displace parked vehicles to other locations throughout the village. For this reason, I do not believe this to be a solution to the concerns SPC have raised, and that underpin this application, but rather that it will create further, and additional issues of the nature described in your letter at other junctions and locations across the village. In addition, I believe the removal of parked cars on certain roads and junctions that act as a visual and physical deterrent to speeding in the village actively goes against any efforts to tackle the very real issue of drivers exceeding the speed limit on our roads to date.</p> <p>In summary, I trust the quantifiable and unavoidable negative impact on a disproportionate percentage of entirely overlooked central village residents and users should result in the immediate withdrawal of this proposal.</p> <p>Proper consultation and engagement with village matters such as this on behalf of SPC would be welcome in future given their role and function as a representative body.</p>	
78	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Austen Drive dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing in response to your letter on the above subject dated 18 February 2025.</p> <p>As a resident of Austen Drive I completely agree with the concerns raised by the Stock Parish Council. However, I am concerned that the current proposal to insert double yellow lines on the 2 corners of Austen Drive (and Cambridge Close) will just push the dangerous and illegal school parking further down Austen Drive and indeed Cambridge Close.</p> <p>In addition, as the proposals currently include double yellow lines and restricted parking on a number of other roads in the village we have strong concerns that not only will we still have the school parking and congestion issue but will also end</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>up as a “car park” for commuters who park in Stock to get the train from Billericay, visitors to the shops, pubs and restaurants and of course parking for those residents who will no longer be able to park outside their houses.</p> <p>I understand from a member of Stock Parish Council that when the Highways Inspector came to review the problems he commented that Austen Drive was too narrow and not built for any sort of parking on the road – it is a tiny close. Council refuse trucks, large delivery vans all have problems accessing the close – most back in but some still have to mount the pavement to get access when there is a car parked on the road. As the fashion is currently for private vehicles to be 4x4 large vehicles they take up most of the road if parked – add to that inconsiderate/poor parking – people trying to access a house often cannot walk on the pavement. Some residents have been unable to get into their garden gate when they park on the pavement outside their house.</p> <p>Also, there is a small pedestrian cut through from the High Street into Austen Drive which is regularly used by wheelchairs, mobility scooters, prams and people with walking sticks. We have more than average usage by elderly residents as it is a route used to go to the High Street by people in the elderly housing on the other side of the school. This is the only safe route from the High Street to access Cambridge Close, Back Lane, and all roads leading off it as Back Lane does not have any pedestrian pavement until further down. Often the only way to walk through from the High Street is on the road as the parents, and others, park on the pavements.</p> <p>I have witnessed many times a situation where it would be totally impossible for an ambulance or fire engine to access either Austen Drive or Cambridge Close.</p> <p>Preferred Action:</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>I would like to propose that all of Austen Drive is designated as a restricted parking road – with no parking for one hour in the morning (08.00 am – 09.00 am) and one hour in the afternoon (2.30 pm – 3.30pm).</p> <p>We have observed this restricted parking in neighbouring Ingatestone, Shenfield, Brentwood and Galleywood around schools, shops and railway stations to great effect. and believe this action will go a long way to resolving any safety/nuisance issues whilst still allowing some parking for legitimate visitors and trade vehicles.</p> <p>This would prevent the school parking and congestion issues. It would also go a long way to preventing Austen Drive being used as a “car park” by residents, visitors and commuters as per my concerns set out above.</p>	
79	Support	<p><b>Email from resident of Back Lane dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am XXXXX resident at XXXXXXXX, Back Lane Stock Ingatestone Essex CM4 XXXX</p> <p>Our family has farmed for the last XX years and use Back Lane as access for lorries moving grain hay and straw , also tractors and trailers moving grain , hay , straw , horses and cattle .</p> <p>Consequently this proposal would be welcome due to the difficulties experienced attempting to pass parked vehicles !</p>	Support noted.
80	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Back Lane dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>My name is XXXXXXXXXXXX we farm halfway down, and at the end of back lane. this is a very long standing business . We need unencumbered access at all times for agricultural tractors and machinery and HGVs over back lane, so these proposals would push drivers to park on back lane.so would you make Shure that in eny plane that back lane has clear access at all times. As obstructions could have a detrimental impact on the business and peoples jobs.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
81	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Back Lane dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing in respect of the new proposed ‘No Waiting at Any Time’ and ‘No Stopping’ areas in Stock (Amendment No. 66, Order 202).</p> <p>I currently live at XXXXXX right at the bottom of Back Lane. I will be moving just up the road to No.XX XXXXXXXXXXXX XXX very soon.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>XXXXXXXXXX is a working farm and we need clear access down the entire length of Back Lane to ensure we can get our vehicles, tractors, equipment etc through without any difficulty.</p> <p>We have had problems in the past with cars being parked down/ on Back Lane and we have either been delayed or unable to get through as a result.</p> <p>We are therefore in favour of the 'No Waiting at Any Time' plans down Back Lane. However, I see on the plans that the 'No Waiting at Any Time' will only apply specifically to Cambridge Close, Austin Drive and a very small part of Back Lane that these roads connect too?</p> <p>I am worried that if the restrictions are only put here, people will simply park further down Back Lane (ie. next to Vernon Corner, opposite High Trees, on the crossroads joining Brookmans Road and Fosters Close/ School Lane) and this will cause us more problems getting through (and will just move the problem you are trying to solve further down Back Lane).</p> <p>In view of the above, I would like to suggest and request that the 'No Waiting at Any Time' should apply all the way down Back Lane.</p> <p>In relation to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' in 'The Square'. - Whist I agree that the village can be very busy at times and I understand why this is being proposed, I worry that these restrictions could have a big affect on the village shops.</p> <p>Our two convenience stores, Stock Village Shop and Budgens, will be affected in particular as these are shops that people will use to park opposite, run in and out of, then head back on their way.</p> <p>Putting these restrictions in The Square will not make these shops as convenient to pop into and people may go elsewhere as a result.</p> <p>This is my only comment/ observation re 'The Square'</p>	
82	Objection	Email dated – 12/03/2025	Objection noted.



	<p>I strongly objected to the proposed parking restrictions around the Square in Stock village. There are businesses that would be greatly impacted by these proposals and could result in their closure.</p> <p>At School times it can get busy during term times but otherwise there is no problem with parking. Please see attached photos which were taken today and are typical of how the square is most of the day.</p> <p>I feel the proposed double yellow lines are totally over the top and unnecessary.</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
--	---	--







			
83	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Swan Lane dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 18 February 2025 inviting formal responses regarding the above proposal.</p> <p>Having lived in <b>Swan Lane</b> since XXXX I do understand and support, in principle, the need for improvement in traffic management. I am also particularly aware of the problems that currently exist at school drop off and pick up times as it affects both home owners and users of Swan Lane. In addition, I have personal experience of the line of sight problems that invariably ensue through poor, and sometimes obstructive, parking outside and alongside the Bear Public House and further up Mill Road.</p> <p><b><u>Swan Lane</u></b></p> <p>It is a good idea to have a 'No stopping 8am-9.30am &amp; 2.30pm-4pm on Entrance Markings'. However, it may encourage more people to park further down Swan Lane. At 'school run times' we regularly find a car parking opposite our drive, usually facing the wrong way, that in turn restricts the passing space. Large farm vehicles travel along Swan Lane periodically. Cars parked along the lane do,</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

	<p>invariably, prevent passing. The narrowest point appears to be outside the wall at Number 9 Swan Lane. Cars do park there on occasions; last year this blocked the road which backed up onto the High Street for ten to 15 minutes (waiting for the driver to return). Blocking of this type occurs periodically (at various parts of the lane). My point is that the proposal, as drafted, will not improve this type of inconvenience to traffic using Swan Lane as the restrictions are too narrowly drawn.</p> <p><b><u>Mill Road (the letter refers to Mill Lane)</u></b></p> <p>The adverse impact on retailers of 'No waiting at any time' does not appear to have been considered fully. The most stark example that I can see is in respect of the Village Store, on the right hand side on entry to Mill Road (from the High Street). Loading and unloading for this store appears to have been forgotten completely as I cannot see unrestricted parking outside the store. Moreover, this store and many other retailers, currently benefit from 'passing trade'. The restrictions, as proposed, will not help these businesses.</p> <p><b><u>The Square</u></b></p> <p>We lived in a flat in the Square (for XX months in XXXX) and had first-hand experience of parking our car in that area. The proposed restrictions will, inevitably, mean that those residents with cars, who currently park there, will have fewer options to park as the spaces available will reduce.</p> <p><b><u>General</u></b></p> <p>It should be noted that, perversely, some of the parking that occurs outside the school run, does tend to slow traffic down; for example, at the junction of The Bear PH with Mill Road. Whilst pedestrians need to exercise care, based on my experience, relatively few vehicles travel too fast for the conditions; put simply, they have to slow down!</p> <p>I do hope the above provides some constructive comments to aid the consultation process.</p>	
--	---	--

		I should be grateful to receive an acknowledgement of safe receipt.	
84	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to object to the above proposal.</p> <p>The proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' would be greatly detrimental and impact the various commercial establishments in Stock - especially in The Square and a section of Mill Road.</p> <p>The proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' would also give rise to cars parking further along Mill Road and impact on other roads where 'no markings' were painted, i.e. Well Lane and Milne Meadow.</p> <p>This would just move the congestion to other roads. Whilst I understand that there are problems, perhaps, there maybe an alternative.</p> <p>Might this be having ' No Parking' between certain hours everyday and also introducing a permit system for Residents in The Square and part of Mill Road.</p> <p>The permit would have a registered licence plate number on it and perhaps be limited to one per household. A voucher system re extra vehicles or visitors could also be considered.</p> <p>I am a resident of Stock for more XX years and would hate to see the decline of the village.</p> <p>I do hope you will reconsider.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
85	Objection	<p><b>Email from school parent dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to oppose the proposed yellow lines in the village of Stock. I am a mother of XX children that attend Stock Primary School but live in Ramsden Heath. It is impossible for me to bring my children to school without using a car and parking nearby. I used to be able to park at the village hall and walk my daughter to school with my son in his buggy. This is no longer a safe option as the Stock Road is too fast and dangerous. Particularly as my son has disabilities</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>which would not warrant a disabled badge but make it extremely difficult to keep him safe on such a walk.</p> <p>The parking in the local area is already limited and reducing it further will just lead to further problems and dangerous walks in to school along roads with limited or no pavements. It will also hugely affect the local businesses with customers being unable to park outside.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the plans for double yellow lines in the village.</p>	
86	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed double yellow lines in Stock as outlined in the Parking Restriction Proposal No. 66 Order 202. As a concerned member of the community, I believe the proposed changes will have a negative impact on both the local residents and visitors to the area.</p> <p>While I understand the need for traffic management and safety, the introduction of double yellow lines in this specific area is unnecessary and would cause undue inconvenience. Many residents and businesses rely on street parking in the area, and these proposed restrictions will limit parking availability, especially for those with mobility issues or families who depend on close parking access.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposal fails to account for the local context and unique needs of Stock village. It will lead to an increase in traffic congestion, as drivers will have fewer options for parking, and this could inadvertently create safety hazards and huge financial impact on the small businesses. There are likely alternative solutions that would address safety and traffic flow without negatively impacting parking access for residents, businesses and visitors.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. I hope my objection is taken into consideration before the final decision is made.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
87	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally express my strong concerns regarding the proposed implementation of double yellow lines in Stock village. As a local resident and</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the

		<p>employee at XXXXXXXXXXXX, I believe these changes will have a significant negative impact on the community and local businesses.</p> <p>My key concerns are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased Speeding: The removal of parked cars will create a clearer road, encouraging drivers to travel at higher speeds, posing a greater risk to pedestrians and other road users.</li> <li>2. Impact on Small Businesses: Many local businesses rely on convenient parking for quick customer visits. Without available parking, footfall will decrease, affecting sales and the overall vitality of the village.</li> <li>3. Parking Issues for Residents: Homeowners will struggle to park near their properties, leading to congestion on nearby streets and potential disputes over limited parking spaces.</li> <li>4. Displacement of Vehicles: With fewer on-street parking options, vehicles will be forced onto side roads, increasing congestion and inconvenience for residents.</li> <li>5. Emergency and Service Vehicle Access: A lack of available parking may result in delivery vehicles and service providers blocking roads or driveways, causing unnecessary disruption.</li> </ol> <p>Instead of implementing double yellow lines, a more effective use of resources would be investing in a speeding camera to address concerns about road safety without harming local businesses or residents. This approach would deter reckless driving while maintaining essential parking spaces for the community.</p>	SEPP Technician response.
88	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Well Lane dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I must write and voice my objection to the above proposed parking restrictions in our lovely village. We have a selection of shops, restaurants and a cafe that will all suffer huge loss of trade should the restrictions go ahead. It is currently a thriving village with a huge sense of community and people do support the local businesses. You will destroy their trade, ruin the heart of our village and prevent people from shopping local.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



89	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from school parent dated – 12/03/2025</b>  Hi am a parent of a child at stock primary school and a regular user of the village shops and the dandelion and burdock.</p> <p>I myself live in the area of west hanningfield and rely on the local shops here as we don't have one in the village, I suffer with a hip disease so I need a place that's easy to get to. With the proposed plans I will really suffer to only for the small journey to get someone which is as asset to the village. Also to all the local businesses such as the restaurants and pubs and the florists which I also use. My elderly mother collects my child and takes her to school a few times a week and said she wouldn't be able to do this is these plans ago ahead which would also have an impact on my work as I wouldn't be able to cover this myself for the same reasons.</p> <p>There should be a better plan that would benefit everyone and the current way has been working well for many years as I have lived and used the area as lived there for over XX years. It seems such a shame to propose this in times when we all need each other to survive both businesses and for the mental health of people being able to still be independent.</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
90	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident and Parish Councillor of Stock dated – 12/03/2025</b>  My name is XXXX and I am a resident of Stock, and also a Stock Parish Councillor.</p> <p>While the Parish Council will be providing a collective response, my personal view as a resident is that the parking issue comes down to two main issues – road safety and the needs of local residents/businesses (staff and customers).</p> <p>I have walked The Square and Mill Road, took some photos and then used Google Maps Street View to work out how many parking spaces could potentially be lost <i>if</i> the SEPP proposals go ahead.</p> <p>By my reckoning, the total number of spaces which would be lost could be approaching 30, depending on how people park and the size of vehicles etc...</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

The breakdown is as follows:

Site No.	Location	Estimated spaces removed	Are these used by residents?
1	Back Lane/High Street (outside Chalmers)	1	Yes
2	Mill Road/High Street (outside cottages and Village Shop)	5-6	Yes
3	Mill Road/The Square (outside 17 The Square)	2	Maybe
4	The Square (outside Dandelion & Burdock)	2	No
5	The Square/High Street (outside Stafford House)	1	Maybe
6	Outside 21 The Square (opposite Dandelion & Burdock)	1	No
7	Both sides of The Square (by the Bus Shelter)	3-4	Maybe
8	Mill Road/The Square (corner outside The Bear)	3-4	No
9	Mill Road bend (north side past No15 etc)	6-8	Yes, some
10	Mill Road bend (south side past Nos 24-34)	0	N/A
	<b>Total</b>	24-29	

Clearly, losing that number of parking spaces is going to have a knock-on effect, particularly as residents whose spaces will be lost directly outside their homes will need to find alternatives.

My own view/experience is that the pressure on parking in the village is predominantly during the hours of 8.30am and 5.30pm, when local businesses are either open (hairdresser, florist) or have peak traffic (two convenience stores and The Bear and The Hoop public houses).

		<p>Of the above, only The Bear has parking available for customers and it is not sufficient when the pub is busy (on Friday evenings and Saturday/Sunday afternoons). Visitors will therefore often park in The Square or on Mill Road. The Hoop directs customers to the Village Hall car park via a sign outside the pub itself, but visitors will often either park on the High Street (in unrestricted bays) or in The Square, as the Village Hall car park is not visible or signposted from the High Street.</p> <p>The Harvard Arms has a car park for customers, but when it is busy (on Friday evenings and Saturday/Sunday afternoons) it will often fill up, and surplus visitors will therefore park in The Square or on Mill Road.</p> <p>So, a solution needs to be found to the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Road Safety</b> – the Parish Council initially approached SEPP because an issue with road safety was raised by villagers, and a survey carried out in January 2024 confirmed that a significant proportion of villagers believed measures were required. The areas of particular concern were the corner of The Square/Mill Road (outside The Bear), the corner of Mill Road/High Street (around to the Village Shop) and the long bend in Mill Road, where vehicles are often parked on both sides of the carriageway and there is no pavement. Whatever measures are implemented should make these three sites safer for all road users and pedestrians.</li> <li>2. <b>Residents' Parking</b> – By my own estimate, at least 10 spaces will be lost by residents who currently park directly outside their homes, some of which have no off-street parking. If these spaces are lost, pressure will rise on the remaining spaces and some residents will be forced to park further from their homes. This is not an ideal solution for elderly residents, or those returning home with heavy items etc. The proposals should therefore seek to minimise the removal of these spaces where possible, for example by shortening the length of yellow lines outside the Village Shop and removing the restriction on the north side of Mill Road.</li> <li>3. <b>Local businesses</b> – A number of spaces are taken up during 'office' hours by people working at the local businesses listed above (4x shops, 2x pubs).</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>These businesses have vowed to work with the Parish Council by encouraging staff to park either in the Village Hall car park or further up Mill Road. This will be helpful, but it is not an ideal solution. I suggest a meeting between the Parish Council, local businesses and the Village Hall car park committee to discuss remuneration to the Village Hall in return for use by staff and customers, and for directing customers to use the Village Hall car park.</p> <p>I am not a parking/traffic expert, obviously, but it is clear that, should the proposals go ahead in full, pressure would be put on the village during weekday 'office' hours, on Friday evenings and at weekends, when the pubs are busy. The reduced number of spaces is likely to prevent some residents from parking outside or even in a short distance from their homes, should they arrive home during these peak hours, and to prevent potential customers stopping briefly to visit the two convenience stores.</p> <p>So, my proposal would be for the proposed restrictions in the following site locations to be removed, as they will not have an adverse effect when it comes to the primary reason for them being imposed – road safety:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Site No.</th><th>Location</th><th>Estimated existing spaces reinstated</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td><td>Back Lane/High Street (outside Chalmers)</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>3</td><td>Mill Road/The Square (outside 17 The Square)</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>5</td><td>The Square/High Street (outside Stafford House)</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>6</td><td>Outside 21 The Square (opposite Dandelion &amp; Burdock)</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>7</td><td>Both sides of The Square (by the Bus Shelter)</td><td>3-4</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td><b>Total</b></td><td>8-9</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Site No.	Location	Estimated existing spaces reinstated	1	Back Lane/High Street (outside Chalmers)	1	3	Mill Road/The Square (outside 17 The Square)	2	5	The Square/High Street (outside Stafford House)	1	6	Outside 21 The Square (opposite Dandelion & Burdock)	1	7	Both sides of The Square (by the Bus Shelter)	3-4		<b>Total</b>	8-9	
Site No.	Location	Estimated existing spaces reinstated																					
1	Back Lane/High Street (outside Chalmers)	1																					
3	Mill Road/The Square (outside 17 The Square)	2																					
5	The Square/High Street (outside Stafford House)	1																					
6	Outside 21 The Square (opposite Dandelion & Burdock)	1																					
7	Both sides of The Square (by the Bus Shelter)	3-4																					
	<b>Total</b>	8-9																					

		<p>Further, I would suggest reducing the length of the proposed restrictions in two site locations:</p> <table><tr><th>Site No.</th><th>Location</th><th>Estimated existing spaces reinstated</th></tr><tr><td>9</td><td>Mill Road bend (north side past No15 etc)</td><td>3-4</td></tr></table> <p>The lines around the bend (under the trees) could end where the white line currently ends, opposite No34 Mill Road.</p> <table><tr><th>Site No.</th><th>Location</th><th>Estimated existing spaces reinstated</th></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Mill Road/High Street (outside cottages and Village Shop)</td><td>2</td></tr></table> <p>The lines on could end at No6 (the third cottage), rather than stretching around the corner in front of the Village Shop (No8). The above would reduce the number of spaces lost by around half, while tackling the road safety issues initially raised by the Parish Council and villagers. This, combined with the Parish Council working with businesses and the Village Hall trustees, should help to make the required improvements to road safety, without harming local business and enabling residents to continue parking outside/near to their homes.</p>	Site No.	Location	Estimated existing spaces reinstated	9	Mill Road bend (north side past No15 etc)	3-4	Site No.	Location	Estimated existing spaces reinstated	2	Mill Road/High Street (outside cottages and Village Shop)	2	
Site No.	Location	Estimated existing spaces reinstated													
9	Mill Road bend (north side past No15 etc)	3-4													
Site No.	Location	Estimated existing spaces reinstated													
2	Mill Road/High Street (outside cottages and Village Shop)	2													
91	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of The Square dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing in response to the letter regarding the proposed parking restrictions under the above order.</p> <p>I am a resident of XX The Square, Stock, Essex, and I am directly affected by these changes, which would have a significant impact on my daily life.</p> <p>I wish to formally object to the proposal for the following reasons:</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>												

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Loss of Parking Near My Property:</b> The proposal states "No waiting at any time" outside my property. If implemented, this would mean I would be unable to park outside or anywhere near my home, causing significant inconvenience.</li> <li>• <b>Negative Impact on Local Businesses &amp; Residents:</b> Businesses in Stock Village rely on street parking for their customers. Removing this parking could severely impact trade and create difficulties for both business owners and residents.</li> <li>• <b>Pedestrian Safety Concerns:</b> Currently, parked vehicles in and around The Square help slow down traffic. Removing them could lead to increased vehicle speeds, posing a serious risk to pedestrians and increasing the likelihood of road traffic collisions.</li> <li>• <b>Disproportionate Impact on Elderly and Disabled Residents:</b> Many residents, particularly those who are elderly or have mobility issues, rely on nearby parking to access their homes safely. The proposed restrictions would create unnecessary hardship for those who cannot walk long distances.</li> <li>• <b>Lack of Adequate Consultation:</b> I am concerned that this proposal has managed to get to this stage with SEPP being in funds from the Parish Council. This has been proposed without sufficient engagement with the local community. Residents and businesses should have had the opportunity to provide input before such significant changes were even considered.</li> <li>• <b>Potential Decline in Property Value:</b> The removal of accessible parking could negatively impact property values in the area, making homes less attractive to potential buyers who rely on nearby parking.</li> <li>• <b>Parking Displacement Issues:</b> If these restrictions are introduced, vehicles will be forced further up Mill Road, causing additional disruption to residents in other parts of Stock.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		I urge for this this proposal to be reconsidered and explore alternative solutions that consider the village and residents.	
92	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Myln Meadow dated – 12/03/2025</b> This email is an objection to the above parking restriction proposal.</p> <p>My husband and I ran the XXXXXXXXXXXXX at XX High Street Stock for almost XX years until we retired in XXXX. It was a pleasure to run a business in such a lovely village, over the last few years operating the shop the parking in and around The Square at times proved difficult for our customers and I know at times we lost custom due to the lack of parking, but generally it was okay and both customers using the shops and business and the residents coped as I believe they do now.</p> <p>If the proposal for the double yellow lines is implemented it would be catastrophic for the businesses and where the residents who live around The Square are meant to park I just don't know. Please leave it as it is.</p> <p>This really is a message from the heart, let's not destroy the centre of Stock.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
93	Objection	<p><b>Email from school parent dated – 12/03/2025</b> I would like to raise my concerns and objection regarding the proposed on-street parking order that is being reviewed in Stock Village.</p> <p>XXX of my primary school age children currently attend Stock C of E school and I need to drive and park twice a day for drop off and collection times, coming from the Billericay side of Stock Road. It would make things extremely difficult for myself and many other parents and carers whose children also attend Stock school if the proposed order was approved by not enabling us to park close enough to the school to get our children to school safely and on-time. I have always parked respectfully and with consideration.</p> <p>My main concern if these restrictions come into force is the safety of my children. We would have to park too far away from the school and be forced to walk along the main Stock Road which can be extremely dangerous. As we are all aware there was a fatality on this road recently that none of us will ever forget, proving</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		that it is an unsafe road for young children to walk any distance on, on a daily basis.	
94	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 12/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am emailing with my objection to the parking restrictions proposed in Stock. I am a parent who has a child at the Stock Primary School, a parent who regularly drives and parks in the square or mill road. I myself live in Stock but with young children so only walk on warmer days.</p> <p>Most pupils and parents at the primary school do not have the privilege of walking as they live further afield. The school is the foundation of the village and has a great reputation however with nowhere for parents to park i and many others fear this will have a knock-on effect for future years and applications. How does the council expect 210 parents to park at a village hall? A parking space which is too small? where is alternative parking which doesn't mean walking young children a long distance?</p> <p>What will visitors do when the school has fundraising events like fayres etc ?</p> <p>Stock has become a very attractive village for people to enjoy walks, events and socialising. Where will these people park? The pubs have become a big part of the village so again will have a huge impact on them.</p> <p>It's a real shame that you feel these changes need to be considered. You will ruin the Stock attraction and atmosphere it has!</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
95	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to strongly object to the above proposals to install double yellow lines in and around Stock Village.</p> <p>Not only will this have an adverse effect on the few remaining businesses in our Village, but homeowners will no longer be able to park near their own homes and their house values will be severely effected as a result.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.



		<p>I live just outside the village, and have to drive to access the shops. A total restriction on parking will stop me and many others from doing this and will severely affect the few remaining shops in the village.</p> <p>Double yellow lines are just not necessary or wanted in Stock. Yes, we have parking problems the same as everywhere else, but this is primarily at school times.</p> <p>A better solution would be a one hour restriction during the day to stop the all day parkers who commute to London. A blanket ban on all parking will have a severe knock on effect for the shops, pubs and local businesses who are struggling enough with the current cost of living.</p> <p>Please reconsider these proposals.</p>	
96	Objection	<p><b>Email dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>We were in favour of certain limitations at first but having read your proposal, my wife and I feel strongly that the parking restrictions in Stock square would be detrimental to all.</p> <p>We think that all funds that is set aside for this should be put towards reducing the speed on the B1007, Mill Road and Common Road to 20mph.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
97	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Lower Stock Road dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>On behalf of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Stock</p> <p>Subject: The proposed parking restrictions for Stock village</p> <p>I am the XXXXXX of XXX XXXXXXXXXXXX and am writing to express her concerns about the proposed parking restrictions in The Square, Stock.</p> <p>She is an XX-year-old, long-time resident of Stock, who now lacks mobility and uses a walking frame. She is officially visually impaired with very limited sight due to XXX and as such these yellow lines will cause her and my family a great deal of issues in bringing her into the village.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>The numerous proposed yellow line restrictions will make it difficult for us to take her and park in the village centre close to the places that she visits – namely The Little Salon and Dandelion &amp; Burdock. It will not be feasible for us to park at the Village Hall and walk her to the above destinations – it will just be too far.</p> <p>Whilst XXX XXXX can see the benefits of some yellow lines at junctions, to be effectively everywhere as currently proposed will make the village centre a no-go area for her. She is also concerned about the impacts on those small business in the village that make it such a lovely place to live.</p>	
98	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>Please note that I that I strongly disagree with the proposal of yellow lines in the square and around central Stock. There are many elderly people living here who need close access to the local shops and businesses, parking in and around the square allows them to drive nearby to the services they need. Also school mums who need close access to Stock school / pre school with young children. Please listen to the local residents who live and work in Stock village, speed restrictions and speed bumps would help the safety in our area.</p> <p>Many thanks for your consideration,</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
99	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing as a resident of Stock, Ingatestone, Essex. (CMX XXX), I totally oppose the installation of Double Yellow Lines, in the proposed plans.</p> <p>I truly believe it will be detrimental to village life and provide no benefit to either residences, local business and people visiting. Ingatestone fact it will do the opposite.</p> <p>Although I understand why there was a request by locals to sort out parking, I feel this step will just create its own problems.</p> <p>There are a few bottle necks where inconsiderate parking causes chaos and if these can be solved, without the need for double lines will be better.</p> <p>If yellow lines are placed in the square, and proposed surrounding area, the businesses in the square will suffer hugely. People will just go else where.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>Dropping off elderly people will not be permitted as it states “No stopping at any time”.</p> <p>People will not use the local shops, who are trying hard to provide for local needs. Budgens for example, are asking locals what they would like in their local shop, as in produce, services etc. if people cannot park they will not use this shop and this will be detrimental to this business and what they are trying to do in the community.</p> <p>Where will residents park?</p> <p>This will have a huge impact on house prices. People are attracted to Stock, because of our unusual amenities in a village. If you can't park you are not going to pay to live here.</p> <p>The double parking from the first house down Mill Road,(on the left hand side) on the slight bend needs to stop. This would prevent the majority of problems.</p> <p>Please do not pass this recommendation as it will totally affect our village. It feels like it has not been thought out taking all consequences of its impact into account. The villagers are totally against it, so please listen to the people who live here and care about there village and its future.</p>	
100	Objection	<p><b>Email dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>please accept this email as my strong objection to the proposed yellow lines in the square of Stock Village, our local businesses (D&amp;B, Stock florist, the hairdressers, the kitchen shop, the local stores and all the pubs) will suffer tremendously. In my opinion, this is complete overkill. Yes, the square can be busy at times with inappropriate parking but yellow lines everywhere is unreasonable. There must be some kind of compromise. Please re-think this over the top proposal.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
101	Objection	<p><b>Email dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I agree something needs to be done about the parking situation in Stock, however I do believe having 'No Waiting at Any Time' is not the answer. There are 2 shops, a coffee shop, hairdressers, florist and other businesses in the Village</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the</p>

	<p>which are not only important to providing the community of the village, they provide employment as well. The shops offer a lifeline to many people who don't have cars, and they are important to the Village. If the restrictions go ahead, the shops are likely to close. A lot of trade is 'passing' and if people can't just 'pop' in while passing, they will find somewhere else to go. The Coffee shop is such a vibrant part of the centre of the Village, as are the pubs. If customers can't park easily, they will struggle too and find somewhere else to go. Then that will close. There are also residents who do not have parking on their premises and need to park near their homes.</p> <p>In these difficult financial times, businesses need all the support they can get.</p> <p>There is also the school. There aren't enough children in Stock to sustain the school so people do have to drive their children there from outside the area. There does need to be somewhere safe for parents to park so they can safely take the children to school.</p> <p>My thoughts are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) In the Square there is no need for double yellow lines either side of the small one way road next to the Cafe. There is plenty of room for cars to park both sides, and there are never cars going in two directions.</li> <li>2) There should be double lines on the corners of the roads, but they don't need to be too long. Just enough to prevent to people parking right up to the corner, hindering vision.</li> <li>3) I think there should be lines outside Kingfishers along the verge as sometimes people do park both sides of the road, and then it does get congested. But there is plenty of room on the opposite side of the road to park alongside the wall.</li> </ol> <p>If the idea is to prevent non residents of Stock from parking their cars all day, then maybe restrictions of an hour a day, Monday to Friday could be introduced in</p>	SEPP Technician response.
--	---	---------------------------

		<p>some of the areas, but not all the same times so there is parking at all times of the day somewhere. That works well in Ingatstone.</p> <p>Parked cars also prevent speeding as the traffic has to slow down, and speeding causes accidents, so this should also be another factor to consider.</p>	
102	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Cambridge Close dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the above proposals in relation to the proposed parking restrictions in Stock village.</p> <p>We support the concerns raised by the Parish Council regarding parking challenges in the village – especially in relation to visibility at key junctions being hindered by parked vehicles. However, we also feel that the requirements of our great local businesses and residents need to be taken into account with these proposals.</p> <p>In relation to the proposals for Back Lane, Austen Drive and Cambridge Close, we support the proposals on Tile Reference TQ685 987 to add yellow lines to these corners. The southeast corner of Cambridge Close (nearly number 2) into Back Lane is incredibly difficult to navigate when cars are parked in this area, (especially given the one way nature of Back Lane), or for emergency vehicles to access.</p> <p>For tile reference TQ690 987, we support the proposals for Swan Lane, and for the corners around Mill Road / High Street junction (opposite the Harvard Inn).</p> <p>For the remainder of the proposal in relation to Mill Road, we feel a more targeted approach would be more mutually beneficial to the village – the area to the south of Mill Road (number 24 to just past 34) should be no waiting at any time, however the opposite side of the road we feel should be limited to key time restrictions – e.g. Monday to Friday 8.30am -9.15am and 2.45pm to 3.30pm. This would prevent vehicles being parked all day, where owners may not be utilising village facilities, and at key busy times. However, would provide more flexible parking for residents. In other areas we visit we see that that the parking restriction as</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>detailed above (i.e. not between 8.30am and 9.15am) could also be permit holders only during that time (which would help residents).</p> <p>In relation to The Square, we broadly support the proposals and note that the no waiting appears to be across driveways, or on corners in the majority of places. Given the one-way nature of the entrance to the Square from the High Street near the pedestrian crossing, we do not believe the No Waiting is required outside Number 35, (or if required it should be limited to 8.30am -9.15am).</p> <p>We hope the above comments are constructive and will help to shape a balanced and proportionate approach to the parking challenges the village is currently facing. Whilst the proposals may help enforce the requirements of the Highway Code in terms of junction visibility etc, they will only become truly effective if they are actively monitored once in place.</p> <p>We look forward to the updates on these proposals once the consultation period has concluded.</p>	
103	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from local worker dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed implementation of double yellow lines outside D&amp;B XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. The addition of these parking restrictions would have a significant negative impact XXXX business and the livelihood of many of its employees, XXXXXXXXXXXX.</p> <p>As a new father, I am particularly concerned about the potential loss of my job due to a decrease in customer footfall, which would be exacerbated by the lack of available parking. XXX restaurant thrives on passersby and regular patrons who are drawn in by the convenience of accessible parking. The imposition of double yellow lines would deter customers who might otherwise visit, fearing they would not have a place to park.</p> <p>Since I began working at XXXXX I have developed a deep passion for my role and the community we serve. I am dedicated to providing excellent service to our customers and contributing to the vibrancy of our neighborhood. Losing my job</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>would not only be devastating for me personally but would also affect the restaurant team and our efforts to create a welcoming space for our community.</p> <p>Furthermore, I worry that finding alternative employment in the current economic climate may prove difficult, especially with the responsibilities of being a new parent weighing heavily on my mind. The job I have at [Restaurant Name] is not just a source of income; it is also a vital part of my identity and contribution to my family.</p> <p>I hope the council will consider the far-reaching consequences that the proposed parking restrictions may impose. I urge you to look into alternative solutions that could support both the need for safe and accessible road traffic while also safeguarding our local businesses and the jobs they provide.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my letter. I hope to see a resolution that allows our restaurant, and others like it, to continue serving our community effectively.</p>	
104	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>My comments in regards the above proposal as follows:</p> <p>At every parish council meeting I have attended especially the once a year open house event the issue of parking has been raised by some residents- in the main long standing members of the community so it is an issue for some in the village</p> <p>Parking at the top end of mill road to the side of the bear pub does cause visibility issues and restricts the width of road excessively when vehicles are parked on both sides.</p> <p>Vehicle are left for excessive periods in the Square / Mill Road area - not residents</p> <p>School drop off/ pick up causes issues in Back lane Austin drive/ Cambridge close</p> <p>Set against this is the need to ensure parking is available for village shops / cafes etc which would be hit very hard by the proposal</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>Therefore I'd suggest a modified approach is taken - a much reduced use of double yellow lines limited to the LHS of the Bear pub and round the corner as you go down Mill Road; a limit of 2 hours parking to be introduced around the square ; a no waiting 8:30-930 and 2:30-3:30 on areas affected by school traffic like back lane Cambridge close etc;</p> <p>All other areas to not have restrictions applied to ensure residents in cottages at end of Mill Road for example are able to park unimpeded</p> <p>The village needs to be a thriving community and the benefits of any parking restrictions much be weighed against the potential negative impact on village businesses and village life</p> <p>My only other comment is on enforcement of any restrictions- how will this be done as evidence of local area around Billericay centre shows many drivers parking on double yellows with no fear of being fined or towed away. Me thinks the same situation would occur in Stock</p>	
105	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I wish to register my objection.</p> <p>Not only will it adversely affect essential local village businesses but will seriously disadvantage elderly village residents, such as myself, unable to walk to and thereby support said businesses which we rely on.</p> <p>The hub of the village will be detrimentally impacted by the proposed measures more than by existing parking issues! I urge you to reconsider.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
106	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Austen Drive dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I wish to object to the 'No waiting at any time' parking restrictions proposed for Austen Drive, Stock and believe it would be preferential to instead have time restrictions Monday to Friday for parking, similar to those proposed for Swan Lane. I appreciate there is an issue with school traffic sometimes parking on the corners of Austen Drive/Cambridge Close, however in the XX years I have lived here, I have never been made aware of any issues with vehicles parking across the driveways of no's 1&amp; 3 and cannot understand why the no waiting lines will extend across the driveways of these properties. I do feel that the proposal will</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.



		<p>just push cars wishing to park in the road further down Austen Drive &amp; will therefore be an issue for residents every day of the year instead of for approximately 40 mins per day Monday to Friday term time only.</p> <p>I am in support of the 'No waiting at any times' restrictions proposed for Back Lane as visibility is greatly hindered when cars are parked at the junction of Cambridge Close.</p>	
107	Objection	<p><b>Email dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>Dear Sir after considering all the options I believe the safest option in Cambridge Close would be 'No stopping' at the school starting and finishing hours. As a resident I find the only time we have problems is during this time and not the rest of the day or when the school holidays are on. It's very difficult to see round parked cars and I fear there may be accidents.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
108	Objection	<p><b>Email dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed parking restrictions and No Waiting Zones for the centre of the village.</p> <p>These are a draconian set of measures, that seem to have come about without proper and adequate prior consultation with residents.</p> <p>There is also a very real risk of causing permanent harm to the viability of local businesses which need all the help and support we can give in current economic circumstances.</p> <p>There must be more creative ways of addressing the parking pressures in the village, which are particularly evident at school drop-off and pick-up. Perhaps if residents had been consulted properly, we could have come up with some alternative suggestions for our village.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
109	Objection	<p><b>Email dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>Please accept this email as an objection to the proposed parking restrictions planned for the village of Stock</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

110	Objection	<p><b>Email dated – 13/03/2025</b> Please accept this email as an objection to the proposed parking restrictions planned for the village of Stock.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
111	Objection	<p><b>Email dated – 13/03/2025</b> Please accept this email as an objection to the proposed parking restrictions planned for the village of Stock.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
112	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of MyIn Meadow dated – 13/03/2025</b> Despite having no direct impact on myself (I live in MyIn Meadow) I totally object to the proposed parking restrictions in Stock Village.</p> <p>Not being able to pop into the village shops/florist/café; park close to The Bear/Hoop which don't have large car parks will have a huge impact on these businesses that ultimately make the village what it is. Residents will have to battle for the few spaces that will be left – creating an even bigger problem. Am not sure how this came to be but I wholeheartedly object; we don't have a parking congestion problem in the village – we have a speed problem on Stock Road (which is already being addressed).</p> <p>This has not been thought through and would encourage the council to throw the proposal out</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
113	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated – 13/03/2025</b> With reference to your letter I have seen from South Essex Parking Partnership dated 18th February 2025, I write with the following reply:</p> <p>My property is 'XXXXXX in Stock at XX Mill Road which my family have owned since XXXX some XX years ago. In that time we have had no parking restrictions outside the shop which is needed for customers and deliveries to park outside to utilise the shop. Also, in all that time there have been no public safety problems with cars parked outside.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

	<p>I was not happy to recently find out through a village residents meeting on 25th February 2025 that this not consulted parking restriction plan for Stock village showing outside my whole shop at XX Mill Road is planned a double yellow line with 'no waiting at any time'. How will customers and deliveries utilise the village shop with this restriction? If this restriction is put in place then the village shop cannot survive without customers parking outside to use it.</p> <p>Also, with less parking planned in the whole village then all other businesses will have less customers able to access their sites and residents will have no spaces to park their cars during the day/overnight and weekends. This is all very unfair as this is a very old unique village that is very popular and growing and needs more parking spaces available not much less to continue its future prosperity.</p> <p>A Petition signed by over 100+ people has been handed into the council in support for altering the current plans for the yellow lines in the village, as proposed by SPC &amp; SEPP.</p> <p>This is for changes to the plan that will better protect local businesses and residents, particularly those living in Stock and surrounding areas.</p> <p>I propose a plan to put a 'single yellow line' outside the village shop at XX Mill Road which would allow '20 minutes waiting time' for customers and deliveries to utilise the shop.</p> <p>Also this single yellow line to be put in the other areas in the village instead of double yellow lines. This will enable businesses to continue to trade and free up spaces so the village can continue to be used by the community.</p> <p>I hope you will consider my plan and look forward to further consultation before any changes are made. I look forward to your reply.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> email dated 14/03/2025</b></p> <p>I write to 'Object' to the proposed parking restrictions of putting 'double yellow lines' right outside my residential property at 'XX Mill Road' , Stock. This space</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>outside my residential property is more than the required distance from the junction to put yellow lines down.</p> <p>Where do the tenants and visitors now expect to park their cars if there are no parking spaces around with much less planned to be in the future compared to currently now?</p> <p>Also, right next door to my property at XX Mill Road, Stock you are not putting yellow lines in place. This is unfair and obviously a mistake in proposing these double yellow lines outside my residential property.</p> <p>Please will you look to cancel these double yellow lines outside XX Mill Road, Stock residential property which would then match next door property at XX Mill Road, Stock.</p>	
114	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed implementation of double yellow lines throughout Stock Village. I believe the extensive implementation of these restrictions will negatively impact local businesses, residents, and Stock Primary School.</p> <p><b>Impact on Local Businesses and Village Atmosphere:</b></p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines in The Square will severely hinder the accessibility of local businesses. These businesses rely on vehicular access for customers, and restricting parking will discourage patronage, potentially leading to closures. This would transform Stock Village from a vibrant community hub into a mere thoroughfare.</p> <p><b>Impact on Residents:</b></p> <p>The proposed restrictions will displace residents' parking, forcing them to park further away from their homes. This will simply shift the parking problem to</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>adjacent streets, inevitably leading to further demands for double yellow lines and a cycle of increasing restrictions.</p> <p><b>Alternative Solution: Marked Parking Bays:</b></p> <p>Instead of double yellow lines, I propose the implementation of clearly marked parking bays in The Square. This solution offers several advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Organized Parking:</b> Marked bays will promote organized parking, preventing vehicles from obstructing junctions and pedestrian walkways.</li> <li>• <b>Enforcement:</b> Clear markings will facilitate effective enforcement by traffic wardens, deterring illegal parking through fines.</li> </ul> <p><b>Stock Primary School and Safety Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing yellow zigzag lines outside Stock Primary School require immediate repainting to ensure their visibility and effectiveness.</li> <li>• To enhance safety during school drop-off and pick-up times, I propose the addition of double yellow lines on the opposite side of Swan Lane, near the school entrance, to prevent further narrowing of the road.</li> <li>• Double yellow lines should be placed on the corner of Back Lane by the estate agents, and on the right hand side of the small path leading to Cambridge Close, to protect pedestrians from poorly parked cars.</li> </ul> <p><b>Addressing School Parking Challenges:</b></p> <p>I acknowledge the parking challenges associated with Stock Primary School. However, directing parents to park at the Village Hall is not a viable solution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Village Hall is private property, and relying on it for school parking is unsustainable.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pavements leading from the Village Hall are in a state of disrepair, posing a safety hazard, particularly for young children and parents with pushchairs.</li> <li>• The walk along Stock Road from the village hall with young children is inherently dangerous.</li> <li>• It is suggested that members of the Parish Council without children, attempt to walk the school run from the village hall with a large group of children, to fully understand the dangers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Potential Consequences for Stock Primary School:</b></p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines could have severe consequences for Stock Primary School. The school relies heavily on fundraising events organized by its PTA. Restricting parking will deter attendance at these events, jeopardizing the school's ability to raise vital funds. This could lead to a decline in student enrollment and, ultimately, the closure of the school. I urge the Parish Council to consider the long-term impact on the community before implementing these restrictions.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly believe that marked parking bays offer a more effective and less disruptive solution to parking issues in Stock Village. I implore the Parish Council to reconsider the proposed double yellow lines and prioritize the safety and well-being of residents, businesses, and Stock Primary School.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
115	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I would like to voice my objection to the parking restrictions you have proposed for Stock Village.</p> <p><b>The Square &amp; Mill Road</b></p> <p>I find this area is safe to walk at the moment with my young children. I have X children, X in a pushchair and X walking. If you change to yellow lines this road would naturally become faster for motorists. At the moment the parked cars make</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.

		<p>drivers slow down to about 5-10mph. Without this you will get people doing 30mph. I will then no longer feel safe walking with my children as there are no footpath's.</p> <p>I also support the business's in these areas who have all expressed their concerns that customers wouldn't be able to park anymore and would therefore be likely to close. Stock is currently a lovely place to live as we have so many things on our door step; florist, cafe, hairdressers, village shops &amp; pubs. If these struggle to get customers because of the parking restrictions you will loose the heart of this village and why people love to live here.</p> <p>Also it was clear from the parish council meeting in February that nearly all residents in the square do not support these parking restrictions you propose.</p> <p>If you follow through with these changes all that will happen is push the problem further up Mill Road and onto other streets.</p> <p><b>Parking restrictions round the school</b></p> <p>As a parent of a child at school and pre school. Lots of children come from outside of the village because the village has become very hard for families to afford to live here. If you put these parking restrictions in place ultimately you will push parents away from the school. The government are pushing more parents to go to work, many parents have to rush off to work and don't have the time to walk the 30mins to and from school. I walk most days and from my house. I have timed it and it takes us 15mins from the village hall to the school entrance. It then takes another 10mins to walk back. So you are asking working parents who already have stressful lives to find extra time to walk this. They will just take their children elsewhere to other schools and then we will lose this amazing school.</p> <p>If you attended any of the parish council meetings. You would have noticed that there is a small number of households complaining about the school parking. You will also find on these same streets that not everyone would want the parking restrictions you have proposed.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		I therefore conclude that I don't believe this solution is workable for the local business's, school parents or the village as a whole. I understand that parking can be a problem, but to put a blanket yellow line approach is not the solution. Please take some more time to really understand the village and look at some other solutions that might ease parking problems.	
116	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>As a Stock village resident I would like to register my objection to the proposed parking restrictions affecting The Square and immediate areas in the village of Stock.</p> <p>My objection is that by effectively implementing a permanent no park zone in the the heart of the village directly impacts both the residents living in these areas and the small businesses that trade here too.</p> <p>These businesses rely on this area where customers to park. By not allowing parking here I feel that customers will simply go elsewhere where parking is convenient.</p> <p>I feel there must be a better way to resolve the current problems, perhaps by issuing Residents parking permits alongside introducing restrictions for certain periods of the day incorporating a no return time period.</p> <p>I do hope that you reconsider this ill thought out proposal and submit a proposal that doesn't constrain our fellow residents and local businesses.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.
117	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>We wish to object to the extensive parking restrictions proposed for Stock village. In our opinion there is only justification for restrictions on the bend in Common Road at the Baker's Arms and on one side of Mill Road in the vicinity of the Bear, both for safety reasons.</p> <p>We are concerned that, otherwise, local businesses and residents of central Stock who have no driveways, will be severely affected to the detriment of the community at large.</p>	Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.



118	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated – 13/03/2025</b>  This email is being written by XXXXXXXX on behalf of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX (DOB XXXXXXXXXXXX), XX Mill Road, Stock CM4 XXX - she has dictated it to me. XXXXXX is partially sighted and needs assistance with computer work.</p> <p>I have lived in Stock since XXXX and walked my X daughters and toddler through the village to Stock C of E Primary School. I know what a hazardous walk it was twice a day. I needed to constantly dodge parked cars whilst watching the children. I see the journey for school children walking to school now is still as hazardous as there are areas without pavements and during winter months the lack of street lighting makes it more difficult.</p> <p>I am in favour of restricted parking with double yellow lines in The Square and at the top of Mill Road provided businesses and residents of The Square are given resident parking permits and a disabled visitor's parking permit.</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
119	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email dated – 13/03/2025</b>  Please be advised that myself and extending family are against the above plan being put in place. I would like there to be a consideration taken that many years ago there was a valid car park for when evolution took place and cars became a more necessary means to travel that was voted to be delinquished and a housing estate be put there.</p> <p>Now us fellow parents and grandparents who park where proposed yellow lines are being put in place to make sure our children's safety is at the top of our list, as well as being working parents to make sure we find a suitable time and efficient place to park also is now being taken away is utterly demoralising. When two young members of the community were tragically injured one unfortunately not surviving the incident, the claim to make the village a 20mph speed limit was knocked back as it was not appropriate for the commuters who use the road. Many who stop and grab a bit of lunch or a coffee but yet double yellow lines have been put forward by just a few members of the village and are being considered even though it will have a detrimental cost to the village itself. The hospitality</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>businesses who rely on passers through will have huge losses as many elderly users who can easily park outside and have a lovely meal with friends will no longer be able to do this. The restrictions seem to be any Mon-Fri not just term time. So it will affect the businesses during school holidays also</p> <p>If they make it term time only.</p> <p>This even more builds the case that this is about children whom we are trying to keep safe and not make the walk along an unsuitable foot path (made for one person at a time) not a whole school full of children. This is irrational and discriminating to parents as we aren't the only people who park there. The one thing I surely know is making the young children and their little innocent lives safe should come before everything.</p> <p>Thank you for reading it is much appreciated and I do hope the consideration for safety of our innocent children is put first.</p>	
120	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of School Lane dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed implementation of double yellow lines throughout Stock Village. I believe the extensive implementation of these restrictions will negatively impact local businesses, residents, and Stock Primary School.</p> <p><b>Impact on Local Businesses and Village Atmosphere:</b></p> <p>The proposed double yellow lines in The Square will severely hinder the accessibility of local businesses. These businesses rely on vehicular access for customers, and restricting parking will discourage patronage, potentially leading to closures. This would transform Stock Village from a vibrant community hub into a mere thoroughfare.</p> <p><b>Impact on Residents:</b></p> <p>The proposed restrictions will displace residents' parking, forcing them to park further away from their homes. This will simply shift the parking problem to adjacent streets, inevitably leading to further demands for double yellow lines and a cycle of increasing restrictions.</p> <p><b>Alternative Solution: Marked Parking Bays:</b></p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

	<p>Instead of double yellow lines, I propose the implementation of clearly marked parking bays in The Square. This solution offers several advantages:</p> <p><b>Organized Parking:</b> Marked bays will promote organized parking, preventing vehicles from obstructing junctions and pedestrian walkways.</p> <p><b>Enforcement:</b> Clear markings will facilitate effective enforcement by traffic wardens, deterring illegal parking through fines.</p> <p><b>Stock Primary School and Safety Concerns:</b>  The existing yellow zigzag lines outside Stock Primary School require immediate repainting to ensure their visibility and effectiveness.  To enhance safety during school drop-off and pick-up times, I propose the addition of double yellow lines on the opposite side of Swan Lane, near the school entrance, to prevent further narrowing of the road.  Double yellow lines should be placed on the corner of Back Lane by the estate agents, and on the right hand side of the small path leading to Cambridge Close, to protect pedestrians from poorly parked cars.</p> <p><b>Addressing School Parking Challenges:</b>  I acknowledge the parking challenges associated with Stock Primary School. However, directing parents to park at the Village Hall is not a viable solution. The Village Hall is private property, and relying on it for school parking is unsustainable.  The pavements leading from the Village Hall are in a state of disrepair, posing a safety hazard, particularly for young children and parents with pushchairs. The walk along Stock Road from the village hall with young children is inherently dangerous.  It is suggested that members of the Parish Council without children, attempt to walk the school run from the village hall with a large group of children, to fully understand the dangers.</p> <p><b>Potential Consequences for Stock Primary School:</b>  The proposed double yellow lines could have severe consequences for Stock Primary School. The school relies heavily on fundraising events organized by its PTA. Restricting parking will deter attendance at these events, jeopardizing the school's ability to raise vital funds. This could lead to a decline in student enrollment and, ultimately, the closure of the school. I urge the Parish Council to</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>consider the long-term impact on the community before implementing these restrictions.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly believe that marked parking bays offer a more effective and less disruptive solution to parking issues in Stock Village. I implore the Parish Council to reconsider the proposed double yellow lines and prioritize the safety and well-being of residents, businesses, and Stock Primary School.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
121	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Well Lane dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>I am emailing to object to the proposed parking restrictions that have been put forward in Stock Village, particularly in relation to parking in the heart of the village (Stock Square and Mill Road). I am concerned about the effect this will have on local businesses, especially in a tough economic climate and also for the residents in this area. This will only push cars to park further along Mill Road to Well Lane and cause observation difficulty and potential accidents at the junction of Mill Road/Well Lane/Common Road.</p> <p>I understand that a petition has already been put forward objecting to this and so I hope you will reconsider the proposal in order to protect our community.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
122	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Stock dated – 13/03/2025</b></p> <p>In relation to the proposed yellow line scheme for Stock Village I would support the installation of yellow lines around the junction of Mill road and Stock road outside the village shop as I have often encountered obstructive and dangerous parking near the traffic island with cars practically ‘abandoned’ making it very difficult to pass between them and the traffic island especially during school run hours. I have encountered similar obstructions outside the bear pub at the junction of the square with Mill Road and in the area of Bakers field and Mill Road where congestion caused by parking creates difficult conditions for drivers and pedestrians alike. I would also support any parking restrictions outside the school that would make the area safer for pupils.</p> <p>I do not think the installation of yellow lines around the rest of the village square however would be helpful, unless consideration is given for the effects on local businesses and residents that live in the area affected by the proposals.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

123	<b>Comments</b>	<p><b>Email from Stock Parish Council dated 14/03/2025</b> Please find attached the Stock Parish Council response to the above Consultation.</p> <p>Please note that the SPC response is based on collective responses to the Consultation that Parish Councillors have received from the residents and business owners of Stock. I would add that all Stock Parish Councillors have been a party to the many discussions that have taken place over many months on our village parking issues. The attached response to the Consultation is a consensus view of the 8 Councillors, exceptions to which one abstained from commenting, one objects wholly to the response, and two object to a proposal to close off the egress junction at Mill Road leading to the High Street. In all, five Councillors wholly approve of the attached response. From the many responses that you have already received from residents on which SPC has been copied, you can appreciate how emotive the matter is.</p> <p>Stock Parish Council would appreciate a meeting with you to discuss the current situation, the proposed Order, and potential ways forward to alleviate our car parking issues.</p> <p><b><u>Attached letter</u></b></p> <p><b>Please accept the following as the Stock Parish Council response to the above order.</b></p> <p><b><u>Summary of Response</u></b> <b>Stock Parish Council (SPC) thanks SEPP for its review of the car parking issues in Stock Village as outlined by SPC in its letter to SEPP last year. The above-order has been presented to Stock residents subsequent to a visit made by SEPP with SPC representatives in attendance and the order is now made to resolve some of the safety issues viewed in roads of concern that were presented at the time.</b></p>	<p>Comments noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
-----	-----------------	---	--

		<p>The SEPP consultation has had a very- large response particularly from residents and businesses in The Square and in Mill Road and it has become clear that some of the measures to be taken by SEPP particularly in this area of the Village will have a detrimental affect to residents (those without off street parking) and to business as customers will be inhibited from parking reasonably near to the attending shop resulting in potential significant loss of business and subsequent demise of the heart of the village. Stock Parish Council thus requests SEPP to make the above order restrictive based on parameters as follows.</p> <p><u>Overview</u> Residents of Stock have complained about parking issues to SPC for quite some time. The concerns fall into two specific areas of the village:-</p> <p><u>Area around the School.</u> As well noted in your "Statement of Reasons" residents located in around the School experience obstructive parking particularly at School drop off and pick up times. When obstructive "parkers" have been approached residents often receive verbal abuse and thus reasoning about the obstruction is not acknowledged.</p> <p>We are pleased to report that the School has enacted the 3PR scheme whereby those picking up and dropping off children are actively requested to park responsibly with care, respect for residents and the safety of all. The owners of the Harvard Inn at the back of the School and the Bear public house in the Square do allow parents at drop off and pick up time to park in their off road car parks which helps to alleviate some of the parking problem. Stock Parish Council therefore feels that the Order imposing double yellow line restrictions in Back Lane, Cambridge Close and Austen Drive would now be better served by a "No Stopping - Monday to Friday 8.00am to 9.30am &amp; 2.30pm to 4pm" as proposed by the School Entrance.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><b><u>Area around The Square and Mill Road</u></b></p> <p>The proposed restrictions in this area are felt to be so inhibitive that significant damage will be done to the sustainable community of Stock _particularly regarding residents who have no off street parking facilities, and the businesses that provide services at the heart of the village. Objections to the proposed order have been both vociferous and numerous. A large delegation against the Order met with the Parish Council to express their concerns, and at the time of writing a petition of nearly 600 signatures has been filed against it.</p> <p>Residents and businesses acknowledge that there are parking issues in this area but are seeking ways to alleviate the problem without the need for extensive painting of double yellow lines. Business owners have indicated that their Staff will no longer park by their premises but instead park at the Village Hall where parking is fairly extensive. SPC will press to obtain firm confirmation of this proposed action. This should go a long way to alleviating the parking problem at peak business times. In addition, SPC will be posting more signage around the Village encouraging motorists coming from outside the village to park at the Village Hall rather than causing congestion around this difficult to drive through area.</p> <p>Clearly the existing double yellow at the junction of the Square and the High Street (adjacent to the War memorial Bus Stop) is still much needed to protect the visibility of drivers entering the busy main road. We also support double yellow lines at the junction of the Square and Mill Road (the Bear pub corner) as motorists parking here obstruct the view of other vehicles coming from the Square which is clearly a dangerous situation in this congested area.</p> <p><b><u>Other Solutions</u></b> for this area are being considered and SPC would like to progress them with SEPP before restrictive yellow lining is placed:-</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>1). To block off the existing egress from Mill Road to the High Street and making this a parking area for the residents who live on this difficult bend.</p> <p>Mill Road traffic wishing to enter the High Street towards the Billericay direction will be directed through the Square and out onto the High Street at the War Memorial Bus stop junction.</p> <p>2). To block off the entry onto the Square as situated by the zebra crossing and opposite the Budgens shop. Make this part of the Square a parking area for residents and users of the Dandelion and Burdock Cafe.</p> <p>Stock Parish Council would like to thank SEPP again for its response to our call to review the parking issues in our Village. The Order Consultation has brought about a greater awareness in the community of safety issues that are caused by obstructive parking, and residents have responded with a more rational view of the situation but are now clearly very concerned about the detrimental effect on the village that extensive double yellow parking restrictions may cause. It is the responsibility of the Parish Council to reflect these concerns as we have hopefully achieved above.</p> <p>We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you again to discuss the current situation and our proposals going forward.</p>	
124	Objection	<p><b>Email dated 14/03/2025</b></p> <p>I have reviewed the restrictions proposed by SEPP for the Stock area and have concerns regarding their enforcement.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



		<p>I share the common view that a raise in awareness and consideration is all that is required (for example, through Stock Primary Schools current 3PR scheme, which is working well) and not the mass introduction of yellow lines.</p> <p>My main concerns are that the yellow lines would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Negatively impact local business.</b> Local businesses make Stock the wonderful village it is, and they need all the help they can get to succeed. Especially, when they themselves are actively trying to support the local area e.g. Budgens have recently put a huge effort into stocking local produce from local butchers, bakers etc. Customers often park for a few minutes in the square to nip in. This will be very difficult with the restrictions. The much loved D&amp;B cafe, florist and hairdressers also rely on customers being able to find street parking.</li> <li>- <b>Force school children to walk on the Stock Road which has well known speeding issues.</b> I have XX young children (XXXXX). I used to park in the village hall car park and walk the children to and from school. I had to stop this due to the dangerous traffic on the Stock Road. Cars, vans and extremely large trucks speed down the road and with XX children and only 2 hands I felt it was dangerous. <b><u>The school run is only a very short period each morning and afternoon and the safety of the children should be prioritised.</u></b></li> <li>- <b>Force elderly Grandparents picking up children from school to walk further/dangerous roads.</b> My mother (XX) sometimes picks my children up from school. She arrives early to ensure she can park close to the school in a considerate place. She has back and hip issues so needs to park nearby. This will become very difficult with the proposed parking restrictions.</li> <li>- <b>Carers and elderly friends.</b> Stock has many older residents who have carers and older friends visiting. Restrictions will make it harder for them to park nearby and may make the elderly feel isolated.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>- <b>Eyesore on local roads.</b> Will be a maze of yellow lines in a beautiful village.</p> <p><b>The proposed parking restrictions appear to be being pushed forward by a very small self interested minority within the village who do not represent those with children, local businesses and the majority of villagers.</b></p> <p>I thank you for the time taken to review this letter of objection and your careful consideration over the implication of the parking restrictions.</p>	
125	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of High Street dated 14/03/2025</b></p> <p>We are against the proposed parking restrictions proposal dated 20th February 2025 for the following reasons:-</p> <p>*Excessive parking restrictions especially around the Square will cause parking problems for residents, visitors to shops pubs and other businesses as well as school drop offs and pick ups as will just move parking congestion problems elsewhere.</p> <p>*Effectively clearing the Square of parked vehicles would encourage faster moving traffic around the Square with potential pedestrian safety issues (as there's no doorways) and the Square will become a "rat-run" for speeding traffic to Mill Road. At present the number of parked vehicles acts as an effective traffic calming measure.</p> <p>*A concern was raised about access and egress issues particularly for larger vehicles... Drivers of larger vehicles should bear in mind that the centre of Stock is small village environment so they should be encouraged to avoid the area around the square, or make their deliveries using smaller vehicles.</p> <p>*It is likely that some free parking spaces are used by commuters travelling by bus to Billericay railway station, therefore rather than introduce full parking restrictions at all times by the introduction of double yellow lines; introduce limited parking durations e.g. 30 minutes, or restrict parking during particular times of the day.</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>* If double yellow lines are utilised at all they should be at short sections at corners of road junctions, along with the usual zigzag road markings by the school entrance.</p>	
126	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Common Road dated 14/03/2025</b></p> <p>I write to you concerning <b>TRO 66 in Stock, Various roads, proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' and 'No Stopping 8am-9.30am &amp; 2.30pm-4pm on Entrance ways'</b>.</p> <p>I am not an elected Councillor in Stock although I do live in Stock, so I should declare a interest.</p> <p>I wanted to share my thoughts on a meeting I attended on Tuesday, 25<sup>th</sup> February, that was convened by local businessman XXXXXXXXXX, owner of the XXXXXXXXXX in The Square, Stock, which was attended by around seventy local residents. The meeting took place at XXXXXXXXXX although it was after hours and no food or drink was offered.</p> <p>Many of the people present live in homes that will be impacted by the proposals in TRO 66; i.e. in The Square or Austen Drive and Cambridge Close, also on Swan Lane.</p> <p>I was surprised to learn, by show of hands, that no one present had been personally canvassed by Stock Parish Council about their views on the proposed TRO even though, I am told, Stock Parish Council submitted evidence of resident support with the application for a TRO.</p> <p>I understand that some form of survey was available in at least one of the village shops, however I would have expected the Parish Council to have made this available in businesses that are in the TRO area - it wasn't - and for the survey to be advertised on the Parish Council website as well as the village notice boards where Stock Parish Council news is posted. Again. It wasn't.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>One resident at the meeting reported contacting the Parish Council clerk four times to ask for details about the proposed TRO, including maps, she didn't receive any response.</p> <p>Many residents felt that the current situation - whereby the Square is often full with parked cars - far from being a safety concern, actually acts as a way to slow the speed of the traffic.</p> <p>I took away from the meeting a sense that the TRO is something being done to the residents of the parish rather than with the support of the residents of the parish.</p> <p>On the whole I do not have a view one way or the other on the proposed TRO.</p> <p>My concern lies with the transparency around the way in which the TRO application was made and the evidence to support it. I do not feel that is a good way of advancing decision making in local communities.</p> <p>That said, given that any comments, of support or objection, are to be looked at by the Joint Committee under delegated authority before a decision is made to make the order, make the order less restrictive or to withdraw it, I would ask the Joint Committee to consider making the Order less restrictive - applying only the 'No Stopping 8am-9.30am &amp; 2.30pm-4pm on Entrance ways' in Swan Lane does not appear to raise objections, or to withdraw it.</p> <p>Withdrawing the application would allow the Stock Parish Council to conduct a proper, fully transparent consultation and to come back at another future date with the support of its residents.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my views.</p>	
127	Objection	<p><b>Email from business owner dated 14/03/2025</b></p> <p>I wish to register my concerns about the proposed parking restrictions in The Square, Stock.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the</p>

		<p>As a owner of a small business in the village, the proposed yellow line restrictions would create a significant threat to my business. Many of my clients, some of whom are disabled or lack mobility, will struggle to park nearby for their appointments. Although there is free parking available at the Village Hall, this is not intended to be used for such purposes and is also too far away to walk to the salon for those elderly and disabled clients.</p> <p>I feel the Parish Council and SEPP have not fully thought through the consequences of imposing so many restrictions, without providing alternative arrangements near to the centre of the village for customer and residents.</p> <p>Many of my clients are local residents including several whom live in and around The Square – where are these residents now going to park? The likelihood is that some will actually park along the B1007 main road through the village, causing greater issues.</p> <p>There is also the risk that, clearing roads leading into The Square and The Square itself, of all parking will lead to cars traveling at higher speeds through the heart of the village. Given the fatality of a schoolboy from the village in the recent past caused by a speeding, dangerously driven car, it does not make sense to open the side roads and The Square to similar potential risks.</p> <p>I do agree that some parking restrictions are necessary, e.g., around some junctions, but most are completely unnecessary. The parking and flow of traffic through the centre of the village is generally self-managing without any significant issues. These proposals appear to have emanated from a very small subset of the Parish Council without proper consultation of the villagers and businesses. I do agree that we need to seek the imposition of a 20mph speed limit through the village on the B1007, however it is unnecessary to introduce so many parking restrictions in areas that will push the issue out to other areas of the village.</p>	SEPP Technician response.
128	Objection	Email from resident of The Square dated 14/03/2025	Objection noted.

		<p>I am writing to state my objections to the proposed restrictions in The Square, Stock. We live at number XX The Square. At certain times of the day parking in the area is congested but we are able to deal with those times. The proposed double yellow lines would severely exacerbate the problem and would, we believe, make it harder to park outside or adjacent to our own properties.</p> <p>We are fortunate to live in a real village with thriving shops, restaurants and pubs creating a real community. These draconian plans will make it literally impossible for some of those businesses to receive deliveries. How can those businesses survive if their customers have nowhere to park? Without these there will be no community and no village, just a group of houses!</p> <p>There is also a real threat to the value of our houses if people find they cannot park in the village.</p> <p>We have a real concern over speeding through the village, especially following the tragic events of last year but these proposals will have no effect on that and, if anything, the parking keeps speeds away from Stock Road low'</p> <p>I'm sure that, by now, you are aware of the strength of feeling amongst the residents about this scheme. My hope is that you will abandon the scheme and allow us to manage the situation ourselves as we already do. Alternatively, please allow us genuine consultation on any alternative ideas!</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
129	Objection	<p><b>Email from resident of Cambridge Close dated 14/03/2025</b></p> <p>Your letter of 18 February, paragraph 4, states that responses can either object to the proposal or support it. I write today to justify amending the proposal. Let me explain.</p> <p>I and my wife have lived in Stock Village for XX years and we are located very close to The Square. I live in Cambridge Close, proposed to be subject to partial Restrictions itself. The proposed Restrictions do not in themselves concern me unduly because of my position at the very end of Cambridge Close, and as a very close resident to the centre of the Village my wife and myself do not park in the Square or Mill Road, we walk to these locations. Therefore, I feel I am not directly affected by the proposals for the Square and Mill Road. However, I am concerned about safety generally whilst doing our best to maintain a thriving commercial</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>aspect to our Village. Without our businesses the Village would lose its identity. Businesses are in many ways one of the lifeblood of our community.</p> <p>We all know the problem with Stock. It was not designed and built for the modern age. A few horses and carts would have graced the scene when many of the original houses were built, surrounded by plenty of fields. Today of course we have the motor car, many houses having more than one, and no fields, at least none of them near the centre of the Village. I am describing infill of housing. This has had a negative effect on the Village. More cars, and less space to provide parking facilities. Foresight of planners should have prevented this.</p> <p>I turn to safety. I believe that residents would admit with their hearts that there are certain places in the Village where we need to act, and to provide drivers with better visibility of the road ahead. I agree that something has to be done. Having said that I believe that 56% also had this view in the survey conducted by the Parish Council last year. This percentage is not conclusive in my view and 44% of residents either disagreed or couldn't actually convince themselves to say yes. This lack of conclusive response has led to a swell of opinion of many in the Village that they don't want any yellow lines. I do not agree with this.</p> <p>So, my position is to urge SEPP to consider comprises that allow all interests in the Village to be accommodated. Where safety is being considered maybe there are some adjustments that can be looked at. I would like SEPP to consider that the Village is desperately short of parking spaces. The nearest car park is in the Village Hall which is at the north end of the Village.</p> <p>What does the Highway Code tell us?</p> <p>Rule 239 includes –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• do not park facing against the traffic flow</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• stop as close as you can to the side</li> <li>• it is safer for your passengers (especially children) to get out of the vehicle on the side next to the kerb</li> </ul> <p>Rule 242 says –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You <b>MUST NOT</b> leave your vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road.</li> </ul> <p>Rule 243 includes –</p> <p><b>DO NOT</b> stop or park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• near a school entrance</li> <li>• anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services</li> <li>• opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space</li> <li>• opposite a traffic island or (if this would cause an obstruction) another parked vehicle</li> <li>• where you would force other traffic to enter a tram lane</li> <li>• in front of an entrance to a property</li> <li>• on a bend</li> </ul> <p><b>except</b> when forced to do so by stationary traffic.</p> <p><b>Rule 244</b></p>	
--	--	---	--



	<p>You <b><u>MUST NOT</u></b> park partially or wholly on the pavement in London and <u>should</u> not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it.</p> <p>When you look at our Village, I feel that you cannot meet all these rules. The road design just doesn't allow it. Even allowing for the proposal there are many areas in the Village that don't meet some of the rules above.</p> <p>As I see it we have two parking problem timings in the Village. 1. Times when pupils at Stock Primary School are brought to, and taken home from, school by their parent(s), and 2. Other times, but primarily during the day and sometimes in the evening. In 1 it is clear to me that far more traffic is found in Cambridge Close, Austen Drive, and Dakyn Drive, the latter not coming under these proposals. Under 2 the pinch points are The Square, and Mill Road from the Stock Village Shop to 24 Mill Road. My attendance in The Square and Mill Road during school opening and closing times indicated that there is no real problem. Parents park respectively and are not excessive in number.</p> <p>Cambridge Close, Austen drive, and Dakyn Drive have no parking issues whatsoever other than at the School opening and closing school times. To be clear, where the restrictions are proposed in Cambridge Close and Austen Drive, we do minimal parking on the proposed Restrictions at any time. I also contend that because there is no dangerous parking other than at school run times, we have no safety issues, and this is one area where a compromise would be appropriate. Accordingly double yellow lines are not needed and yellow lines linked to school run times would be a better solution. There is one exception to this and that is Back Lane North side Map file TQ690 987 and Cambridge Close Both sides from its junction with Back Lane northwards for 10 metres, where there is occasional parking in Back Lane outside of the school run and where double yellow lines would improve drivers' line of vision when exiting Cambridge Close into Back Lane either turning right or left.</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>RECOMMENDATION: Replace double yellow lines with restricted times yellow lines linked to school opening and closing hours as indicated in previous paragraph.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: To support safety concerns in the Cambridge Close and Austen Drive I recommend white stop lines in Austen Drive at its junction with Cambridge Close. This would make it clear who has right of way and minimise potential accidents.</p> <p>By way of reassurance, I have visited Daykn Drive and on my visits, there was no disrespectful parking eg no blocking of driveways and no parking on grass verges.</p> <p>You may be interested to know that currently 43 cars dropping off and picking up school kids, park either in Daykn Drive, Cambridge Close, Austen Drive, and Back Lane [near Cambridge Close). This compares with circa 30 who park in The Square, and Mill Road. The difference with Back Lane, Cambridge Close, Austen Drive, Daykn Drive, and Brookmans Road is that we are cul-de-sacs, and e have to get into the B1007 at the Back Lane junction (Harvard Inn) which is single lane with priority for traffic going eastwards towards the B1007. With 43 cars coming down Back Lane in a constant line twice a school day leads to blockages on B1007 as cars who want to go westwards into Back Lane at the same time queue back into the B1007. Back Lane is what is it is but do SEPP need to reconsider the priority being reversed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: Priority in Back Lane from B1007 to 6 Back Lane to be reversed.</p> <p>I now want to deal with the other Restrictions proposed for the Village. The Table lines up with the Effect of the Order table on the formal Notice.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		Mill Road – South & Southwest sides	<p>South – Agreed</p> <p>Southwest side – Retain parking space for 3 cars, closest to the High Street. Driver's line of sight eastwards when entering the High Street is not hindered and large vehicles will be able to get past the 3 parked cars. However, I strongly believe that the existing traffic island is not helpful to traffic flow. Therefore, I recommend that the island is shortened in depth and moved towards Saddlers House (ie first house in Mill Road on the South side). This is an example of the compromise that is needed in this situation, to give some support to residents whilst handling a bottle neck location.</p>	
		Mil Road – Southwest side	The map attached with the proposals does not appear to show yellow lines outside 22 Mill Road despite the description suggesting otherwise. I do agree with the proposal for No 22 for 79 metres.	
		Mill Road - Northeast side	If the traffic island could be moved eastwards, then I would agree with double yellow lines. With the island unmoved I think there can be one parking space outside Saddlers House.	
		Mill Road – Northeast side	Agreed	
		The Square – Southeast side	I would like to see the 10 metres reduced to 7 metres. I don't believe that this would cause any obstruction.	

		The Square – Southeast side	I believe that there should be no Restrictions as proposed. Whilst this would lead to single file traffic, there are numerous single file parts of the Square. More importantly traffic can see each other from either direction in The Square at this point and so be able to make way for each other.	
		The Square – Southeast side	Agreed	
		The Square – Southeast Side	Agreed	
		The Square – Northwest side	I believe that there should be no Restrictions here. Whilst I appreciate that any vehicle parked here would be within 7 metres of the corner, I think that when you look at the layout and lines of sight for vehicles coming in any direction there are no obstructions that represent a danger. The Square road width here is at its widest. On the opposite southeast side Restrictions are proposed and which I agree because the visibility is restricted. However, this is not the case on the Northwest side.	
		The Square – Northwest side	As in the previous section, the road is wide at this point. Accordingly, I believe that we can manage traffic flows without double yellow lines in this location.	
		The Square – Northwest and Southwest side	I agree with double yellow lines on the Northwest side but feel that the Southwest side can be dispensed with. This junction to the B1007 is one-way coming towards The Square. It has always been a single lane	

			road. A vehicle parked close to this corner does not cause any obstruction in my view.	
		The Square – Southwest side	Agreed	
		The Square – Northeast & Northwest sides	Agreed	
		Back Lane – Southwest side	I believe that a single space can be accommodated in this location. Traffic turning into Back Lane from the B1007 coming from the southwest is not obstructed and neither is viewing into Back Lane. This space would be useful to the estate agent business without being a hazard to road users.	
		Back Lane - Northside	Agreed	
		Cambridge Close – Both sides	As explained in paragraphs above these Restrictions should be changed from No Waiting At Any Time to No Waiting during school opening and closing times.	
		Cambridge Close – Both sides	As explained in paragraphs above these Restrictions should be changed from No Waiting At Any Time to No Waiting during school opening and closing times.	
		Austen Drive – Both sides	As explained in paragraphs above these Restrictions should be changed from No Waiting at any time to No Waiting during school opening and closing times.	

		Swan Lane – Both sides	Agreed	
		<p>I calculate that the Restrictions as proposed would result in the number of spaces being lost against what I see as vehicles parking now. I am including the School runs.</p> <p>Mill Road – 12</p> <p>The Square – 16</p> <p>Back Lane, Cambridge Close &amp; Austen Drive – 13 (NB Vehicles only park in these streets during School runs. Outside School runs I see no issue with parking, or speeding).</p> <p>Total – 41 – One asks oneself where these cars will go. What does SEPP think?</p> <p>My recommendations will reinstate approximately 12 spaces excluding the Back Lane area north of B1007. So that is 12 out of 28. I think this represents compromise whilst not ignoring the safety aspects of what is trying to be achieved. I identified an area of land in Mill Road on the northwest side just southeast of No 15. It currently has 2 willow trees on it and is owned I am told by Lord Petre. This would be ideal for 4 or 5 angled car parking spaces which in my view would benefit the Village much more than the 2 willows. Previous objections on grounds of village aesthetics should be overridden and provide some rest bite for residents of Mill Road in that vicinity, who are faced with lack of parking anywhere near their property at nighttime, and during the day would give local businesses some support for customers. I see no dangerous scenario with reversing a parked car into Mill Road. Compare this to Galleywood where parking of similar type is</p>		

	<p>allowed at the shop's location on a main road with buses and lorries. If they deem that safe, then Mill Road will be safer.</p> <p>Throughout my assessment you will notice the absence of the word pedestrian. This isn't because I think they shouldn't be safe. Indeed, I do. However, I recognise that most of the The Square has no pavements as it stands, and these Restrictions do not consider pedestrians either. The reality is that pedestrians already navigate large parts of The Square by the road, so my proposals will reduce the space they have to walk in compared to the proposed Restrictions, but still allow better scenarios than currently.</p> <p>There are no pavements between The Bear and Highcliffe House in Mill Road. With double yellow lines proposed (and I agree) on either side, the expectation is that traffic heading primarily northwest into the Village will be travelling at speeds in excess of what they do now. I know that this is a concern to residents. Therefore, I RECOMMEND the following.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A hatched narrow walkway on the southeast side of Mill Road between these points to give pedestrians and drivers a defined area to use, and avoid, and</li> <li>2. Appropriate traffic calming measures from around the Catholic Church in Mill Road up to the start of the Restrictions. This may be static signage, flashing warning signs, red concrete tarmac, mph signs on tarmac.</li> </ol> <p>Summary:</p> <p>SEPP have the future of the Village in their hands with this proposed Order. You know that there is strong opposition in the Village. They have expressed this with petitions. I have attempted to provide answers which are my opinions alone. I</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>want the Village to retain its unique heritage and continue to be a place where residents and businesses live and prosper together.</p> <p>Please give my proposals due consideration and I would be happy to spend some time with SEPP to work through the detail if required. It seems clear to me that these decisions require further thought and maybe the consultation should be extended and give SEPP time to work closely with the Stock Parish Council and others.</p>	
130	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email dated 14/03/2025</b> I am writing with regards to the proposed parking restrictions in Stick, put forward by SEPP.</p> <p>Considering the limited parking opportunities already in Stock, these proposals to reduce further are utterly ludicrous and in my opinion will heighten the risk of schoolchildren being involved in traffic accidents. The main roads are so busy and with more people being forced to park further away from the school, it will no doubt increase that risk during the walk to the school.</p> <p>I have a child in year X at the school and these plans concern me incredibly.</p> <p>Not only that, but there will no doubt be a negative effect on businesses in the area - for example the Bear, Stock Florist, etc.</p> <p>I really cannot see any sense or any significant reason for these parking restrictions to be implemented and I would urge you to not approve their introduction.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
131	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email dated 14/03/2025</b> I stongly object to the severity of the parking restrictions that are proposed for Stock Village. It will affect the village shops and school. We do not live in the centre of Stock, but we do attend the school, and occasionally need to drive to the shops for parcel pickups- drop offs, and these parking restrictions will make it</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>



		<p>harder to sue the village for these things. We are concerned that the businesses in the village will suffer, and it will make it difficult for the parents whose children attend the school from outside Stock to pick up and drop off their children.</p> <p>Some parking restrictions may be necessary, as parking in and around the village can be problematic, but not nearly as severe as the ones proposed.</p>	
132	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup> Email dated 17/03/2025</b>  I strongly oppose this. We live in Back Lane, with limited parking. If this goes ahead it will cause people to try and park down our road.</p> <p>The majority of the village are against this, with many thinking of moving if this g</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Email dated 17/03/2025</b>  I strongly oppose this. We live in Back Lane, with limited parking. If this goes ahead it will cause people to try and park down our road, which is already busy.</p> <p>The majority of the village are against this, with many thinking of moving if this goes ahead. We love our village, we have all lived with the square as it is, there has never been a major accident. If this goes ahead it will have a major negative impact on us all</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>
133	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email from resident of Mill Road dated 17/03/2025</b>  I am writing to express my objection to the proposed traffic restrictions with the introduction of yellow lines throughout the village.</p> <p>It is my opinion that the introduction of yellow line parking restrictions will have a negative effect on the local businesses in respect to customer visits and trade at a time when the council should be supporting local business.</p> <p>Also the residents in the areas impacted will not be able to park within a reasonable distance from their homes. This is unreasonable as many impacted residents are elderly and some have disabilities. Parking permits which would no</p>	<p>Objection noted.  Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>doubt have an associated cost is not a solution but instead is a further tax which is unacceptable.</p> <p>The major issue concerning road safety in the village is that of speeding motorists and NOT parking. Imposing double yellow lines will reduce parking, which currently reduces the speed of traffic, will enable cars to travel even faster with potentially tragic outcomes.</p> <p>The residents have been campaigning for a 20 MPH limit throughout the village to improve safety, not parking restrictions that will have a detriment impact on local business and residential life.</p> <p>If these restrictions are imposed we will see businesses close which will destroy the heart and soul of the village without any improvement to the overall safety of the residents what ever their age.</p>	
134	<b>Objection</b>	<p><b>Email and attached letter from resident of The Square dated 19/03/2025</b></p> <p>Further to receipt of the proposed plans above I would like it noted that I strongly oppose to the plans of double yellow lines being placed around the village. To create a safer village surely you reduce the speed through the High Street limit to 20 mph -the suggestion that double yellow lines will create a safer village is inconceivable -it will merely create a freeway for speeding traffic through the village.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the village already has an issue with lack of parking for residents and visitors so to reduce the amount of current spaces available will only add to the existing problems and in turn affect the residents and local businesses. My suggestion is as follows which I hope you will consider:</p> <p>For safety in the village reduce the current speed limit from 30 mph to 20mph</p> <p>Decline the proposal of double yellow lines which will protect our current local</p>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 4 of the report for the SEPP Technician response.</p>

		<p>businesses and save tax payers money on works that are not necessary or wanted Offer residents the option of resident parking permits -which in turn will create a revenue</p> <p>Promote the free village car park for visitors of the village and its businesses/school</p> <p>I sincerely hope you listen to my opinions and the people of Stock Village before making this dreadful decision.</p> <p>Thanking you in advance for your considerations.</p>	
--	--	--	--