

Tandridge parking review 2021-22: Decisions report

A document explaining our final decisions on proposed new parking controls and restrictions, following formal advertisement and public feedback

Contents

Introduction	4
Caterham Hill division	5
Caterham on the Hill.....	5
Buxton Lane junction with Penrhyn Close.....	5
Coulson Road	5
Cromwell Road	5
Essendene Road, including junction with Whyteleafe Road	6
Foxon Lane junction with Foxon Lane Gardens.....	6
Money Road junction with Money Avenue	6
Caterham Valley division.....	8
Caterham.....	8
Colburn Avenue	8
Newstead Rise.....	8
Tupwood Lane (1).....	9
Tupwood Lane (2).....	9
Whyteleafe	9
Downsway	9
Godstone Road (1)	10
Godstone Road (2)	10
Hillbury Road	11
Maple Close.....	11
Salmons Lane.....	11

Tandridge parking review 2021-22: Decisions report

Godstone division.....	12
Godstone.....	12
Ivy Mill Lane.....	12
Salisbury Road junction with Dewlands.....	12
Nutfield.....	12
A25, in the Nutfield cemetery lay by.....	12
South Godstone.....	13
Lagham Road.....	13
Lingfield division.....	14
Dormansland.....	14
New Farthingdale.....	14
Lingfield.....	14
Little Lullenden junction with Grove Road.....	14
Newchapel Road.....	14
Vicarage Road junction with Vicarage Close.....	15
Smallfield.....	15
Meadow View, junctions with Mead Lane and Plough Road.....	15
Oxted division.....	17
Hurst Green.....	17
Holland Road (1).....	17
Holland Road (2).....	17
Hurstlands.....	17
The Greenway.....	18
Wolfs Wood.....	18
Limpsfield.....	18
Bluehouse Lane (1).....	18
Bluehouse Lane (2).....	19
High Street (1).....	19
High Street (2).....	19
Old Oxted.....	20
High Street (1).....	20
High Street (2).....	20
Oxted.....	20
Downs Way, junctions with Greenacres.....	20
Station Road East.....	21
Station Road West.....	21
Gresham Road junction with Station Road East.....	21
Warlingham division.....	22
Tatsfield.....	22

Church Hill	22
Paynesfield Road.....	22
Westmore Road.....	22
Paynesfield Road junction with Johns Road	23
Warlingham	23
Farleigh Road at junction with The Copse	23
Farleigh Road, including junctions with Boxwood Way and Bond Road	23
Kingswood Lane	24
Limpsfield Road (1).....	24
Limpsfield Road (2).....	25
Tithepit Shaw Lane	25
Westhall Road.....	25
Annex 1 – General information	27
Speed limits, traffic calming, and speed enforcement	27
Road safety and sustainable travel for schools	27
Creation of additional parking space on verges or grassed areas.....	27
Requests for permit parking schemes	27
Requests for additional parking controls.....	28
Enforcement	28
General enquiries	28

Introduction

This document sets out our final decisions about which new parking controls and restrictions should go ahead, with or without changes, as part of our Tandridge parking review 2021-22.

We formally advertised our intention to introduce the proposed new parking controls and restrictions by way of a notice published in the Surrey Mirror on Thursday 13 January 2022. There then followed a four-week period, which ended on 10 February 2022, during which people could comment on or object to any of the proposals. To help raise awareness of the proposals, in addition to the press notice, we also put up notices on street light columns and sign posts near where the new restrictions were proposed, and notified people most directly affected by post. We published copies of the proposal documents on our website, where there was also an online form for people to use to let us have their views.

This report lists all the proposals and presents a summary of the type and number of comments received, our responses where appropriate, and the final decisions and reasons for them for each one. It does not contain a transcript of each objection made, but, as required by the regulations, each and every comment and objection was read and considered before any final decisions were made.

Only themes considered relevant to the proposals have been mentioned in this summary report. People often raise highway issues that are not part of these proposals, such as:

- Resurfacing, potholes, and highway maintenance.
- Additional new or modified parking controls.
- Creation of additional parking spaces in place of grassed areas or verges.
- Speed limits and enforcement, traffic calming, road safety and road layouts.
- Off street car parks.
- Planning issues.

These are beyond the scope of the parking review and therefore such queries have not been addressed in this analysis. For further information and guidance, please see Annex 1 at the bottom of this document.

Having advertised our intention to introduce the parking proposals, the regulations allow us to make minor modifications to them before their introduction without the need for further advertisement. Of course, we can also cancel a proposal entirely.

At locations where no objections or comments were received there is no analysis and the proposals will - unless otherwise stated - be introduced 'as advertised' i.e. without any changes from the advertised proposal. Where changes have been made, there will usually be a revised drawing in addition to the written description.

These decisions are now final and there is no appeal stage, although customers can ask us to reconsider any parking controls, whether old or new, at any time as part of the next parking review in the area.

Caterham Hill division

The original drawings are still available on the [parking review page on our website](#) for reference.

Caterham on the Hill

Buxton Lane junction with Penrhyn Close

Introduce double yellow lines on the junction. This proposal is shown in drawing 1.

Overview

- Objections: 2
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

One objection raised concerns about oil delivery but most of the comments and objections were about other issues in the road and asking for additional measures and restrictions that we cannot introduce now as we have not advertised our intention to do so. The purpose of the proposal was to improve sightlines for drivers leaving the Close and the main problem with sightlines is trying to see what is coming from the north when pulling out, so we will reduce the length of the double yellow lines to the south of the junction so they just go up to, but not in front of, the dropped kerb for number 129, but introduce the ones to the north of the junction as advertised.

Coulsdon Road

Extend the double yellow lines to the north of the junction with St Michaels Road by approximately 4.5 metres. This proposal is shown in drawing 2.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

There were no objections so we will extend the double yellow lines as advertised. The comments were mostly about parking problems in the area and the need for better enforcement of existing restrictions, as well as a desire for additional measures to be introduced in St Michaels Road, which we cannot introduce now as we have not advertised our intention to do so.

Cromwell Road

Extend the double yellow lines on the western side at the junction with Banstead Road up to the start of the dropped kerb giving access to the garages behind numbers 253a to 253d Coulsdon Road. This proposal is shown in drawing 3.

Overview

- Objections: 2
- Other comments: 0

- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objections were that parking in Cromwell Road is already limited so more spaces should not be taken away and that the cars parking there now would move to other streets where parking is already limited. However the new yellow lines will only stop up to four cars parking so not make a huge difference to parking in the area as a whole, but they will ensure that pedestrians will be able to use the pavement on at least one side of the road and will no longer have to walk in the road when negotiating the bend, so significantly improving safety.

Essendene Road, including junction with Whyteleafe Road

Introduce double yellow lines in Essendene Road on both sides of the bend outside numbers 54 and 56, and on both sides of the junction with Whyteleafe Road. This proposal is shown in drawing 4.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 4
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Good support and a request for additional restrictions, which we cannot introduce now as we have not advertised our intention to do so.

Foxon Lane junction with Foxon Lane Gardens

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides of the junction. This proposal is shown in drawing 5.

Overview

- Objections: 7
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

In the main the objections were that the lines were longer than necessary, with two saying that they would spoil the look of the road, although most agreed with some restriction on the junction. We will therefore go ahead but make the lines to the north of the junction and on both sides in Foxon Lane Gardens about 5 metres shorter.

Money Road junction with Money Avenue

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides of the junction. This proposal is shown in drawing 6.

Overview

- Objections: 4
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

The objections were mainly about the loss of available parking in particular in Money Road, where people thought the proposed lines were too long and would remove important spaces and push cars to park elsewhere. There was also a concern expressed about losing the ability to stop to pick up or drop off items, but this is allowed for a short period on yellow lines. Although the lines are no longer than the standard 10 metres, we will reduce the length of the ones on Money Road by a couple of metres at each end and so lessen the impact on current parking patterns and space, but still improve sightlines and access to Money Avenue particularly for larger vehicles.

Caterham Valley division

The original drawings are still available on the [parking review page on our website](#) for reference.

Caterham

Colburn Avenue

Introduce double yellow lines along the whole of the eastern side of the road. This proposal is shown in drawings 7 and 8.

Overview

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 2
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objection was that the yellow lines are not necessary. The other comments were that the lines would stop the occasional parking that happens on the eastern side but were also asking for additional restrictions on the other side, which we cannot introduce now as we have not advertised our intention to do so. The purpose of the yellow lines is to stop any parking in the eastern side because, although it does not take place very often, when it does, it causes a real problem.

Newstead Rise

Extend the double yellows from the junction with Markfield Road on both sides round the bend up to in line with the northern boundary of number 9. This proposal is shown in drawings 9.

Overview

- Objections: 6
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

Most of the objections said that the proposed double yellow lines were too long and removed essential parking spaces and would move the parking to cause problems elsewhere, although a number acknowledged that they needed to be longer at the entrance to the road. The other comment was relating to enforcement and the need for it. The expression of support said that the bend was dangerous because parked cars forced people to walk in the road. In light of the comments, we will reduce the scheme down so as to keep more parking space available. We will extend the double yellow lines at the start of the road on the northern side to a point in line with the eastern boundary of number 1 (approximately 7.5 metres) then have a space of 15 metres for parking (for three cars), then double yellow lines as far as number 2, but leave the outside of the bend unrestricted. We will though go ahead as advertised on the southern side of the road, because vehicles parking on the inside of the bend block sightlines for drivers and often block the pavement, forcing pedestrians to walk in the road when going round the bend.

Tupwood Lane (1)

Extend the double yellow lines from the junction with The Copse southwards to the beginning of the dropped kerb of number 80. This proposal is shown in drawing 11.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 2
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

There were no objections. Both the other comments and the expression of support were asking for additional restrictions which we cannot introduce now as we have not advertised our intention to do so.

Tupwood Lane (2)

Introduce double yellow lines to the south of the entrance to Croudace House as far as the northern boundary of 6 Tupwood Lane.

Introduce double yellow lines to the north of the entrance to Croudace House in order to update the traffic order to match what is already on the ground. These proposals are shown in drawing 12.

Overview

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objection was that the spaces to the south of the entrance to Croudace House were needed by people visiting or working in Caterham Valley. The other comment was asking for additional parking restrictions. This proposal came about at the request of our Transport Development Planning team following a road safety audit, related to the Croudace House redevelopment and it will not significantly affect parking capacity in the area as a whole, so will go ahead as advertised. We cannot introduce any additional restrictions now as we have not advertised our intention to do so.

Whyteleafe

Downsway

Introduce a resident permit parking scheme in Downsway. This proposal is shown in drawings 41 and 42.

Overview

- Objections: 16
- Other comments: 4
- Support: 53
- Final decision: Drop the proposal and make no changes to the restrictions in Downsway at this time.

Analysis

Even though at first glance there seems to be considerably more support than objections, the overall figures are skewed a lot by comments from people that do not live in Downsway (and many of whom do not even live nearby). Of the 53 expressions of support, only 23 of them came from Downsway residents, and because of multiple responses from some properties, these only represent the views of 12 Downsway households. Of the 16 objections, 14 of them were from Downsway residents, representing 12 households, and the other 2 were from nearby households (on Godstone Road) who cannot park in their road, so need to park in nearby side roads. So, the responses from Downsway, by household, are split 50:50 for and against.

As there are 55 households in Downsway, the responses only reflect the views of half of them, which means that fewer than a quarter of households responded in support of the scheme, which is not a strong mandate for the introduction of a permit scheme.

Although the original petition was signed by 67 residents, representing 43 households, 8 of the 43 then objected when the scheme was advertised, most of them because of the cost. (It is not uncommon that people sign petitions asking for a permit scheme without being fully aware of the facts then change their minds when they become aware of what the implications are.) Even if we were to assume that the remaining signatories still wanted a scheme, that would mean that slightly less than two thirds of households would want it, which is below our normal threshold, and it is by no means a safe assumption.

In addition to the above, a number of the comments suggest that it is quite often simply the number of residents of Downsway trying to park their own cars in the road that causes an issue, which is something a permit scheme would not help with.

Godstone Road (1)

Change the single yellow line to double yellow lines on the western side from number 118 to the pedestrian crossing markings outside number 78. This proposal is shown in drawing 42.

Overview

- Objections: 2
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The two objections are not really objecting to the yellow lines themselves, but are asking for extra deterrents (such as bollards or a barrier) to stop people parking, which are beyond the scope of the parking review. While double yellow lines cannot be guaranteed to stop people parking while using the Tesco store, they are often seen as a greater deterrent than single yellow lines and so may help to stop people parking there.

Godstone Road (2)

Remove the double yellow lines from in front of numbers 418 and 420. This proposal is shown in drawing 43.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 5
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Just support for the proposal.

Hillbury Road

Extend the double yellow lines on the north side from outside number 4 Roundburrow Close up to the entrance to the recreation ground car park. This proposal is shown in drawing 44.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Just support for the proposal.

Maple Close

Extend the double yellow lines on the eastern side from the junction with Maple Road up to the entrance to the parking area serving numbers 1 to 9. This proposal is shown in drawing 42.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Just support for the proposal.

Salmons Lane

Replace the single yellow line with double yellow lines on both sides of the road from the level crossing to the junction with The Avenue. This proposal is shown in drawing 45.

Overview

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objection was that the yellow lines would prevent delivery drivers servicing the residences near the bottom of Salmons Lane, however vehicles can stop on double yellow lines for short periods to make deliveries.

Godstone division

The original drawings are still available on the [parking review page on our website](#) for reference.

Godstone

Ivy Mill Lane

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides from the junction with Bletchingley Road to just past the entrance to numbers 3 and 3A and opposite the driveways of numbers 6 and 7. This proposal is shown in drawing 14.

Overview

- Objections: 2
- Other comments: 2
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objections both expressed disappointment that parking was still being allowed on both sides along parts of the road and suggested that the additional restrictions should be introduced. Both the other comments also suggested additional restrictions. This proposal originated from a request to introduce yellow lines to replace parish council signs that used to be on the edge of the green at the top of the road and there is no reason not to introduce them as advertised. We cannot introduce any additional restrictions now as we have not advertised our intention to do so, but they could be considered in a future parking review.

Salisbury Road junction with Dewlands

Introduce double yellow lines on all sides of the junction. This proposal is shown in drawing 15.

Overview

- Objections: 10
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Drop the proposal and make no changes to the restrictions at the junction at this time.

Analysis

Most of the objections said that there was already a shortage of parking in the roads, which would get worse and that there were no problems at the junction, in light of which we will not introduce the yellow lines. There were also a number of comments about other parking issues in the area.

Nutfield

A25, in the Nutfield cemetery lay by

Introduce a restriction on waiting at any time for vehicles over 5 tonnes. This proposal is shown in drawing 26.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

No responses about this proposal.

South Godstone

Lagham Road

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides outside and opposite numbers 27 to 37. This proposal is shown in drawing 32.

Overview

- Objections: 20
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Drop the proposal and introduce no new restrictions in Lagham Road at this time.

Analysis

The request for these restrictions was said to be fair for the residents and businesses but it is clear that many residents do not share this view and that the situation is not as straightforward as it had first appeared to be. There is clearly an issue here and finding a solution to it will not be simple but a blanket restriction on parking does not seem to be the answer, so should not be introduced at the moment. However the location should be looked at again in more detail in the next Tandridge parking review, which is due to start at the end of the year.

Lingfield division

The original drawings are still available on the [parking review page on our website](#) for reference.

Dormansland

New Farthingdale

Introduce double yellow lines in the turning head next to the entrance to the grasscrete area to prevent obstructive parking and improve access. This proposal is shown in drawing 13.

Overview

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objection suggested that the yellow lines should be shorter so as not to take away so many parking spaces, but we think they are the minimum length possible to achieve the objective of maintaining access to the grasscrete area on the green.

Lingfield

Little Lullenden junction with Grove Road

Introduce double yellow lines on and opposite the junction. This proposal is shown in drawing 23.

Overview

- Objections: 2
- Other comments: 1
- Support:
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

One objection said that there is minimal parking for residents so could the yellow lines be shortened, the other said that the problem was caused by the bollards and the other comment said that more parking spaces should be created. The bollards were installed to stop large vehicles overrunning the footway and making new off-street parking spaces is beyond the scope of a parking review, but we will reduce the double yellow lines on the northern side of the road, in front of numbers 36 & 38 by approximately 4.5 metres, and otherwise go ahead as advertised. This will remove one less parking space but should still allow access for larger vehicles.

Newchapel Road

Introduce double yellow lines on south side of Newchapel Road from the end of the lay by outside Ormuz cottages past the entrance to Lincolns Mead up to the start of the dropped kerb of Fieldings and extend the ones on the north side up to the entrance to the driveway alongside Arch Trees. This proposal is shown in drawing 24.

Overview

- Objections: 3
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

Two of the objections asked whether the layby outside Ormuz cottages could be made resident permit parking only and mentioned the lack of parking in the area. The other objection was about the negative impact on businesses, particularly the nearby takeaways, whose customers stop on Newchapel Road to pick up their food. One of the objections also accepted that parking on the road is frequent and regularly disrupts traffic. We cannot introduce any additional controls, such as a permit parking scheme, now as we have not advertised our intention to do so and there is a problem caused by vehicles parking along this stretch, particularly during the day, but it is maybe less of an issue in the evening and overnight, so we will install a single yellow line operating on Monday to Saturday, from 8.30am to 6pm, in the section on the south side between the cottages and Lincolns Mead, with the rest being installed as the advertised double yellow lines.

Vicarage Road junction with Vicarage Close

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides of the junction. This proposal is shown in drawing 25.

Overview

- Objections: 5
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

The main thrust of the objections is that parking is already limited on Vicarage Road and is much needed by the local residents and that the yellow lines are longer than necessary. A couple of them suggested introducing a resident permit parking scheme in the road as a solution, however, we cannot do this at the moment as we have not advertised our intention to do so. Likewise with the other comment which was asking for an additional restriction in Vicarage Close. But we will reduce the length of the yellow lines to the north of the close by approximately 4.5 metres, but otherwise go ahead as advertised. This should still improve sightlines for drivers pulling out of Vicarage Close, but will remove one less parking space.

Smallfield

Meadow View, junctions with Mead Lane and Plough Road

Introduce double yellow lines on the junction of Meadow View and Mead Lane and on the junction of Meadow View and Plough Lane. These proposals are shown in drawing 31.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 2
- Support: 4
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The comments and expressions of support suggest other measures to help improve the situation relating to underuse of local private car parks, but this is something we have no control over. They also ask for additional restrictions, which cannot introduce now as we have not advertised our intention to do so, but they could be considered in the future if necessary.

Oxted division

The original drawings are still available on the [parking review page on our website](#) for reference.

Hurst Green

Holland Road (1)

Extend the double yellow lines at the junction with Roseacre approximately 20 metres to the north. This proposal is shown in drawing 16.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 14
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Lots of support, with some suggestions to increase the length of the lines, which we cannot do now as we have not advertised our intention to do so.

Holland Road (2)

Extend the double yellow lines outside number 154 to just past the driveway of number 160. This proposal is shown in drawing 16.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 3
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The other comment supported the extension of the yellow lines but wanted them to be made even longer which we cannot do as we have not advertised our intention to do so.

Hurstlands

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides of the road from the entrance to Greenhurst Lane to just past, and into, the entrance to Wolfs Wood. This proposal is shown in drawing 17.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The other comment suggests parking at the location is not a problem, but otherwise just support.

The Greenway

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides of the bend outside numbers 24 to 28d on the south-western side and opposite numbers 20 to 28d on the north-eastern side. This proposal is shown in drawing 18.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Support with a request for additional restrictions, which we cannot do now as we have not advertised our intention to do so.

Wolfs Wood

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides of the junction opposite numbers 48 and 50 to improve traffic flow and access, especially for larger vehicles. This proposal is shown in drawing 19.

Overview

- Objections: 12
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 4
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

The objections were almost universally saying that there is not enough parking in the area as it is, and that the proposal will make things harder for local residents. In the support there is mention of a problem with vehicles parking too close to the junction. The recent works carried out widening the road should have helped but it is still dangerous for cars to park too close to the junction so we will still install the lines there but reduce the length of them on the north-eastern spur by 10 metres on both sides of the road in order to reduce the amount of parking space that will be lost.

Limpsfield

Bluehouse Lane (1)

Extend the single yellow line outside number 55 to just past the entrance to number 59. This proposal is shown in drawing 20.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

No responses about this proposal.

Bluehouse Lane (2)

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides from the junction with the High Street and Titsey Road to the layby outside numbers 190 and 192. This proposal is shown in drawing 21.

Overview

- Objections: 4
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Two of the objections were on the grounds that there should be restrictions introduced further along Bluehouse Lane. One was on the grounds that it the proposal may lead to more parking on the High Street near Titsey Corner and the other was concerned that it would prevent parking on the gravel area in front of number 93 and 95. The restriction on the southern side (outside The Old Shop) was requested by the parish council because of the problems caused by vehicles parking there, either fully or partly on the pavement. The yellow lines on the northern side are just to stop parking migrating to that side of the road instead which would cause similar problems, but there is nothing to stop residents still parking on the gravel area, as that it not part of the highway. We cannot add any of the other restrictions asked for (the need for which has never been mentioned before) but they can be considered in the next review if appropriate, as well as on the high Street if necessary.

High Street (1)

Extend the double yellow lines on the eastern side from outside The Manor House to approximately 30 metres past the steps up to the church. This proposal is shown in drawing 21.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

No responses about this proposal.

High Street (2)

Extend the double yellow lines on the western side so they go across the full width opposite the entrance to Stanhopes. This proposal is shown in drawing 22.

Overview

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objection was because there are not also restrictions on the High Street near Titsey Corner, but these yellow lines are needed and we cannot add the other restrictions asked for as we have not advertised them, but could consider doing so in the next parking review.

Old Oxted

High Street (1)

Remove the single yellow line from the no longer used bus stop in the lay by in front of the flats, 28-50 High Street. This proposal is shown in drawing 27.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Just support.

High Street (2)

Extend the double yellow lines that currently stop in line with the eastern boundary of 2A westwards by approximately 3 metres. This proposal is shown in drawing 27.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments:
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

No responses to this proposal.

Oxted

Downs Way, junctions with Greenacres

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides of the road and opposite both of the junctions with Greenacres, including both sides of the bend between the junctions and extending on the eastern side to the turning space outside the school entrance. This proposal is shown in drawing 28.

Overview

- Objections: 4
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

The objections are mainly that the parking problems in the area are only for short periods of the school day, that more parking should be provided and in particular that the proposal will have a negative impact on the residents in numbers 9-19 Downs Way and disrupt their established parking arrangements. The other comment reiterated the impact on residents of

9-19 and also suggested additional restrictions elsewhere, which we cannot introduce now as we have not advertised our intention to do so, and other measures, such as bollards, which are beyond the scope of the parking review, as is the provision of more off-street parking. These restrictions prohibit parking in locations where it should not really be taking place, but in order to mitigate the impact on Downs Way residents, we will introduce the yellow lines as advertised except for a reduction in their length in front of numbers 17 and 19.

Station Road East

Remove the parking bay alongside 129 to 131 (Lorimers) and replace with double yellow lines, so the taxi rank can be relocated there from its current position in the middle of the road, which is a safer and more suitable place for it (subject to agreement with Tandridge District Council's licensing team). This proposal is shown in drawing 29.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

No responses to this proposal.

Station Road West

Extend the double yellow lines and shorten the parking bay outside The Hoskins (opposite 12 to 14 Station Road East). This proposal is shown in drawing 29.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

No responses to this proposal.

Gresham Road junction with Station Road East

Change the single yellow line to double yellow lines on both corners at the junction and into Gresham Road. This proposal is shown in drawing 30.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

No responses to this proposal.

Warlingham division

The original drawings are still available on the [parking review page on our website](#) for reference.

Tatsfield

Church Hill

Remove the two School Keep Clear markings in order to update the traffic order to match what is already on the ground. There is no drawing for this proposal.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The comment was asking for all yellow lines in Tatsfield to be pale yellow and narrower, so not a comment about the proposal, but a general one. However, removing all the existing lines and replacing them with new different ones is not a realistic proposition both in terms of cost and potential damage to the road surface.

Paynesfield Road

Introduce double yellow lines on the inside of the bend opposite the entrance to Shipfield Close. This proposal is shown in drawing 33.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The other comment was asking for additional restrictions which we cannot introduce now because we have not advertised our intention to do so, but which could be considered in future.

Westmore Road

Reduce the length of the double yellow lines to the south of the junction with Grove Road by approximately 4 metres to free up parking space. This proposal is shown in drawing 33.

Overview

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objection pointed out an error in the description, as did the expression of support, but the plan was clear and anyone unsure could have contacted us for clarification. The objection was against the removal of the yellow lines and allowing more parking because cars parked on Westmore Road obstruct sightlines for drivers at junctions and leaving driveways and park on the pavement impeding pedestrians. However the lines are only being reduced slightly and will still be long enough to maintain sightlines for drivers leaving Redhouse Road, while providing a bit more parking for local residents, who requested the change, as they have not enough or no off-street parking available for use.

Paynesfield Road junction with Johns Road

Introduce double yellow lines on the southern side of the junction and remove a short section of the double yellow lines in Johns road on the north side of the junction. These proposals are shown in drawing 34.

Overview

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

The objection made a good case for not extending the yellow lines so far along Paynesfield Road so we will reduce their length by 5 metres, with the rest going in as advertised.

Warlingham

Farleigh Road at junction with The Copse

Replace the single yellow line with double yellow lines across the entrance to The Copse. This proposal is shown in drawing 35.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

No responses for this proposal.

Farleigh Road, including junctions with Boxwood Way and Bond Road

Introduce double yellow lines on the southern side from outside the Village Hall up to number 50 and shorter lengths on the northern side, including all the way from the Boxwood Way junction up to number 51 on the northern side. This proposal is shown in drawing 36.

Overview

- Objections: 8
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The common themes of the objections were a reduction in the number of spaces for parking, possibly causing an increase in the speed and volume of traffic and problems for deliveries, carers and tradespeople. Also mentioned were making the road look more urban and making drivers more likely to pull into gaps quickly. Some of them acknowledged that restrictions at the junctions with Boxwood Way and Bond Road are a good idea and that there are standoffs in the road when two vehicles meet at a point where there is only single file traffic. It is this last problem that led to this scheme being proposed.

While some possible parking spaces will be lost, we have tried to keep it to a minimum and by providing more passing places, for cars to pull over to let oncoming traffic pass, drivers should not feel the need to speed past lines of parked cars and so it may well result in slower vehicle speeds. It should also reduce the number of stand offs and resulting road rage incidents, which have in the past led to people driving along the pavements, so making it safer for pedestrians and children walking to school. Deliveries can still take place as vehicles are allowed to stop on yellow lines for short periods to load and unload. We therefore think the benefits will outweigh any negative impact.

Kingswood Lane

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides of the road from the junction with Oakenshaw Close to number 31, outside numbers 37 and 41 and outside numbers 57 and 59. This proposal is shown in drawing 37.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 8
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

There is clearly a lot of support for the proposal. There were some comments suggesting other measures such additional restrictions, permit parking for residents, parking charges for non-residents a 20mph speed limit, but we cannot introduce any of these as we have not advertised our intention to do so.

Limpsfield Road (1)

Remove the double yellow lines next to the paved former verge area in front of numbers 159-165. This proposal is shown in drawing 38.

Overview

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objection was that cars may park on both sides of the road if the restriction next to the paved area is removed, but we think it is likely that cars will only park on the paved area, which they are not allowed to do at the moment because the yellow line restriction applies to the full width of the highway including the verge and footway, and it was obviously installed as somewhere to park.

Limpsfield Road (2)

Introduce double yellow lines outside numbers 178 to 214. This proposal is shown in drawing 38.

Overview

- Objections: 5
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

Most of the objections were concerned that introducing this restriction on Limpsfield Road would just serve to push the parking into other nearby roads, which are already more heavily parked. It was also mentioned that it is not a constant problem, but only at certain times, mainly on Sunday mornings and that the sports clubs do what they can to accommodate as much parking as possible and that such a measure could prove detrimental to their futures. Too much displacement could be a problem but there is an issue so, in order to help with access and sightlines at the busiest point, we will put in some yellow lines but much shorter ones, just extending from the southern end of the dropped kerb of number 188 southwards to the street light outside number 192.

Tithepit Shaw Lane

Introduce double yellow lines opposite Warlingham school from the southern end of the pedestrian crossing area southwards to in line with the southern building line of the sixth form centre. This proposal is shown in drawing 39.

Overview

- Objections: 2
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead but with modification.

Analysis

One objection was that it did not make sense to only restrict parking on part of the road – it should be all or none. The other that it was going to make access to the Sanderstead to Whyteleafe Countryside Area and Riddlesdown, particularly for people with limited mobility, so could the restriction just be during school hours. The other comment was a request for some additional yellow lines that we cannot introduce now as we have not advertised our intention to do so. As the intention was to keep the road opposite the bus stop clear, so that two-way traffic could keep moving when a bus was at the stop, and buses only use the stop on schooldays, we will just put in a single yellow line, operating on Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm instead of double yellow lines. That would leave the space for people to park and visit the countryside area/common at other times.

Westhall Road

Extend the double yellow lines to the south of the junction with Coneybury Close to the start of the dropped kerb access to numbers 90 to 94. This proposal is shown in drawing 40.

Overview

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1

- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The comment was a general one about the need for more enforcement.

Annex 1 – General information

This annex contains information about topics that are quite often raised by people when making comments in response to parking proposals, but are generally things that are not considered within a parking review, or not possible to consider at that time.

Speed limits, traffic calming, and speed enforcement

Speed limits are introduced by the county council provided Surrey Police agree with the limit proposed. Further information about speed limits can be found on our website at:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/road-safety-and-emergencies/speed-limits>

Speed limits and traffic calming measures are considered by our local area highway team, and you can raise queries regarding these subjects using the contact details below:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/contact-us/roads-and-transport>

The police are the only authority with powers to enforce speed limits.

Road safety and sustainable travel for schools

Surrey County Council provides a range of services to help schools on this matter, more information can be found at:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/schools-and-learning/teachers-and-education-staff/road-safety-and-sustainable-travel-for-schools>

Creation of additional parking space on verges or grassed areas

This is not something that is considered by the parking team or within a parking review. Unfortunately, the council has essentially no funding to carry out this type of work at the current time, but any requests for these types of schemes would need to be considered by the local area highway team, who can be reached via the contact details below:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/contact-us/roads-and-transport>

Requests for permit parking schemes

We can consider introducing permit parking schemes under appropriate circumstances. However, such significant changes can't be considered based on only one or two comments. Anyone wanting to find out more about permit parking should first look at our webpage which explains where, why, and how a scheme could be introduced, and how they work, at:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/parking/restrictions-and-controls/permit-parking-schemes>

Having read that information, any customers interested in pursuing the idea of permit parking further, should consider raising a parking scheme request form (petition), as explained online at:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/parking/reviews>

Requests for additional parking controls

Due to the legal processes involved, we cannot generally consider further parking restrictions over and above those already 'advertised'. The best way to put forward any ideas for new parking controls is to raise them to be considered as part of the next parking review in the area. Information about parking reviews, including how and why we do them, and how to raise any further requests, is available on our website at:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/parking/reviews>

Enforcement

Parking controls on street in Tandridge are administered and enforced by Sevenoaks District Council on behalf of Tandridge District Council. They also enforce the district council's off street car parks. For more information, please see the Parking page on the district council's website at <https://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Parking-streets-and-transport/Parking>.

General enquiries

Any other enquiries regarding highways can be raised via the electronic forms on our website:

<https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/contact-us/roads-and-transport>

Or using the contact details below:

- **Telephone:** 0300 200 1003 (9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday, excluding bank holidays. Emergencies only at all other times)
- **Email:** contactcentre@surreycc.gov.uk
- **Textphone (via Text Relay):** 18001 0300 200 1003
- **SMS:** 07860 053 465
- **VRS:** [Sign Language Video Relay Service](#)
- **Fax:** 020 8541 9575
- **Address:** Surrey County Council, Contact Centre, First Floor, Dakota, De Havilland Drive, Weybridge, Surrey KT13 0YP