

Runnymede parking review 2022/23: Decision report

A document explaining our final decisions on proposed parking schemes following public advertisement and feedback

Introduction

This document sets out our final decisions about which schemes should go ahead, with or without changes, as part of our Runnymede parking review 2022/23.

Our parking proposals were 'advertised' by way of a press notice published in the Surrey Advertiser on Friday 27 January, and there then followed a four week 'objection period' which ended on 24 February 2023, to allow for the public to make representations regarding the proposals. To raise awareness of the proposals, in addition to the press notice we also put up around 150 site notices near where the new restrictions were proposed, and notified people most directly affected by post. This included letters to around 330 notification cards to addresses at or close to the proposal locations. Copies of the proposal documents were made available on our website, where there was also an online form for people to use to let us have their views.

We received a total of 258 responses to the proposals via our online form, letters, and emails, with comments about 49 of the new parking scheme proposals.

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 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:

- Speed limits and enforcement, traffic calming, road safety, road layouts and geometry.
- Creation of additional parking spaces in place of grassed areas or verges.
- Resurfacing, potholes, and highway maintenance.
- Further new or modified parking controls.
- 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 3 – General enquiries towards 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.

If you are unsure of the meaning or effect of a parking restriction or control that we've proposed, please refer to [Annex 1 – Explanation of restriction types](#), found towards the bottom of this document.

[Annex 2 – Further information](#) provides some background information about the legal and policy aspects of our work in this area.

As mentioned above, [Annex 3 – General enquiries](#) provides information about things beyond the remit of a parking review.

If you would like to know the existing parking restrictions in a given area, please refer to our online [parking restrictions maps](#).

Table of Contents

Runnymede parking review 2022/23: Decision report.....	0
Introduction.....	0
Addlestone division proposals	5
Addlestone	5
Corrie Road – refer to drawing 3282_54	5
High Street – refer to drawing 3282_55.....	5
Quiet Close junction with Firfield Road – refer to drawing 3282_57	6
Crockford Close – refer to drawing 3282_69	6
Marsh Lane junction with Meadow Way – refer to drawing 3282_79	6
Marsh Lane junction with Simplemarsh Road – refer to drawings 3282_79.....	6
Bourneside Road junction with Astor Close – refer to drawings 3282_133	7
Chertsey division proposals.....	8
Chertsey.....	8
Ruxbury Road – refer to drawings 3282_36 and 3282_135	8
St Ann’s Road – refer to drawing 3282_37.....	8
Pretoria Road – refer to drawing 3282_41.....	9
Eastworth Road junction with St Johns Way– refer to drawing 3282_45	9
Eastworth Road junction with Queen Street – refer to drawing 3282_45	9
Free Prae Road – refer to drawing 3282_45	9
Highfield Road – refer to drawing 3282_45	10
Ford Road – refer to drawing 3282_47.....	10
A317 Chertsey Road – refer to drawing 3282_47	10
South Grove (traffic regulation order amendment) – refer to drawing 3282_126.....	11
Chilsey Green Road – refer to drawing 3282_134	11
Egham division proposals.....	12
Egham.....	12
Hythe Road – refer to drawing 3282_70.....	12
Derwent Road – refer to drawing 3282_84.....	12
Kewsick Road – refer to drawing 3282_84.....	12
Mead Close – refer to drawing 3282_136.....	13
Pooley Green Road – refer to drawing 3282_137	13
Englefield Green division proposals	14
Egham.....	14
A30 Egham By-Pass (electric vehicle recharging points) – refer to drawing 3282_14 in the EV Bays drawing set.....	14

Rusham Road – refer to drawing 3282_17.....	14
Langham Place (traffic regulation order amendment) – refer to drawing 3282_93.....	14
Yard Mead – refer to drawing 3282_103.....	14
Englefield Green	15
Simons Walk – refer to drawing 3282_08.....	15
Harvest Road – (electric vehicle recharging points) – refer to drawing 3282_09 in the EV Bays drawing set.....	15
Harvest Road – refer to drawing 3282_10.....	16
Northcroft Road – refer to drawing 3282_71	16
Middle Hill – refer to drawings 3282_83 and 3282_138.....	16
Foxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water division proposals	18
Thorpe.....	18
Western Avenue – refer to drawing 3282_25	18
Delta Way – refer to drawing 3282_25	18
Staines-Upon-Thames	18
Bundy’s Way – refer to drawing 3282_142.....	18
Longcross	18
Longcross Road – refer to drawing 3282_141.....	18
Ottershaw.....	19
Shaw Close (electric vehicle recharging points) – refer to drawing 3282_63 in the EV Bays drawing set.....	19
Woodham and New Haw division proposals.....	20
Row Town	20
Ongar Hill - refer to drawing 3282_58	20
Coombelands Lane and Ongar Hill – refer to drawing 3282_59.....	20
New Haw.....	20
The Avenue (electric vehicle recharging points) – refer to drawing 3282_65 in the EV Bays drawing set.....	20
Keston Avenue – refer to drawing 3282_65	21
Kingston Rise – refer to drawing 3282_65.....	21
Queen Mary’s Drive junction with Copthall Way – refer to drawing 3282_94	21
Marshall Place junction Woodham Lane – refer to drawing 3282_139.....	22
Florence Avenue junction with Linden Close – refer to drawing 3282_95.....	22
Woodham.....	23
Faris Barn Drive – refer to drawing 3282_140.....	23
Windsor Great Park.....	24
Englefield Green and Virginia Water.....	24

Reduction in parking charges, Bishopsgate Road, Wick Road and Wick Lane. Allowance of No:1 Wick Road to be able to buy visitor permits for Area D.....	24
A320 Highway Upgrade.....	25
Ottershaw and Green Lane roundabouts.....	25
Annex 1 – Explanation of restriction types.....	26
No waiting at any time.....	26
No waiting (at a time non-continuous throughout the year).....	26
No loading.....	26
Controlled Parking Zone	26
Restricted Parking Zone.....	26
Permit parking schemes.....	26
Traffic signs and road markings	27
Annex 2 – Legal and policy information.....	28
Policy and Strategy	28
Surrey Transport Plan	28
Parking Strategy.....	28
Parking Reviews.....	29
Legislation	29
Annex 3 – General enquiries	30
Speed limits, traffic calming, and speed enforcement.....	30
Road safety and sustainable travel for schools.....	30
Creation of additional parking space on verges or grassed areas	30
Requests for permit parking schemes.....	30
Requests for additional parking controls	30
Enforcement.....	31
General enquiries.....	31

Addlestone division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mr John Furey](#). We have made the original [advertised drawings available on our website](#) to accompany the written description below for reference.

Addlestone

Corrie Road – refer to drawing 3282_54

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: No objections received, proceed as advertised.

Analysis

Double yellow lines will prevent vehicles parking and blocking access to the Weylands Court parking area and on the footpath in front of this development which blocks access for some members of the community. It is anticipated double yellow lines will improve compliance with and of understanding of the restriction. The current restriction is frequently ignored and not well signed. This proposal has received the support of the Police.

High Street – refer to drawing 3282_55

Overview:

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

Analysis

Double yellow lines were proposed along here in the previous review but not progressed due to oversight.

The objection received was from a shop keeper, concerned that they would not be able to receive deliveries to the shop or delivery drivers picking up orders.

It is recommended to proceed as advertised; Double yellow lines were proposed along here in the previous review but not progressed due to oversight. This is a busy A road and vehicles parking along this stretch of the High Street either do so on the pavement, obstructing pedestrians or partly on the carriageway disrupting the flow of passing traffic.

A loading restriction was **not** advertised and is not being introduced. Double yellow lines will not prevent vehicles stopping to load/ unload goods and people for up to 20 minutes so shop deliveries and moped pick-ups can continue unaffected.

Quiet Close junction with Firfield Road – refer to drawing 3282_57

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received, therefore proceed as advertised.

Crockford Close – refer to drawing 3282_69

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received, therefore proceed as advertised.

Marsh Lane junction with Meadow Way – refer to drawing 3282_79

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received, therefore proceed as advertised.

Marsh Lane junction with Simplemarsh Road – refer to drawings 3282_79

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: 2
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received, therefore proceed as advertised.

Analysis

One of the commentors is concerned about the frequency of enforcement these new restrictions will get.

The second commentor is concerned that the yellow lines will stop in line of their access opposite and parked vehicles will obstruct their driveway access.

With the forthcoming change in Enforcement agents, it is expected that there will be more patrols across Runnymede Borough which will lead to improved compliance with the parking restrictions.

The advertised double yellow lines will extend to a point 1 metre east of the boundary line of number 39 and Holly Gate on the opposite side of Simplemarsh Road. Therefore, on the north side the yellow lines will extend 2 metres past the dropped kerb access.

Bourneside Road junction with Astor Close – refer to drawings 3282_133

Overview:

- Objections: 7
- Other comments: 2
- Support: 12
- Final decision: Proceed with an amendment.

Analysis

Petition received signed by Astor Close residents requesting double yellow lines on the junction of Bourneside Road with Astor Close.

It is recommended to proceed with an amendment. The people who are supporting the proposal have stated vehicles parking on and blocked footways and vehicles parking too close to the junction are the issues that need addressing. Footways in Astor Close are unusable for pedestrians. The objectors are concerned about the loss of parking. Taking into consideration the need for on-street parking space, it is recommended the extent of the double yellow lines will be reduced to a point in line with the rear building line of No.29 on the western side of Astor Close. This will move the vehicles back from the junction improving sightlines and making it easier for pedestrian to cross the road.

By installing the full extent of the advertised double yellow lines on the eastern side the footway will remain clear for pedestrian use.

Chertsey division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mark Nuti](#). We have made the original [advertised drawings available on our website](#) to accompany the written descriptions below

Chertsey

Ruxbury Road – refer to drawings 3282_36 and 3282_135

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received, therefore proceed as advertised.
advertised.

St Ann's Road – refer to drawing 3282_37

Overview:

- Objections: 3
- Other comments: 1
- Support: None
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Analysis

The three objections that have been received are from residents concerned that they will no longer be able to park directly outside their property, and there will be limited alternative parking places available.

There is understanding of this view, but it is recommended to proceed as advertised. Vehicles parking on the southern side of St Ann's Road at this point are parking on the inside of the bend, in breach of Rule 243 of the Highway Code (Do not stop or park on a bend). Parked vehicles along this stretch of road are not helpful for the sightlines of passing traffic or for the safety of the people getting in or out of the parked vehicles.

Although the footway may not be fully obstructed, parking partly on the pavement is occurring and this can be obstructive and seriously inconvenience some pedestrians, those in wheelchairs or with those with visual impairments for example. Although these new restrictions may displace some vehicles to the other side of St Ann's Road or into Grove Road or Masonic Hall Road, it is anticipated the new restrictions will improve road safety and the general flow of traffic along the B375.

Pretoria Road – refer to drawing 3282_41

Overview:

- Objections: 3
- Other comments: None
- Support: 4
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Analysis

The objections received are to do with the loss of on-street parking space along Pretoria Road, however it is recommended to proceed as advertised. Parking partly on the footway can never be considered 'official' parking and although the footway may not be fully obstructed, parking on the pavement can block and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or those with visual impairments.

Since the construction of the housing estate at the eastern end of Pretoria Road there has been an increase in pedestrians using the footway as the proposals supporters say. There has also been an increase in vehicles travelling along Pretoria Road in both directions regularly. Better access for emergency services to all the new properties is also required.

Eastworth Road junction with St Johns Way– refer to drawing 3282_45

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received, therefore proceed as advertised. advertised.

Eastworth Road junction with Queen Street – refer to drawing 3282_45

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received, therefore proceed as advertised. advertised.

Free Prae Road – refer to drawing 3282_45

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: No objections have been received, therefore proceed as advertised. advertised.

Highfield Road – refer to drawing 3282_45

Overview:

- Objections: 3
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

Analysis

Three objections have been received stating that there is a high consistent demand for parking in this residential street and extending the disabled bay will increase the pressure on parking space. It is therefore recommended not to proceed with the formalisation and extension of this disabled bay. Although the current situation might not be ideal for the blue badge holder, the high demand for parking space in this street of terraced houses does give them some advantage in securing a parking space. It is recommended to leave the existing disabled bay the same size, position, and status, which does at least give the blue badge holder an opportunity to park in Highfield Road.

Ford Road – refer to drawing 3282_47

Overview:

- Objections: None
 - Other comments: None
 - Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received, therefore proceed as advertised.
advertised.

A317 Chertsey Road – refer to drawing 3282_47

Overview:

- Objections: 3
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Analysis

The Traffic Regulation Order is sought to enable improved road safety for footway users and vehicular users on Chertsey Road, to prevent footway parking and obstructions on the carriageway on Chertsey Road between numbers 215 and 227.

The double yellow lines are required to enable footway users to use the footway adjacent to the road without needing to divert around vehicles parked partially on the footway which can create a Highway safety risk. In addition, the parking of vehicles along this stretch also creates hazards for vehicular users of Chertsey Road by locating additional obstructions that need to be navigated on what is a well-used A class road (A317).

The recommendation for double yellow lines at this location is also as a result of a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit carried out as a result of the recent Highway improvements by the school as a result of the planning permission ref: RU.17/1136 on 2nd February 2018 for: *Proposed demolition of existing Runnymede Centre (former The Meads School); construction of new 6FE secondary school and*

sports hall; improved vehicle access, pedestrian access, parking and on-site drop-off/pick-up areas; formal and informal playing areas.

Although three objections have been received, and those objectors have legitimate concerns about where they will park their vehicles in the future, it is recommended to proceed as advertised as parking restrictions are provided to deter on-street parking and to allow the full footway width to be available to pedestrians (as well as reduce the potential for side-swipe conflicts due to lane encroachment). This recommendation was made as a result of a Stage 3 Road Safety Audit that took place between 8 October and 4 November 2021. The situation assessed by the audit team was *'restricted footway width and forced change in alignment for northbound vehicles. Directly to the north of the new signal junction, on-street parking occurs outside several properties which results in vehicles partly blocking the footway as well as part of the northbound nearside running lane. The parking restricts the available footway width for pedestrians, creating a hazard for pedestrians who may be forced to proceed in the carriageway. This is of particular concern for the visually impaired, the mobility impaired and pedestrians with pushchairs. Also, northbound drivers proceeding in the nearside running lane are forced to encroach into the offside running lane to pass parked vehicles, which in turn forces drivers in the offside lane to encroach the right turn lane. This creates the potential for side-swipe conflicts as well as creating the risk of conflict with the offside kerbs of the central reserve'*.

South Grove (traffic regulation order amendment) – refer to drawing 3282_126

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Chilsey Green Road – refer to drawing 3282_134

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Egham division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Robert King](#). We have made the original [advertised drawings available on our website](#) to accompany the written description below.

Egham

Hythe Road – refer to drawing 3282_70

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Derwent Road – refer to drawing 3282_84

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: 2
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Kewswick Road – refer to drawing 3282_84

Overview:

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: None
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Analysis

One objection has been received stating the stretch of Keswick Road where the double yellow line is proposed is used as overflow parking for Thirlmere Close. There are other locations which can be used for on-street parking and therefore it is recommended to proceed as advertised. Parking on a bend or within 10 metres of a junction, is a breach of Rule 243 of the Highway Code. Just because vehicles have been parking along this stretch of Keswick Road for a long time, does not make it correct. Preventing vehicles parking here in the future will improve road safety and sightlines for all road users.

Mead Close – refer to drawing 3282_136

Overview:

- Objections: 5
- Other comments: None
- Support: 5
- Final decision: Proceed with an amendment.

Analysis

The objectors argue that the proposed double yellow lines extend to far into Mead Close and some useable on-street parking space would unnecessarily be lost. The supporters of the proposal would like to see the junction area of Mead Close and Vicarage Road kept clear of parked cars at all times to improve safety and maintain access. It is recommended to proceed with an amendment. Double yellow lines will be introduced on both sides of Mead Close to improve road safety and maintain access at all times, however they will be shortened in length to maintain some on-street parking. Yellow lines will terminate at the dropped kerb by the rear garden gate of No.2 and in line opposite.

Pooley Green Road – refer to drawing 3282_137

Overview:

- Objections: 5
- Other comments: None
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed with an amendment.

Analysis

Three of the five objections received are to do with the proposed length of double yellow line on the north side of Pooley Green Road that would potentially act as a passing place. The other two objections are against introducing double yellow lines on the southern side of the road as this is used as overspill parking space.

It is recommended to proceed with an amendment. Do not install the advertised double yellow lines on the northern side of Pooley Green Road, which was to be the passing place between No's 163 to 175. By not installing this length of restriction the space will be retained for on-street parking which is in high demand along this road. The main objective of keeping the south side pavement unobstructed for pedestrians and improving the passage for buses should still be achieved with the southern side restriction being fully installed.

Englefield Green division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Marisa Heath](#). We have made the [advertised drawing available on our website](#) to accompany the written description below

Egham

A30 Egham By-Pass (electric vehicle recharging points) – refer to drawing 3282_14 in the EV Bays drawing set.

Overview:

- Objections: 11
 - Other comments: 0
 - Support: 0
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

Analysis

Due to the high number of objections, stating there is a lack of Electric Vehicle ownership in the vicinity at the moment, and concerns about the safety non-residents pulling into and out of the lay-by on the A30 it is recommended not to install Electric Vehicle Recharging Points at this location.

Rusham Road – refer to drawing 3282_17

Overview:

- Objections: None
 - Other comments: None
 - Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Langham Place (traffic regulation order amendment) – refer to drawing 3282_93

Overview:

- Objections: None
 - Other comments: None
 - Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Yard Mead – refer to drawing 3282_103

Overview:

- Objections: None
 - Other comments: None
 - Support: 2
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Englefield Green

Simons Walk – refer to drawing 3282_08

Overview:

- Objections: 8
- Other comments: 20
- Support: 7
- Final decision: Consult again on an expanded proposal.

Analysis

In light of the comments received and with the support of the County Councillor, a second informal consultation with Simons Walk residents on an expanded parking scheme has taking place. The expanded scheme included:

The following additional restrictions:

1. The introduction of double yellow lines from outside Number 56 to Number 42a. Filling in an unrestricted gap between existing double yellow lines and mirroring the proposal from the northern bend in the road.
2. Introducing a Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm single yellow from outside Number 42 to Number 12. Filling in an unrestricted length of Simons Walk with a restriction that matches the existing restriction on the opposite side.
3. Introducing double yellow lines outside Numbers 6 and 8.
4. Introducing a Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm single yellow line from outside Numbers 4 and 2. Filling in an unrestricted gap between the advertised double yellow lines and the existing double yellow lines at the junction with Bakenham Lane.
5. Introducing a Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm single yellow line restriction on all the public highway in Roberts Way.

This second consultation proposes a lot more restrictions than the already advertised proposal and may still be amended depending on the feedback received. if it proves popular with Simon Walk and Roberts Way residents, subject to the views of the Traffic Regulation Order Legal Team. it may need to be formally advertised by public notice again before it can be progressed to give the wider public the opportunity to view and comment upon it.

Harvest Road – (electric vehicle recharging points) – refer to drawing 3282_09 in the EV Bays drawing set.

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Harvest Road – refer to drawing 3282_10

Overview:

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 2
- Support: None
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Analysis

The objector admits they are not objecting to the advertised proposal but taking the opportunity to raise the issue of parked vehicles elsewhere on Harvest Road.

One commentator has taken the opportunity to talk about parking in general around Englefield Green, and other is requesting other highway improvement.

Northcroft Road – refer to drawing 3282_71

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: 4
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Middle Hill – refer to drawings 3282_83 and 3282_138

Overview:

- Objections: 15
- Other comments: 5
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Analysis

It is recommended to proceed as advertised. It should be noted that the scope of this project was to look at on-street parking and how to make that safer only.

The parking problem we are trying to resolve, is the bunching up of parked vehicles at some of the narrowest points of Middle Hill which leads to vehicles travelling in opposite directions meeting head on and having to drive on the footway to pass.

To resolve these issues will either require a reduction in car ownership or spreading the existing vehicles out over a longer length of Middle Hill with some passing places introduced to allow for safer passage of through traffic. This is what this scheme will deliver. It could result in some residents not being able to park directly outside their property, but this is never guaranteed on the public highway which is open to everybody to use equally. There may be an increase in vehicles parking in The Retreat and Lodge Close, these are safer places to park vehicles.

It is felt that a residents permit scheme is really not a financially viable option at the current time. Permits start at £80 for the first vehicle and increase from there for additional vehicles. There would be the cost of buying visitor permits on top, still with no guarantee of residents having an on-street parking space.

It was beyond the scope of this project to consider speed limits, traffic calming, or additional signage to direct various groups of road users to alternative routes, however Surrey Highways have provided this reply in answer to those concerned:

- Speeding – Speed surveys have indicated a generally good level of driver compliance with the speed limit. Traffic calming measures help restrain vehicle speeds north of Parsonage Road and the on-street parking helps restrain speeds south of Parsonage Road.
- Road width – The available road width is restricted by on-street parking and this impacts on vehicle flows. This is why measures have been proposed to help regulate the parking.
- Bollards in the footway – A significant number of bollards would be required resulting in a substantial installation cost as well as an ongoing maintenance burden (since evidence suggests they would be subject to ongoing damage). In addition, the footway is relatively narrow and therefore bollards would restrict the available width and cause potential difficulties for wheelchairs or pedestrians with pushchairs or prams.
- Lack of signs. Middle Hill is subject to a 30mph speed limit and has a system of street lighting. In such circumstances, we are not permitted to install speed limit repeater signs.
- Large vehicles - Whilst you could potentially introduce a 7.5 tonne environmental weight limit, vehicles that some residents consider to be large would still fall below 7.5 tonnes. The restriction would also have an exemption for access so delivery vehicles visiting properties in the road, refuse collection vehicles etc would still be able to use the road. Introducing a weight limit in Middle Hill in isolation would potentially result in large vehicles being displaced on to other local roads (such as Tite Hill) resulting in complaints from residents in those roads. As such, any proposal to introduce a weight restriction would need to be considered on an area wide basis.

Foxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Jonathan Hulley](#). We have made the original [advertised drawings available on our website](#) to accompany the written description below.

Thorpe

Western Avenue – refer to drawing 3282_25

Overview:

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: None
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Analysis

The one objector says the additional restrictions are not necessary and they will prevent them having deliveries.

It is recommended to proceed as advertised. Double yellow lines do not prevent vehicles stopping to deliver goods and people for up to 20 minutes.

Delta Way – refer to drawing 3282_74

Overview:

- Objections: Done
- Other comments: Done
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Staines-Upon-Thames

Bundy's Way – refer to drawing 3282_142

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: 1
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Longcross

Longcross Road – refer to drawing 3282_141

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Ottershaw

Shaw Close (electric vehicle recharging points) – refer to drawing 3282_63 in the EV Bays drawing set.

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Woodham and New Haw division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Scott Lewis](#). We have made the original [advertised drawings available on our website](#) to accompany the written description below.

Row Town

Ongar Hill - refer to drawing 3282_58

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Coombelands Lane and Ongar Hill – refer to drawing 3282_59

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 3
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Analysis

The one commentator is concerned these restrictions will displace parking to the opposite side of Coombelands Lane. This will be monitored, and if it does occur will be addressed in the next Runnymede parking review.

New Haw

The Avenue (electric vehicle recharging points) – refer to drawing 3282_65 in the EV Bays drawing set.

Overview:

- Objections: 2
- Other comments: 1
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Analysis

It is recommended to proceed as advertised. The two objections are not specifically against the introduction the Charging Points in this location, but more about vehicles parking in The Broadway for long periods of time. The issue of long-term parking is something we shall look to address in the next Runnymede parking review and plan to informally consult over the summer.

Keston Avenue – refer to drawing 3282_66

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: 2
- Support: 3
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Kingston Rise – refer to drawing 3282_65

Overview:

- Objections: 11
- Other comments: 2
- Support: 19
- Final decision: Proceed with an amendment.

Analysis

It is recommended to proceed with an amendment. There is definite split in the responses between people associated with the schools in the area, and those who live in the area. The decision taken has tried to strike a balance between both sides, The supportive comments are from parents taking and collecting children from school who wish the footway to be clear of vehicles during these times and would like reduced congestion in the street for safety. The objectors to the original proposal are from residents who use Kingston Rise as extra parking space. It has been decided the best way to try and accommodate the requirements of both groups is to down grade the advertised double yellow lines to a Monday to Friday 8.30am to 4.30pm single yellow line restriction. This will help keep the road and footway clear during the school day when parents are walking children to and from school, but will still allow residents to park vehicles overnight and at weekends.

Queen Mary's Drive junction with Copthall Way – refer to drawing 3282_94

Overview:

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 4
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Analysis

It is recommended to proceed as advertised. Although one objection has been received, parking in the vicinity of a roundabout is not safe or good practice and is in breach of the Highway Code Rule 243 at any time. There will still be places to park on-street along Queen Mary's Drive, but they might not be directly outside of some residential property.

Marshall Place junction Woodham Lane – refer to drawing 3282_139

Overview:

- Objections: None
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 3
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Florence Avenue junction with Linden Close – refer to drawing 3282_95

Overview:

- Objections: 4
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

Analysis

Due to the four objections received stating these restrictions are un-necessary, and as agreed with Councillor Lewis, it is recommended not to proceed with this proposal.

Woodham

Faris Barn Drive – refer to drawing 3282_140

Overview:

- Objections: 17
- Other comments: 4
- Support: 7
- Final decision: Proceed with an amendment.

Analysis

It is recommended to proceed with an amendment. Install the double yellow lines on the junction of Faris Barn Drive and Faris Lane as advertised to keep the junction area safe, accessible, and move any parked vehicles clear of the junction. Quite a few objections have been received to the advertised Monday to Friday 8am to 1pm single yellow line proposal, so it recommended not to proceed with this at the present time.

A few vehicles parking on street in Faris Barn Drive is acceptable, they may belong to residents, or their visitors when the need arises and a few day parkers as the number of vehicles travelling along Faris Barn Drive is extremely low.

Windsor Great Park

Englefield Green and Virginia Water

Reduction in parking charges, Bishopsgate Road, Wick Road and Wick Lane. Allowance of No:1 Wick Road to be able to buy visitor permits for Area D.

No drawings. Traffic Regulation Order Amendments only.

Overview:

It is recommended to reduce the pay by phone parking charge from £3 per hour to £2 per hour between 11am and 5pm for both of the on-street parking bays in Bishopsgate Road (Pay by phone identification numbers 16641 and 16642) A lower tariff is likely to mean the parking area is better used during quieter times of the year. It would also address some of the complaints from local businesses and visitors.

It is recommended to reduce the pay by phone parking charge from £3 per hour to £2 per hour between 11am and 5pm for the on-street parking bay in Wick Lane (Pay by phone identification number 16640) A lower tariff is likely to mean the parking area is better used during quieter times of the year. It would also address some of the complaints from local businesses and visitors.

It is recommended to reduce the pay by phone parking charge from £3 per hour to £2 per hour between 11am and 5pm for the on-street parking bay in Wick Road (Pay by phone identification number ID: 16639) A lower tariff is likely to mean the parking area is better used during quieter times of the year. It would also address some of the complaints from local businesses and visitors.

The new on-street parking fees at the above-mentioned locations is proposed to be:

1 hour = £2

1-2 hours = £4

2-3 hours = £6

3-6 hours = £8

A Traffic Regulation Order amendment is made that allows property number 1 Wick Lane to be eligible to buy visitor permits for Permit Zone D in the borough of Runnymede under the terms and conditions of the scheme.

- Objections: 15
- Other comments: 7
- Support: None
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Analysis

It is recommended to proceed as advertised. The vast majority of objectors are not opposed to the price reduction that has been advertised. The objections that have been received are about having to pay for parking at all, and about the revised layout to the on-street parking arrangements in Bishopsgate Road and Wick Lane. Neither of these things were being consulted upon.

A320 Highway Upgrade.

Ottershaw and Green Lane roundabouts.

Refer to drawings - 3282_63 and 3282_88 in the PDF titled: A320 Highway Upgrade Project. Realignment of parking controls.

We have made the original [advertised drawings available on our website](#) to accompany the written description below.

Overview:

Amendments to position of existing parking controls due to road widening scheme As part of the forthcoming major project to upgrade the A320 road from Chertsey southwards through Ottershaw towards Woking some road widening, and realignment is going to take place. A more detailed local consultation will be taking place in the coming months.

The junction of the A320 Guildford Road with D3027 Little Green Lane, C127 Green Lane and B386 Holloway Hill is going to extensively remodelled and expanded. In order to accommodate the new road layout, some existing parking controls in the area will need to be amended as shown on the A320 Highway upgrade project, realignment of parking controls drawing.

The junction of the A320 Guildford Road with B3121 Murray Road, A319 Chobham Road and D3046 Foxhills Road is going to extensively remodelled and expanded. In order to accommodate the new road layout, some existing parking controls in the area will need to be amended as shown on the A320 Highway upgrade project, realignment of parking controls drawing.

- Objections: None
- Other comments: None
- Support: None
- Final decision: No objections have been received therefore proceed as advertised.

Annex 1 – Explanation of restriction types

No waiting at any time

This means that parking is not allowed at any time. This restriction is nearly always indicated by double yellow lines marked on the ground; no upright signing is required (or indeed permitted) in this case. The only exception to this would be a restriction that applied within a 'restricted parking zone', or 'pedestrian / pedestrian or cycle zone', wherein no road markings are needed but upright signage is required.

There are standard exemptions for loading and unloading, picking up and dropping off of passengers, and parking by blue badge holders for up to three hours (provided it's safe).

No waiting (at a time non-continuous throughout the year)

An example may be 'No waiting Monday – Friday 8am – 6pm'. These restrictions are the same as those above, with the same exemptions, the only difference is the times at which they operate. This restriction is usually indicated by a single yellow line marked on the road, which must be accompanied by upright signing. The only exemption to this would be within a controlled parking zone (see below).

No loading

A loading restriction is indicated through small yellow marks on the kerb at right angles to the road and repeated approximately every 3 metres. A single kerb blip means that loading is prohibited at specific times/days, a double kerb blip means loading is prohibited at any time.

Loading restrictions would always be in addition to waiting restrictions. Stopping to allow passengers to board and alight is allowed even where loading restrictions apply. There are no exemptions for blue badge holders.

'Loading / unloading' generally refers to items too large or bulky to be practicably moved very far, such as a refrigerator.

Controlled Parking Zone

This is simply an alternative way of signing waiting restrictions. In a controlled parking zone, the times at which the single yellow lines are in operation (i.e. when parking is prohibited), are displayed on zone entry signs (unless signed otherwise locally). The main benefit of a controlled parking zone is to reduce sign clutter within the zone. Any type of parking bays – signed and marked in the normal way - may or may not be provided within the zone.

Further information about [controlled parking zones is available on our website](#).

Restricted Parking Zone

This is where waiting restrictions (and loading restrictions if applicable) are indicated on zone entry signs, and on frequent upright repeater signs within the zone. There are no road markings to indicate the restriction. Any type of parking bays may be provided within the zone, which would need to be individually marked and signed.

Permit parking schemes

Permit parking may be provided as 'normal' marked parking bays with accompanying upright signing. These may or may not comprise part of a controlled parking zone or a restricted parking zone.

Permit parking areas are schemes where there are no road markings to indicate the parking controls, only signs which read, "Permit holders only past this point", at the entry points to the area. Repeater signs are provided within the area. Waiting restrictions (single or double yellow lines) can be included within a permit parking area.

Further information about [permit parking schemes](#) is available on our website.

Traffic signs and road markings

Further background information on common road markings and traffic signs may be found on the Department for Transport webpage [Know your traffic signs](#).

Annex 2 – Legal and policy information

Policy and Strategy

Our decisions around parking schemes are based on a number of policies and strategies.

Surrey Transport Plan

The [Surrey Transport Plan](#) is a statutory document that sets out our strategy to help people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably within Surrey, in order to promote economic vibrancy, protect and enhance the environment, improve the quality of life, and reduce carbon emissions.

Based on this vision there are four objectives for the Surrey Transport Plan:

- **Effective transport** - to facilitate end-to-end journeys for residents, business and visitors by maintaining the road network, delivering public transport services and, where appropriate, providing enhancements.
- **Reliable transport** - to improve the journey time reliability of travel in Surrey.
- **Safe transport** - to improve road safety and the security of the travelling public in Surrey.
- **Sustainable transport** - to provide an integrated transport system that protects the environment, keeps people healthy and provides for lower carbon transport choices.

There are 13 strategies that form the Surrey Transport Plan, one of which is the Parking Strategy.

Parking Strategy

The [Parking Strategy](#) is designed to help shape, manage and deliver the county council's vision for parking, "Provide parking where appropriate, control parking where necessary".

The objectives of the Parking Strategy are:

- Reduce congestion caused by parked vehicles
- Help enable greener and more sustainable travel choices
- Make best use of the parking space available
- Enforce parking regulations fairly and efficiently
- Provide appropriate parking where needed

To achieve these objectives and realise the vision for parking, work will be channelled through three main areas:

- Manage on street parking space to ensure optimum use through our parking review process.
- Operation of civil parking enforcement – fair and cost effective with greater use of technology to achieve compliance.
- Promotion of parking controls that can help improve sustainable and greener transport and communities. At the same time, the policies are intended to help achieve other objectives of the council, such as improving journey times, sustaining and enhancing the vitality of town centres and contributing to a reduction in carbon emissions.

Parking Reviews

We receive hundreds of requests for new parking restrictions within our boroughs and districts every year. We use the parking review process to efficiently prioritise requests and manage the implementation of those requests following prioritisation and approval. Engineers consider a number of factors when assessing those requests, including:

- road safety
- accessibility
- congestion
- the possibility of just displacing a problem, and
- how many people support the request.

Legislation

The list below provides the most relevant pieces of legislation to our work around parking restrictions and controls. It is not an exhaustive list.

- [Highways Act 1980](#) - this is the primary legislation that governs local authorities' powers and duties relating to the public highway.
- [Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984](#) – this is the legislation that provides the power for local authorities to regulate or restrict traffic on the public highway.
- [The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders \(Procedure\) \(England and Wales\) Regulations 1996](#) – this dictates the procedures which authorities must follow in order to lawfully make a traffic regulation order.
- [Traffic Management Act 2004](#) – this legislation provides powers and duties in relation to managing traffic on the public highway network, and provides the power for enforcement of a number of parking related contraventions.
- [The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016](#) – this is a Statutory Instrument that provides instruction to authorities as to the road markings and traffic signs that may / must be installed on the public highway.

As defined by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the reasons for which authorities may introduce a traffic order for waiting, loading and stopping restrictions are:

1. Avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising.
2. Preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road.
3. Facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians).
4. Preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property.
5. Preserving the character of the road in a case where it is especially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot.
6. Preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.
7. Any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995, relating to air quality.

No such explicit list exists for the creation of parking controls, e.g. parking bays, permit schemes etc.

Annex 3 – General enquiries

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:

[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 on the next page. 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:

[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. 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 on the next page. Note, it is not aligned to our policies around climate change to remove green space to provide additional parking for vehicles, and therefore officers would rarely recommend such action.

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:

[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:

[The parking review process](#)

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:

[The parking review process](#)

Enforcement

Parking controls on street in Elmbridge are administered and enforced by Elmbridge Borough Council on our behalf. They also enforce their own public off street car parks. If you have any queries about this, you may reach them on:

- **Telephone:** 01372 474474 (Monday to Friday 8.45am - 4.30pm)
- [Online](#)

General enquiries

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

[Contact our roads and transport service](#)

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
- **Fax:** 020 8541 9575
- **Address:** Contact Centre, 1st Floor, Fairmount House, Bull Hill, Leatherhead, Surrey, KT22 7AH