

Spelthorne parking review 2020: Decision report

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

Contents

Introduction	2
Stanwell and Stanwell Moor division proposals.....	3
Staines South and Ashford West division proposals	7
Ashford division proposals	8
Sunbury Common and Ashford Common division proposals	12
Lower Sunbury and Halliford division proposals.....	13
Laleham and Shepperton division proposals	15
Staines division proposals.....	16

Introduction

The Spelthorne Parking Review 2020 proposals, which were agreed at Spelthorne Joint committee on 30 November 2020, were advertised from 26 March to 23 April 2021. As part of this process, street notices were erected at each location, and notification cards were hand delivered to those properties immediately fronting proposed changes. In addition, a formal notice was published in the Surrey Herald.

All these documents referred members of the public to drawings and a statement of reasons document available online via the webpage: www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorneparking Those without access to the internet were asked to write in requesting information be posted to them.

Responses to the advertisement were received via an online form through the webpage above, or by letters being sent to the following address: Spelthorne Parking Review 2020, Parking Team, Hazel House, Merrow Lane, Guildford, Surrey, GU4 7BQ. Members of the public were asked to submit either a support, comment or objection response.

During the advertisement period, there were 95 support responses, 22 comment responses and 186 objections. All these responses have been read and considered in full, and the total number of responses for each location have been listed. However, for the purpose of this report, the responses have been summarised into key points only, followed by analysis and a decision on how to proceed following these considered responses.

Please note that all responses to the advertised electric vehicle charging points were considered as part of a separate project for the county and are not included in this report. The outcome of the advertised locations will be published online via the same webpage above. Those who responded to the advertisement of these locations will be notified of the outcome individually by email or by letter.

The decisions made in this report are final and there is no appeal process. Any further requests for changes to these agreed restrictions will need to be submitted as part of a future [parking review of Spelthorne](#).

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.

Stanwell and Stanwell Moor division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mr Robert Evans](#).

Stanwell

Cranford Avenue junction with Long Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0109
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Lauser Road junction with Town Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0169
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

Comment requesting lines to be extended significantly further, up to number 2.

Analysis

Additional restrictions cannot be added at this stage and would need to be considered as part of a future parking review.

Hadrian Way (cul-de-sac) junction with Hannibal Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0169
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

Objection regarding loss of space for nearby flats and restrictions are only being proposed to assist driveway access.

Analysis

The advertised double yellow lines are to maintain access, sight lines and road safety on this northern part of the junction. As it is already an offence to park within 10m of a junction under the Highway Code, this location should not be viewed as being parking space.

Orchard Way junction with A30 Service Road and Desford Way Access Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 1121
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1

- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

Objection relating to proposals causing unnecessary disruption to local businesses and residents in this area and that the junction leads to a slip road only, which has good sight lines.

Comment relating to non-resident vehicles being displaced to where residents normally park outside their houses.

Analysis

Whilst Orchard Way is off the A30 service road, it is still a junction, and it is an offence to park within 10m of a junction under the Highway Code. It is also an offence to obstruct a footway to the point where people cannot get past, which is also happening regularly at this location, as well as on the grass verge causing damage to it. Whilst there will likely be displacement of vehicles further into the street, there will still be unrestricted space after the lines terminate which is not directly outside residential properties, particularly on the western side. The combination of parking offenses taking place here will all be resolved with the double yellow lines being introduced, which apply to all adjacent footways and verges as well.

Stanwell Moor

Spout Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 1120 and 1126
- Objections: 5
- Comments: 2
- Support: 6
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Spout Lane acts as a useful overflow parking area for Stanwell Moor.
- Most of the traffic is one way, coming from Airport Way.
- Useful parking location for recreational ground visits.
- Useful parking location for workers nearby.
- Vehicle speeds could increase.
- Restricting the entire street is unnecessary and unwarranted.
- Most of the road is not residential and doesn't need restrictions.
- Vehicles, including taxis will park elsewhere in the village, which will upset residents more.

Comments related to the need for parking provision for residents, deliveries, visitors, and tradesman.

Analysis

The large number of vehicles parking both short and long term in Spout Lane, including its associated issues such as repeated littering, obstruction of two-way traffic flow, and prevention of proper street cleaning being carried out, has been complained about for several years by residents of Stanwell Moor. Whilst most of the traffic is indeed coming off Airport Way, it is still a two-way road and there is still regular northbound traffic accessing properties and businesses fronting this street, including the flower centre at its northernmost end. Meeting traffic has great difficulty in both seeing each other and passing each other, depending on whether there is any section of road free to pull into or reverse back into at the time. Ultimately, parking on any part of Spout Lane will be causing issues either to residents or passing traffic, as the street has never been suitable for on street parking. With the vast majority of nearby streets within Stanwell Moor being unrestricted, there are still many opportunities to park nearby. Loading and unloading is allowed to take place on double

yellow lines, so deliveries will not be affected. Drivers are also allowed to stop on double yellow lines for pick ups or drop offs. As mentioned in the committee report and statement of reasons document, the advertised double yellow lines are supported by the Stanwell Moor Residents' Association and are understood to be supported by the wider community. Spelthorne Joint Committee also expressed its support for such restrictions at its meeting in September 2019.

Horton Road (including junction with Hithermoor Road)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 1103 and 1127
- Objections: 9
- Comments: 2
- Support: 7
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Horton Road is a wide road and parking does not affect traffic flow.
- Horton Road residents and their visitors will not be able to park near where they live and won't be allowed to park on the raised kerb island.
- The proposed parking restrictions will push the parking problem further into the village and may create worse and more hazardous problems elsewhere.
- Resident permit parking is needed instead of double yellow lines.
- Restricting the entire street is unnecessary and unwarranted.
- Parents and children will need to cross the busy Horton Road to visit the playground.

Comments related to parking being needed by residents and their visitors on the raised kerb island and the wider footways. Also questioning what is going to happen to the laybys shown with no restrictions.

Analysis

The large number of vehicles parking both short and long term in Horton Road, including its associated issues such as repeated littering, obstruction of two-way traffic flow for larger vehicles, and prevention of proper street cleaning being carried out, has been complained about for several years by residents of Stanwell Moor. Whilst two-way traffic flow is possible for two passing cars, it is problematic when larger vehicles are involved, and there are many larger vehicles which use Horton Road regularly.

It was made clear on the advertised plans that the double yellow lines also apply to adjacent footways, and this was also made clear to the Stanwell Moor Residents' Association when the scheme was first being discussed. As this is an enforcement legality for yellow line restrictions, parking next to the double yellow lines entirely on the footway, including on the raised kerb island, will not be permitted and will be enforceable through Penalty Charge Notices. It is already an offence to drive over a footway where the kerbs have not been lowered to allow access and they are not constructed to take the weight of vehicles.

It remains a possibility that displacement further into Stanwell Moor village may take place by some of the vehicles parking on Horton Road. However, the parking situation within the village will need to be monitored to determine whether this is happening and whether it is causing any issues which may warrant further restrictions in the village. The possibility of displacement further into the village was also made clear to the Stanwell Moor Residents' Association when the scheme was first being discussed.

As double yellow lines are proposed for the Horton Road carriageway, the only locations potentially suitable for any such permit parking scheme in the future would be the currently unrestricted layby areas. However, there is no demand or justification for this type of proposal at this stage, therefore the laybys will remain unrestricted for use by any member of the public.

Sight lines for both drivers and pedestrians using Horton Road will be improved by the double yellow lines, which will help those wishing to cross Horton Road for any reason.

As mentioned in the committee report and statement of reasons document, the advertised double yellow lines are supported by the Stanwell Moor Residents' Association and are understood to be supported by the wider community. Spelthorne Joint Committee also expressed its support for such restrictions at its meeting in September 2019.

Staines South and Ashford West division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Ms Denise Turner-Stewart](#).

Ashford

Avondale Road junction with Cumberland Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0125
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Adelaide Road junction with Ferndale Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 1129
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised

Summary

Objection relating to restrictions not being needed and money should be spent on repairing roads instead.

Analysis

The restrictions are needed to maintain sight lines, access, and road safety on this junction.

Ashford division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Ms Joanne Sexton](#).

Ashford

Feltham Hill Road (by The Elms)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0130
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 3
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised

Summary

Comments related to highlighting the difficulties of seeing and accessing the entrance to The Elms; request for assessment of Feltham Hill Road in another part of it; and request for the existing double yellow lines to be extended further southwards beyond the Fontmell Park junction.

Analysis

The request to extend the existing double yellow lines further southwards will need to be considered as part of the next parking review of Spelthorne.

Feltham Hill Road (outside Morgan Court)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0130
- Objections: 4
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised

Summary

The 4 objections (3 of which came from the same household) related to the following: -

- Parked cars help slow traffic down as drivers speed along this road.
- Residents and their visitors with limited off street parking need to be able to park here.
- Restricting the road at all times is unnecessary and should just be at peak times.

Analysis

The double yellow lines advertised only cover one specific 3 car length part of Feltham Hill Road outside Morgan Court to act as a passing place. Parking can still take place for around 4 to 5 cars after the end of the double yellow lines. As the advertised double yellow lines just allow space for westbound traffic to pull into, vehicles will still be slowing down because of the remaining parked cars at this location. As parking has been seen on many occasions to be persistent at this location and not just at peak times, and that it is highly obstructive to two-way traffic flow on this busy road, double yellow lines are necessary here. The passing place was proposed as a compromise to allow parking to continue without stopping it all entirely, which was previously suggested to the council.

Romney Close junction with Poplar Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0182
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0

- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

6 New Parade, Church Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0127
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Clarendon Road / Coleridge Road / Chaucer Road / Ford Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0127, 0128, 0186 and 1105.
- Objections: 113 (plus a 97 signature objection petition)
- Comments: 6
- Support: 38
- Final decision: Proceed with amendments (do not proceed with the advertised permit scheme but proceed with the advertised double yellow lines on the crossroads junction of Dudley Road and Clarendon Road, extending westwards into Clarendon Road and its junction with Chaucer Road).

Summary

The 113 objections related to the following: -

- The permit scheme will just move the problem to other nearby streets.
- The wider implications of the scheme have not been considered.
- The costs for permits are too high.
- Not all residents can afford the permits.
- The permits should be free.
- Permit parking is not needed here.
- Residents can already find spaces to park, even prior to the pandemic.
- Parking has improved since the pandemic as commuters now work from home, therefore the scheme should be put on hold.
- The restriction period should be shorter.
- The restriction period should be longer.
- It will impact too much on visitors to residents and their tradesman.
- The area is useful for those visiting Ashford town centre.
- It will impact on local businesses, especially small businesses.
- Residents never asked for permit parking.
- The initial consultation results did not justify proposing permit parking.
- It is safer to park as close to the train station as possible, especially late at night.
- Local car parks should be improved instead.

The 6 comments related to: -

- Concerns regarding displacement to other streets nearby.
- Suggestions of alternative shorter time periods.
- Suggestions of adding additional streets.
- Questioning the high permit costs.
- Concerns regarding visitors and carers.

Analysis

The 113 individual objections represented 97 households located inside and outside the advertised permit area. This has been broken down as follows: -

Inside the permit area, there were 42 objecting households, these were from: -

- Chaucer Road: 14 objecting households.
- Clarendon Road: 16 objecting households.
- Coleridge Road: 10 objecting households.
- Ford Road: 2 objecting households.

Outside the permit area, there were 55 objecting households, including those located in nearby adjoining streets; parts of the same streets listed above but outside the permit area; from streets elsewhere in Ashford; or from further afield.

The petition signed by 97 residents of Clarendon Road, Chaucer Road, Coleridge Road, Dudley Road, Ford Road and Albert Road (including some unnamed roads), represented 43 households and stated the following wording: -

Please register my objection to the proposed parking scheme for Clarendon Road TW15 and surrounding roads. Whilst not opposed to some sort of scheme the current proposals are not acceptable and further consultation giving several options to be considered is the way forward. I note that objections should be recorded per registered voter and not per household. Democracy in this country is recorded per voter not per household.

In terms of properties located inside the proposed permit area, the petition represented a further 19 objecting households in addition to the 42 households who submitted objections through the advertisement process. In total, this represents 61 objecting households inside the permit area. In comparison, 21 households inside the permit area submitted support responses.

In terms of properties located outside the proposed permit area, the petition represented a further 7 objecting households in addition to the 55 households who submitted objections through the advertisement process. In total, this represents 62 objecting households outside the permit area.

As with any permit scheme, it should be clear following an advertisement that what is being proposed is going to please the vast majority of residents, knowing that there will still likely be some residents against the scheme. However, there are many individual residents and many households against this proposed permit scheme, both inside and outside the advertised permit area. The number of objecting households inside the permit area, even relative to the total number of properties, is high for a scheme of this type. It also outweighs the supporting households who responded to the advertisement by almost 3 to 1.

In response to the petition wording, there has been extensive previous consultation with residents over permit parking in this part of Ashford prior to this advertisement. This past consultation has provided different options, but ultimately a permit parking scheme is the only way to prioritise resident vehicles over non-resident vehicles. Any yellow line based scheme for example, which can deter all day parking with a short time period etc, does not work where residents also need to be parked on street as the restrictions apply to them and their visitors also. Permit parking provides an exemption to residents and their visitors through the issuing of permits, which is why it works so

well. However, it is understood that asking residents to pay to park outside their homes with a strict criteria for the issuing of permits is not always what residents actually want, and this is why such permit schemes should only be introduced when there is reasonably low opposition when advertised.

Therefore, it is deemed best not to proceed with the advertised permit scheme. The topic of permit parking in this part of Ashford, considering this advertisement and previous extensive consultations, has been exhausted.

As there will be benefit to the conversion of the single yellow lines to double yellow lines on the crossroads junction of Clarendon Road and Dudley Road, extending westwards into Clarendon Road and its junction with Chaucer Road, this part of the advertisement will proceed.

Sunbury Common and Ashford Common division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Ms Alison Griffiths](#).

Sunbury

86 Alexandra Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 1110
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Brooklands Close

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0147
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Heathcroft Avenue (including junction with Green Lane)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0135 and 0137
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection did not contain reasons other than unhappy with parking restrictions.

Analysis

Parking restrictions are the only way to enforce the parking in between the islands as the white hatching is just advisory.

Lower Sunbury and Halliford division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mr Buddhi Weerasinghe](#).

Sunbury

16/17 Station Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0138
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Green Street junction with Heritage Close

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0140
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Stratton Road (including junction with Rooksmead Road)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0146
- Objections: 14
- Comments: 0
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed with amendments.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- There is no need for restrictions here.
- Restrictions will move the parked vehicles further up the street.
- It is only a problem here at school peak times.
- The restrictions will impact on resident and visitor parking.
- The restrictions will be ignored by those visiting the school.
- Parking is already limited in this street without further double yellow lines.
- Restrictions are an overreaction and unnecessary.
- Vehicles will displace to nearby roads and other junctions, such as those with Green Street.
- Restrictions on the junction are necessary but not adjacent the field.
- London Irish have offered parking for school visitors with an entrance from Hazelwood Drive.

Analysis

The advertised parking restrictions were agreed as part of a Road Safety Outside Schools meeting in late 2019, which involved officers from Surrey County Council and Surrey Police, as well as staff from the school. The restrictions layout was deemed to be an ideal situation in terms of maintaining traffic flow and sight lines. However, it is appreciated that the situation may have improved since the assessments took place, and it is possible some parents and carers will continue to pick up and drop off children on the double yellow lines which they are legally allowed to do.

Following the objections received, many of which from residents in the vicinity of the proposed restrictions, it is proposed to proceed with the following restrictions only: -

- To proceed with making the existing school keep clear marking enforceable.
- To proceed with double yellow lines on the junction of Stratton Road and Rooksmead Road but for a reduced distance of 12m in all directions.

These changes will allow the school keep clear marking (which is a 'no stopping' restriction) to be enforced and will allow sight lines and access to be maintained on the junction, but to a more minimal extent. This will help to minimise displacement and will also reflect there no longer being a need to create an overlap with the restrictions along the footpath side, as they are no longer being proceeded with.

Loudwater Road junction with Halliford Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 1102
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection related to space being reduced for residents as many have multiple cars per household and suggested other road safety measures be introduced instead, such as speed cameras and making the road one-way. Also suggested removing the tree located on the junction.

Analysis

The eastern side of the junction is the side that was deemed to have sight line issues due to parked cars. The relatively small extension of the double yellow lines has taken into account a set number of car spaces being left until the nearest dropped kerb, so as not to disrupt the existing parking by residents any more than absolutely necessary for the requirements of the junction's sight lines. The tree is located on the western side of the junction which was not the side with the issue. This extension of double yellow lines was deemed to be highly necessary following several visits to this junction during the parking review.

Laleham and Shepperton division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Ms Maureen Attewell](#).

Shepperton

Lindsay Drive junction with Gordan Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 1130
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

Comment related to a separate parking issue on the bend in Gordan Road.

Analysis

Additional requests will need to be submitted as part of a future parking review of Spelthorne.

Green Lane junction with Manygate Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0197
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Harrow Way junction with Charlton Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 1124
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Staines division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Ms Sinead Mooney](#).

Staines

Mill Mead

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0113 and 0116
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Shortwood Avenue

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0124
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

Objection related to the restrictions moving the parking to elsewhere in the street making it worse for residents and access. Also, regarding the requirement for vets to visit the Common.

Analysis

As mentioned in the statement of reasons document, restrictions in the turning circle (which is not an area ever intended for parking) were supported by the majority of Shortwood Avenue residents when consulted by their local county councillor, and were also supported by Surrey Fire and Rescue with regards to maintaining access to the common for emergency vehicles. The loading and unloading of goods is still allowed to take place on double yellow lines, but the parking of vehicles, including by vets or anyone else visiting the common, would need to take place elsewhere in the street.

Dolphin Court junction with Bremer Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0170
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection related to parking spaces being lost on the junction for residents. The comment related to a request to extend the double yellow lines further on one side of Dolphin Court.

Analysis

As it is already an offence to park within 10m of a junction under the Highway Code, this location should not be viewed as being parking space. An extension of double yellow lines on one side was considered as part of this parking review but was not deemed to be necessary at this time.

Chestnut Grove

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0181
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

One objection stated that Chestnut Grove should remain unrestricted; that Churchill Court already has allocated parking which could be expanded; and suggested shortening or relocating the disabled bay to increase space. The second objection questioned the need for the restrictions in this location.

Analysis

The advertised double yellow lines were proposed following drivers persistently blocking the dropped kerb entrance to the two Churchill Court spaces, including ignoring an access protection marking which was installed to help highlight the access. Whilst double yellow lines over a short length such as this are not ideal, it is the only way to help ensure this location is kept clear as the double yellow lines can be enforced even without any complaints regarding access being blocked. The disabled bay located next to this parking area is the correct size for disabled bays, which are larger than normal parking bays. It will be in a location most suitable for the blue badge holder(s) who requested it and won't be moved to allow abled bodied drivers more space as that contradicts its entire purpose on street.

Commercial Road (including junction with Octavia Way)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0183
- Objections: 15
- Comments: 2
- Support: 9
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- The restrictions will prevent parents and carers picking up or dropping off children.
- The restrictions will impact on those residents with limited or no off street parking.
- Parking will be displaced to nearby streets.
- Parking will be displaced to further down Commercial Road.
- It will affect tradesman, allotment visitors and deliveries.
- It will affect residents with children, especially when unloading shopping.
- Traffic flow is being prioritised over the needs of residents.
- Parking for local businesses already reduces parking for residents.
- There is no issue with parking or stopping on the north side of the street.
- Making the end of Commercial Road a "no waiting at any time" zone is unnecessary.
- Vulnerable residents will be unable to be picked up or dropped off.
- The proposal also needs a passing place on the south side.

The comments related to supporting the proposals with suggestions to make the road one-way.

Analysis

Firstly, there may be some misunderstanding about what is being proposed here. The proposal is to double yellow line the north side of Commercial Road up to and including its junction with Octavia Way. Parking will be allowed to continue on the south side as it currently does, which is where the vast majority of people park. The proposal is to address the obstructions caused to passing traffic and pedestrians, pram users, wheelchair users and mobility scooter users trying to access the footway when vehicles are also parked on the north side, particularly in the vicinity of the Laleham Road junction. However, loading and unloading by residents or delivery vehicles, including picking up and dropping off passengers, is still allowed to take place on double yellow lines. It is therefore understood that with stopping permitted, these issues will not be completely resolved, but it will help reduce the issue to brief moments rather than being more persistent.

This location, and the obstructions to traffic flow and to the footway, has been complained about to the council for several years, and in this parking review, the council received further multiple complaints regarding these same issues. The advertised restrictions aim to address these issues in the vicinity of Laleham Road, whilst also trying to manage likely displacement further along Commercial Road, which would likely otherwise have resulted in staggered parking on approach to Laleham Road and creating traffic flow issues elsewhere. However, having the restrictions up to Octavia Way and protecting that junction also, helps to mitigate displacement and to keep parking on the south side up to this point, where there is room for several additional vehicles to park without needing to be blocking the road and footways closer to Laleham Road.

It is worth mentioning that obstructing a footway to the point where people cannot get past and are forced to go into the road is an offence which can be enforced by the police under obstruction laws. It is even more hazardous to force pedestrians into a road so close to a busy road junction. Having no off-street parking at a property does not provide any exemption to this.

As parking on the south side still prevents two-way traffic flow, drivers approaching Laleham Road often have to pull into where dropped kerbs break up the row of parked cars to allow oncoming traffic to pass. Understanding that this is not ideal, especially for larger vehicles, a passing place (a section of double yellow lines) on the south side may be considered necessary as part of a future parking review to further improve traffic flow in this part of Commercial Road.

In terms of displacement, as the vast majority of vehicles park on the south side with only a small isolated number of vehicles parking on the north side as well, the large extent of the advertised double yellow lines does not equate to significant levels of displacement, rather than move a small number of vehicles further along Commercial Road onto the south side where there is space.

All things considered, restrictions on the north side of Commercial Road here are long overdue and certainly justifiable for road safety, traffic flow and footway access reasons. Therefore, it is a proposal which should proceed as advertised.

Victoria Road and Moor Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0112 and 0188
- Objections: 17
- Comments: 3
- Support: 20
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- There will be less space in total for residents and their visitors to park.
- There will not be enough space left on Moor Lane with the double yellows proposed.
- It is unfair to ask residents to pay for permits.
- The cost for residents and visitors is too much.
- These roads are useful for the wider community of Staines to park.
- These roads are useful for those who work in Staines to park.
- These roads are useful for commuters to park.
- Meadow Court and the rest of Moor Lane are not included in the scheme.
- The restriction times are too long and should be shorter just to deter commuters etc.
- Traffic speeds on Moor Lane will increase with less parked cars.
- The parking situation will be worse with less parking space on Moor Lane.
- All residents should be allowed at least one permit regardless of off street parking.
- Recent lockdowns have shown that the majority of parked cars belong to residents anyway.
- A free time period should be considered for shoppers or visitors.

The comments related to suggested changes to an existing parking restriction nearby; displacement to other parts of Moor Lane; the double yellow lines on Moor Lane removing too much space; and parking shown on the plan to be allowed in front of the King Acre Court access and the pedestrian access.

Analysis

The 17 individual objections to this scheme represented 15 households, which are broken down as follows: -

- King Acre Court: 3 objecting households.
- Victoria Road: 5 objecting households.
- Meadow Court: 1 objecting household.
- Mede Court: 1 objecting household.
- Moor Lane: 1 objecting household.
- Wider community (commuters, town centre workers, visitors etc): 4 objecting households.

9 of the households listed above front the proposed parking restrictions. The 20 support responses represented 15 households of Moor Lane and Victoria Road, 13 of which were households fronting the proposed restrictions.

The 9 objecting households is reasonably low relative to the total number of households fronting the restrictions that were all notified by letter regarding these proposals. It can be assumed here that the vast majority of households (over 80%) are in support of the permit scheme or have no objections to it. The number of objections from those outside the permit area is also low, considering that street notices were erected along the streets to inform those who do not live here but need to park for various reasons. The scheme should therefore proceed as advertised.

When formalised parking bays (as shown on Moor Lane) are drawn up, road width, sight lines and two-way traffic must be considered to ensure that the parking being permitted is safe and unobstructive. Unfortunately, on Moor Lane, many of the locations where drivers are currently parking cause issues for two-way traffic flow and sight lines, and therefore the double yellow lines are required for the permit bays to be introduced. The number of permit bays is the maximum that can be introduced on Moor Lane considering all these factors. Permit holders will be able to park in either Moor Lane or Victoria Road with the same permit, should there be space in one location but

not another. With the restrictions being for residents only, and bearing in mind that not all residents may be requiring the bays at the same time, it is still anticipated to be sufficient space in total, but will be subject to monitoring and further assessment if this proves not to be the case.

Whilst it is understood that these streets are used by those working or visiting Staines town centre, the purpose of resident permit schemes is to prioritise resident parking where the majority have little or no off street parking, as is the case here.

Meadow Court and Mede Court are eligible for permits but do not have permit bays located outside their properties. It is understood that many of these residents will not actually require permits, but as they are near to the permit area and bays, it was deemed practical to include them, especially for the use of visitor permits.

Whilst reducing the total number of cars parked on Moor Lane may potentially result in a slight increase in traffic speed, there will still be on street parking in large numbers on this street, but sight lines will be much improved for all road users. The overall benefit of managing all the parking in this area, including preventing parking partly on the footways, should create a safer environment for all.

The permit costs and criteria for permit schemes are set around the entire county and are not subject to alteration for one location only. The cost of introducing and maintaining resident permit schemes should not be covered by the general taxpayer, which is why there are costs associated with these types of schemes.

Any free time period (for example permit holders or 2 hours) would very likely see the parking bays taken up by those visiting Staines, greatly reducing the total number of spaces for residents and rendering the scheme somewhat pointless. With such a time period, shoppers would be able to park for free, avoiding the need to pay to park in the nearby Two-Rivers car park for example, and this is why such a period is not practical here.

Finally, regarding the comments regarding the King Acre Court access etc, as the scheme for Victoria Road operates with signing only (permit holders only past this point), permit parking is applicable for any part of public highway beyond this point, but shared accesses or pedestrian dropped kerbs still cannot be obstructed. The only exception is where a resident is parking across their own dropped kerb to their own property/driveway whilst displaying a resident permit, or where their own visitors are displaying a visitor permit.