

Elmbridge parking review 2021/22: 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 Elmbridge parking review 2021/22.

Our parking proposals were 'advertised' by way of a press notice published in the Surrey Advertiser on Friday 8 April, and there then followed a five week 'objection period' which ended on 13 May 2022, 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 200 site notices near where the new restrictions were proposed, and notified people most directly affected by post. This included letters to around 180 residents within the proposed permit schemes plus other locations where we'd previously carried out informal consultations, and 590 notification cards to addresses at or close to the remaining 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 533 responses to the proposals via our online form, letters, and emails, with comments about 45 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

Elmbridge parking review 2021/22: Decision report.....	0
Introduction.....	0
Cobham division proposals.....	5
Cobham	5
Portsmouth Road – refer to drawing J30.....	5
Portsmouth Road – refer to drawing L28.....	5
Tilt Road and Elm Grove Road – refer to drawing L32.....	6
Green Lane – refer to drawing M28.....	7
Sandy Lane – refer to drawing N28.....	7
Sandy Lane – refer to drawings Q26 and Q27	7
East Molesey and Esher division proposals	8
East Molesey	8
Graburn Way – refer to drawing S03.....	8
School Road and Challoners Close – refer to drawing S05.....	8
Matham Road – refer to drawing S06.....	9
St Mary’s Road – refer to drawing S06.....	9
Esher.....	10
Portsmouth Road – refer to drawing N24	10
West End Lane, near the Princess Alice Hospice – refer to drawing O17.....	10
West End Lane, access to 26-32a – refer to drawing O18	11
Esher Green – refer to drawing Q16	11
Bracondale – refer to drawing Q19.....	11
Copsem Lane – refer to drawing Q19.....	12
Hersham division proposals.....	13
Hersham	13
Mayfield Road – refer to drawing J15.....	13
Green Lane, Green Lane Avenue – refer to drawing K18	13
Trenchard Close, Queensway South – refer to drawing L17	13
Queens Road – refer to drawing L17	14
Avondale Close – refer to drawing L18.....	14
Burwood Road, Vaux Crescent, Burwood Close – refer to drawing L18	15
Rydens Grove, Molesey Road – refer to drawing M16.....	17
Pratts Lane – refer to drawing M17	18
Thrupps Lane, Mole Road, Green Lane, Havers Avenue – refer to drawing M18.....	18
Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott division proposals.....	19

Claygate.....	19
The Avenue – refer to drawing T18	19
Dalmore Avenue – refer to drawing U20	19
Hinchley Wood.....	20
Manor Road North – refer to drawing U13.....	20
Oxshott.....	20
High Street, Steels Lane, Oakshade Road – refer to drawing S30.....	20
The Dittons division proposals.....	21
Esher.....	21
Ember Lane, Chestnut Avenue – refer to drawing S10	21
Thames Ditton.....	21
Summer Road, Warwick Gardens – refer to drawing U06.....	21
Speer Road, Warwick Road – refer to drawing U07	22
Speer Road – refer to drawing U08.....	22
Watts Road – refer to drawing V09	23
Ferry Road, Portsmouth Road – refer to drawing W08	24
Sugden Rd, Mayfield Cls, Bankside Drv, Scott Farm Cls – refer to drawing W11	25
Walton division proposals.....	26
Walton.....	26
Nelson Close – refer to drawing K11	26
Ambleside Avenue and St John’s Drive – refer to drawing L11.....	26
Walton South and Oatlands division proposals	28
Walton.....	28
Cleveland Close – no drawing required.....	28
High Street – refer to drawing I11.....	28
Wynton Grove – refer to drawing J14.....	28
Rydens Avenue – refer to drawing K13.....	29
Weybridge.....	30
Cricket Way – refer to drawing H13.....	30
West Molesey division proposals.....	31
West Molesey	31
Central Avenue – refer to drawing O06	31
High Street – refer to drawing P05	31
Ray Road – refer to drawing P05	31
Weybridge division proposals.....	32
Weybridge.....	32
Barnes Wallis Drive, Sopwith Drive – refer to drawing B26	32

Portmore Park Road – refer to drawing C15	32
Prince’s Road, Hanger Hill – refer to drawing E17	33
Pine Grove – refer to drawing E17	33
Queens Road (at Woodview Court) – refer to drawing E17.....	34
Queens Road (bus stop improvements) – refer to drawing E17.....	34
South Road – no drawing required.....	35
South Road – refer to drawing F17	35
York Road, Queens Road – refer to drawing F17	35
St George’s Avenue – F18	36
Cobham	37
Redhill Road – refer to drawings E28, E29, E30, E31 and F32.....	37
Annex 1 – Explanation of restriction types.....	38
No waiting at any time.....	38
No waiting (at a time non-continuous throughout the year).....	38
No loading.....	38
Controlled Parking Zone	38
Restricted Parking Zone.....	38
Permit parking schemes.....	38
Traffic signs and road markings	39
Annex 2 – Legal and policy information.....	40
Policy and Strategy	40
Surrey Transport Plan	40
Parking Strategy.....	40
Parking Reviews.....	41
Legislation.....	41
Annex 3 – General enquiries	42
Speed limits, traffic calming, and speed enforcement.....	42
Road safety and sustainable travel for schools.....	42
Creation of additional parking space on verges or grassed areas	42
Requests for permit parking schemes.....	42
Requests for additional parking controls	42
Enforcement.....	43
General enquiries.....	43

Cobham division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [David Lewis](#). The [original drawings](#) are still available on our website for reference.

Cobham

Portsmouth Road – refer to drawing J30

Overview:

- Objections: 22 (67%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 11 (33%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor modification.

Analysis

Six residents plus three non-resident owners of two of the properties included within the proposed scheme supported the proposal. None objected. Support was based around the difficulty they currently have in finding a parking space outside their properties due to non-resident parking.

The majority of objections (16) were from residents of 14 properties within Matthew Arnold Close, stating that they were concerned about overflow parking from Portsmouth Road residents parking within their road and reducing the space available for them to park. There were some concerns about additional traffic flow and road safety as a result. Residents were unhappy that they were not directly notified about the proposal.

Of the remaining objections, the most common concern was about the impact the proposal would have on the Nursery. The proposed parking bays would not prevent picking up and dropping off by non-permit holders in the bays.

The remaining concerns were around general loss of parking for visitors and workers in Cobham. These road users may choose to find alternative parking space on street or use the public car parks. We encourage the public to consider using other transport modes, preferably walking or cycling wherever possible.

Given the feedback received, we have decided to go ahead with the proposal but as a separate permit scheme.

Portsmouth Road – refer to drawing L28

Overview:

- Objections: 112 (98%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 2 (2%)
- Final decision: do not proceed.

Analysis

Objections come from a mixture of local residents, as well as people from further away who use the layby when accessing the nearby restaurant or using / working at the nursery.

Objections on the basis that people would have no-where to pick up/drop off are self-evidently flawed.

Many nearby residents have no or limited off street parking, and they often use the lay-by for parking. Numerous people object to the scheme on the basis that it is unnecessary as the lay-by is rarely full.

Given the number of objections to this proposal, we are happy to cancel it.

Tilt Road and Elm Grove Road – refer to drawing L32

Overview:

- Objections: 9 (64%)
- Other comments: 3 (21%)
- Support: 2 (14%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received seven objections from five different properties on Tilt Road, one from Elm Grove Road, and one from a resident of Surbiton.

The majority of objectors and objections relate to the sections marked in front of the driveways outside 6 to 8, and 20 to 24 Tilt Road. Residents do not believe there is a problem in this part of the Road and, as demand for parking is high, believe this part of the scheme should not go ahead. This particular part of the proposal is made in order to provide a couple of areas where vehicles can pull in to allow other vehicles to pass in the other direction without the need to take to the footway.

A number of the objections also state that parking will be displaced. The number of vehicles affected is very small in relation to the overall capacity of the road. The council has no obligation to provide, facilitate or allow on street parking, it has a very clear mandate to maintain and improve road safety and traffic flow on the highway network. Where parking causes obstruction of the carriageway to the point where other motorists drive on the footway to get through, we must intervene.

A number of residents also raise concerns about the environmental or aesthetic impact of the proposed parking restrictions. The advantage of double yellow lines is that they require no upright signing and therefore no signposts, and they can be marked with a narrow 50mm line in a subtle shade of yellow. It is difficult to understand how road markings would be less in keeping with the conservation area than the parked vehicles.

We received one objection from Elm Grove Road stating that the lines at the junction are too long and should be reduced to one-side only in order to limit the loss of parking capacity. It is not realistic from a road safety perspective to install the lines on one side of the junction only.

Two residents, one of Tilt Road and one of Elm Grove Road wrote to support the proposals entirely.

Customers requesting additional parking controls should refer to information provided in Annex 3.

Green Lane – refer to drawing M28

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 8 (100%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

All eight responses came from local residents, including two from Green Lane, one from Ashcroft Park and one from Fairmile Lane.

A couple of respondents felt that the proposals should be extended further. Of course, the more restrictions are introduced, the greater the volume of displaced vehicles. We therefore believe the best course of action is to introduce these proposals 'as is' before considering whether any further adjustments are required.

Sandy Lane – refer to drawing N28

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 2 (100%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received two comments in support of this proposal. One of these comments seemed unsure as to whether their support was intended. The other supported the proposal without further comment, other than to say Sandy Lane should be a 20 mile per hour speed limit – see Annex 3.

Sandy Lane – refer to drawings Q26 and Q27

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1 (100%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received one response from a nearby resident who supported the proposal as Sandy Lane is too narrow to allow parking to take place.

East Molesey and Esher division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Steve Bax](#). The [original drawings](#) are still available on our website for reference.

East Molesey

Graburn Way – refer to drawing S03

Overview:

- Objections: 1 (100%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

One person objected to the proposals, saying that parking for the boat club would be reduced.

There will still be a considerable amount of kerbside space that visitors can use to park, as well as the Hurst Meadows Car Park.

School Road and Challoners Close – refer to drawing S05

Overview:

- Objections: 26 (54%)
- Other comments: 4 (8%)
- Support: 18 (38%)
- Final decision: Go ahead with modified scheme.

Analysis

We received a total of 48 responses about this proposal, of which 11 were from Challoners Close, and 22 were from School Road.

Although every comment has been read and considered, we have removed duplicate responses from the same household for the purposes of the following figures, where percentages are given on a road by road basis:

- Challoners Close: 8 objections (73%), 2 other comments (18%) and 1 support (9%),
- School Road: 2 objections (13%), 2 other comments (13%) and 12 support (75%),
- Walton Road: 4 objections (100%),
- other roads: 12 objections (92%) and 1 support (8%).

As predicted, the responses are mixed with one road very strongly in favour and one road very strongly against the proposal. Of course, people from outside the scheme are overwhelmingly against the proposal too, which is to be expected.

The comments and concerns raised by residents of Challoners Close aren't materially different from those raised during the informal consultation carried out back in October 2021, although more residents objected this time.

The primary objections from Challoners Close were, in order of prevalence:

- The proposals are unnecessary / there is ample parking capacity in the road (6).
- Proposals will not help address pavement parking / emergency access. (4)
- Residents should be able to obtain a permit regardless of private off-street parking. (3)
- Residents should be able to have free visitor permits. (2)
- The proposals are physically unfeasible due to road layout/width, particularly with respect to the section of road opposite 10-18. (2)
- The two-hour bays are too far away from the shops to be useful. (2)
- Scheme hours are too / unnecessarily long (2)
- Residents with trees need to park on street during certain times of year, but they will not be eligible for parking permits. (2)
- Additional costs / burden on Challoners Close residents is unfair. (2)
- Unfair impact on Walton Road flats. (1)
- Scheme hours are too short (parking problems are worst when all residents are home) (1)

In addition to the objections of residents of Challoners Close, there were objections from non-residents such as visitors and local workers, and other nearby residents who concerned about displacement. The objections from School Road residents centred around cost.

Given the level of support from residents of School Road, as demonstrated both in the informal consultation stage and in the advertisement stage, we decided to go ahead with the scheme for School Road but - owing to the objections from Challoners Close – it was preferable to remove that road from the scheme meaning that those residents will be able to continue to park on their street at no cost should they wish to do so.

We wrote to residents again about this idea in October, and received three objections from residents of School Road, three from Challoners Close, and one response in support of the proposal from Challoners Close. Therefore, this revised scheme appears to be significantly more acceptable to residents than the original scheme.

We can review the impact of the new scheme in a future parking review if necessary. Customers requesting additional parking controls should refer to information provided in Annex 3.

Matham Road – refer to drawing S06

Overview:

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

Analysis

We received an objection from a resident of Matham Road stating that the proposal will cause vehicles to be displaced to their road. This doesn't apply to this scheme, as we're simply removing parking bays that never existed on site from the traffic order.

St Mary's Road – refer to drawing S06

Overview:

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

Esher

Portsmouth Road – refer to drawing N24

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (66%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1 (33%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received two objections from residents of Esher and Cobham. One objection didn't have any reasoning in particular, the other stated that parking is always busy here and people need to park in order to access the countryside. The objection also queries the traffic events that lead to the proposal.

The lay-by was not constructed in order to provide parking capacity. There will remain parking capacity at this location following the introduction of this proposal, and there are public car parks nearby to enable visitors to park off the road. There is no particular accident data at this location that lead to this proposal. We do not have a policy of waiting for accidents to happen before introducing parking controls. In locations where road users have raised safety concerns that are supported by our own site assessments and observations it is sensible to intervene before accidents occur.

We also received one message from a local resident in support of this proposal.

West End Lane, near the Princess Alice Hospice – refer to drawing O17

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1 (100%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received one comment in support of the proposals from a nearby resident, however they were concerned about the potential for displacement and therefore suggested further controls. Please refer to Annex 3 in relation to requests for further parking controls. We do carry out regular parking reviews which can be used to address any displacement issues arising.

West End Lane, access to 26-32a – refer to drawing O18

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 2 (100%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received two responses from residents local to this proposal. One of these suggested that the lines should not extend more than 1.5 metres past the corner, and one suggested that the lines should be extended further than currently planned. We do not think it is necessary at the moment to extend the restrictions further than currently planned. Please report any concerns about highway condition via our website, see Annex 3 for details.

Esher Green – refer to drawing Q16

Overview:

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

Bracondale – refer to drawing Q19

Overview:

- Objections: 7 (64%)
- Other comments: 1 (9%)
- Support: 3 (27%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

There were four responses from three addresses in Bracondale; three in support and one other comment which suggested additional parking controls were required in order to prevent parking over a driveway. We do not feel further controls are necessary at the current time as there is adequate space to park between the driveway of number one and the double yellow lines at the junction without causing obstruction. A further suggestion was made to join the proposed double yellow lines around the northern end of the road with more double yellow line, however this would remove space in which another two vehicles could park without causing obstruction and is therefore difficult to justify. The support for the controls comes from residents on the basis that current parking causes obstruction to the carriageway and footway and would inhibit access for emergency services.

We received seven objections which came from parents of students at the nearby school and tennis club, on the basis that they use the road to park in whilst dropping or collecting their children. We are not banning all parking in the road; the proposals are simply designed to stop dangerous obstructive parking which prevents safe access to the road.

Copsem Lane – refer to drawing Q19

Overview:

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

Hersham division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [John O'Reilly](#). The [original drawings](#) are still available on our website for reference.

Hersham

Mayfield Road – refer to drawing J15

Overview:

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

Analysis

We received one response from a local resident giving support to the proposal for a number of reasons.

Green Lane, Green Lane Avenue – refer to drawing K18

Overview:

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

Trenchard Close, Queensway South – refer to drawing L17

Overview:

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

Analysis

Both of the objections we received were from local residents. One supported the idea of the proposal but requested that the lines beside number 19 Queensway South were reduced in order to allow space for an additional vehicle to park. We are happy to make this adjustment.

The other objection stated that the location is a residential area and residents need space to park. Whilst we understand that residents often use the road to park on, our duty as highway authority is to maintain a safe and efficient road network. We are careful to introduce what we believe is the minimum length of restrictions required to maintain safety and access in locations where parking is under high parking stress.

Queens Road – refer to drawing L17

Overview:

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

Analysis

We received one objection to this proposal from a resident of a nearby road. They stated that each of the parking bays would interfere with sightlines and traffic flow. We agree that parking on street in the locations indicated will interfere with traffic flow, it will cause some motorists to have to give way to vehicles coming the other way at times, this is in line with our traffic calming objectives for the area. Sightlines at all applicable junctions are acceptable. The parking bay opposite 1-15 Cavendish House is not close enough to the exit of the church to cause an obstruction, motorists waiting to leave the car park have good sightlines east and west along the road to judge whether it is safe to manoeuvre.

Avondale Close – refer to drawing L18

Overview:

- Objections: 4 (80%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1 (20%)
- Final decision: cancel the proposal.

Analysis

All feedback was from Avondale Close residents, 4 objections from three properties, and one expression of support. The objections stated that the restrictions should be retained in order to maintain access along the road and into driveways. They state that residents have off street parking and if further parking is required there are nearby car parks available to use.

The resident in support believed it would make parking and movement for visitors easier.

Given the lack of overall support for the proposal we will not proceed with it.

Burwood Road, Vaux Crescent, Burwood Close – refer to drawing L18

Overview:

- Objections: 19 (70%)
- Other comments: 2 (7%)
- Support: 6 (22%)
- Final decision: go ahead with modified proposal.

Analysis

We accepted objections from a number of roads in Hersham, plus one from Walton and one from Weybridge. We didn't get any objections from properties directly fronting these proposals.

We received one objection from a property opposite the proposed double yellow lines between Burhill Road and Burwood Close, one from a property in Burwood Close and one from a property in Vaux Crescent. Of the remaining objections, six were from adjacent or nearby roads, and nine were from further away.

The vast majority of objections -12 - were from church users, stating that the parking ban would make it difficult for visitors to the church or church hall, particularly the elderly and very young. Furthermore, it would be difficult to load and unload goods, or have tradesmen visit, or during weddings and funerals.

It is unclear whether all of the people objecting fully understood the proposal, which is not to ban all parking, but - chiefly - to introduce some yellow lines and some time limited parking bays along Burwood Road.

There is an exemption within the traffic orders for 'official' vehicles associated with weddings and funerals. Blue badge holders are allowed to park on yellow lines with their blue badge and clock displayed for up to three hours provided they are not causing an obstruction. The proposal includes a blue badge parking bay, plus space for around twelve vehicles in the two hour parking bays, operating Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6pm, between the church hall and the church.

It is perfectly acceptable to stop on yellow lines in order to load and unload goods, and to allow passengers to board and alight.

There were a couple of suggestions to extend the time allowed in the parking bays to three hours.

One objection acknowledged that parking for the church is difficult at the moment as workers or visitors to local businesses monopolise the space.

In addition to the concerns from church users, the primary issues raised were:

- Parking will be displaced to Faulkners Road making it more difficult to run activities in the hall as volunteers are unable to park and bring equipment.
- Parking will be displaced to side roads, making parking more difficult for residents.
- Traffic speeds will increase, posing a danger.
- Forcing vehicles to park fully on the carriageway will be dangerous and cause excessive congestion.

We do not believe the proposals will increase traffic speeds or cause excessive congestion, although traffic will have to give way for larger vehicles at some points, which is why 'passing places' (the double yellow lines between parking bays) have been included in the scheme.

People needing to load / unload goods at the Hall in Faulkners Road may do so by temporarily parking across the adjacent driveway, or nearby yellow lines if there is no space in the uncontrolled part of the road,

One objection raised concerns about the removal of yellow lines on the northern side of Burwood Road. This is a misunderstanding as the proposal is to remove the existing single yellow line and replace it with double yellow.

The concern from resident of Burwood Road is that vehicles will be displaced to the northern side of the road. This is already where the majority of vehicles park and therefore the proposal is unlikely to make a significant impact in this regard. It is likely that residents and their visitors are primarily those that park here, so any attempt to remove such parking would probably be unpopular, and could also increase traffic speeds. As there are numerous driveways along the northern side of the road, this allows scope to see traffic 'between' parked vehicles when exiting driveways, particularly if motorists reverse in to allow an exit in the forward direction.

The two 'other comments' from residents of Vaux Crescent and Burwood Close, supported the proposals and requested additional or more severe parking controls.

We received six comments in support of the proposals, four of which were from residents of Burwood Road, one of Vaux Crescent, and one from Conyers Close. Many of these also requested items like bollards to protect the grass verges on Burwood Road / Vaux Crescent, which are matters beyond the scope of the parking review, please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries.

In light of the feedback received, we are happy to increase the time allowed in the parking bays to three hours. This should allow time for people to carry out their business in the area and limit displacement.

Rydens Grove, Molesey Road – refer to drawing M16

Overview:

- Objections: 6 (55%)
- Other comments: 1 (9%)
- Support: 3 (36%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor modification.

Analysis

We received six objections from residents of five properties on Molesey Road, of which one address directly fronts onto a section of proposed double yellow line.

Amongst the objections, there was some support for the proposed yellow lines with three people stating that they should go ahead. The primary concern was the time limited parking bays which were specifically mentioned by four people as a problem because residents without off street parking use these areas to park, and it is difficult to find a space elsewhere due to the prevalence of dropped kerbs.

Whilst we recognise that residents value on street parking, the reality is that the highway does not exist for this purpose. When drawing up proposals we try to limit the loss of 'parking space', however the primary function of the public highway is to provide the safe and efficient movement of people and goods, and our legal duties lie in maintaining and improving this functionality.

One objection was specially about the proposed yellow lines on the south side of the road, stating they should finish at the boundary of 126 and 128, because vehicles often park adjacent to the raised section of kerb between 130 and 132. With the proposals as advertised it will still be possible for a vehicle to park at the location described, so there is no need to adjust the length of lines.

Some other suggestions included a permit scheme aspect to the proposed time limited parking bays. This would not be feasible for such a small number of bays in the middle of such a significant residential area, it would be very difficult to allocate permits, and it would also defeat the purpose of the scheme if all of the bays were occupied all day by residents leaving no space for short term visitors. Another suggestion was to convert the wide area in front of the shops to parallel bays. The land is not owned or maintained by us, so the point is moot. However, there would almost certainly be safety concerns about vehicles frequently reversing out onto Molesey Road.

The 'other comment' stated that the proposals would damage the shops, and increase speeding along the road. The proposals include time limited parking bays specifically in order to provide somewhere for short-term visitors to legally park. We recognise the link between forward visibility, highway width, and traffic speed, and do not believe the proposals will encourage speeding.

Comments regarding crossing points and speed limits are beyond the scope of the parking review, please see Annex 3 – General enquiries.

We thank those who commented in support of the proposal. One of those comments suggested extending the yellow lines further south along Molesey Road, and another did not support the time limited parking bays.

We have had numerous complaints regarding this location over a number of years and therefore we feel it is important to go ahead with the yellow lines for safety reasons. We also feel it is important to support local businesses and therefore we should go ahead with some time limited parking bays, however in light of the comments of local residents we will reduce their number by not going ahead with those planned for the eastern side of Rydens Grove.

Pratts Lane – refer to drawing M17

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (67%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1 (33%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

All of the feedback we received was from residents of Park House, Pratts Lane.

The two objections included support for yellow lines on ‘the corner’, but objected to the proposals on the basis of a lack of parking for Park House. The comments suggested creating extra parking by removing some grass or making parking easier for residents by introducing a permit scheme. It is beyond the scope of the parking review to consider these suggestions, please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries.

We have suggested the parking controls that apply on the bend and at the junction; there will still be space for several vehicles to park on the straight part of the road.

We thank the resident who commented in support of the proposal.

Thrupps Lane, Mole Road, Green Lane, Havers Avenue – refer to drawing M18

Overview:

- Objections: 1 (25%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 3 (75%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received three comments from residents in support of the proposals – two from Thrupps Lane and one from a resident of Conyers Close. Their observations are that the proposed double yellow lines would improve safety and access for larger vehicles, having witnessed many near misses at the junction.

The objection was also from a resident of Thrupps Lane, who thought the yellow lines would make parking more difficult, and there was already a lack of space. They also thought that the proposals would increase speeding around the bend and reduce safety, and that the implementation of previous restrictions had already had that effect.

The public highway does not exist to provide a parking facility, it is there in order to provide safe and efficient movement of people and goods. It is important that people are allowed adequate sightlines see when negotiating a junction or bend for obvious safety reasons. We recognise the link between forward visibility, highway width, and traffic speed, and do not believe the proposals will encourage speeding.

Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mark Sugden](#). The [original drawings](#) are still available on our website for reference.

Claygate

The Avenue – refer to drawing T18

Overview:

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

Dalmore Avenue – refer to drawing U20

Overview:

- Objections: 6 (29%)
- Other comments: 1 (5%)
- Support: 14 (67%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received a total of six objections to this proposal, of which four were from three addresses in Dalmore Avenue, and two were from the same address in Common Lane.

Two objections focussed around their believe that the obstruction problems in Dalmore Avenue were transient and that permanent controls were not needed, and their imposition would lead to parking displacement and problems elsewhere. The majority of feedback suggests that the problems are not transient. We carry out regular parking reviews so can consider any problems that may arise due to parking displacement as part of the next parking review if necessary.

Another objection stated that the process is undemocratic. In a democracy, the electorate selects a person to represent their views in the decision making process, in this particular case that is your county councillor. The council is not obliged to seek a majority of support before deciding whether to introduce a parking scheme such as this, and we believe the informal consultation and formal advertisement has been successful in engaging with those most likely to be affected by the proposals. The same objection also raised the matter of widening verges. This subject is beyond the scope of the parking review, please see Annex 3 – General enquiries for details.

One objection seemed to object primarily on the basis that the existing yellow lines are not enforced effectively and so any further restrictions would be pointless. These comments are not otherwise reflected in the feedback to this proposal. We believe that we operate an effective enforcement regime through our partners at Elmbridge borough council, although please do contact them with any specific concerns.

The two objections from outside of the road raised concerns about reducing access to the recreation ground, particularly for those with limited mobility. Whilst of course we encourage people to get outdoors and enjoy green space, we have a duty to maintain a safe and accessible road network and believe that these proposals are necessary to comply with that requirement.

We received a total of 14 comments in support of the proposal which came from eight properties in the road, plus one from each of Coverts Road, Foley Road, and Hare Lane.

The support is mainly owing to safety and amenity issues that will be resolved by the yellow lines acting to prevent obstructive parking along the road. Residents state that there have been many cases of obstructive parking preventing access for fire appliances, delivery and service vehicles, and even regular cars.

The other comment, from a resident of the road related to a dropped kerb issue, which we do not believe will be affected by this proposal.

Hinchley Wood

Manor Road North – refer to drawing U13

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1 (11%)
- Support: 8 (89%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Support came from three addresses in Fernwood Place, one in Priors Wood, and one from Hinchley Way. The support was based around improved safety at the junctions.

We also received one 'other comment'; and one 'support' from the same address on Manor Road North.

Altogether, three of the representations suggested that the lines should be extended further, which we do not feel this is necessary at the current time.

Oxshott

High Street, Steels Lane, Oakshade Road – refer to drawing S30

Overview:

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

Analysis

The feedback received – from a resident of Montrose Gardens – states that the three car bay on the High Street is vital to keep for various reasons.

The only parking bay on the High Street is just to the south of the junction with Oakshade Road; we are not making any changes to this area.

The main feature of the proposal is to remove the existing yellow lines from the layby outside 1 to 3 Heath Buildings, and replace it with a disabled parking bay, and also a part time loading bay and parking bay. The proposal is to increase parking capacity, not reduce it.

The Dittons division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Nick Darby](#). The [original drawings](#) are still available on our website for reference.

Esher

Ember Lane, Chestnut Avenue – refer to drawing S10

Overview:

- Objections: 1 (50%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1 (50%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

One resident on Ember Lane was concerned the yellow lines would prevent stopping briefly, before seeking to manoeuvre into their driveway. The restriction is not a 'no stopping' restriction, so it's perfectly acceptable to continue to do this.

The other comment came from a resident of Chestnut Avenue, who we thank for their support.

Thames Ditton

Summer Road, Warwick Gardens – refer to drawing U06

Overview:

- Objections: 6 (55%)
- Other comments: 2 (18%)
- Support: 3 (27%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor modification.

Analysis

The six objections came from residents of five roads in the local area. Responses broadly shared the same concerns, which were:

- Parking here provides access to nearby amenities, such as the shops and restaurants of East Molesey, Hampton Court Palace, the river Thames, and Kingston Grammar School's sports facilities.
- The proposed restrictions would cause displacement to other roads, causing problems there.
- There isn't a significant problem here; moving traffic can pass in either direction with lane of parked vehicles.
- The parking that does take place is of an occasional and short term nature.

Analysis of the 'other comments' shows two residents who are concerned about displacement and congestion in Speer Road and Warwick Gardens that would result from the scheme. One resident suggests additional controls to ensure the smooth passage of the bus along Speer Road, and the resident of Warwick Gardens suggests that the footway is narrowed to improve traffic flow on Summer Road, and resident parking permits introduced for Warwick Gardens. We are proposing double yellow lines at the junction of Warwick Road and Speer Road which would provide an

adequate passing place for larger vehicles. Any further controls would have to be considered as part of a future parking review. It is beyond the scope of the parking review to look at adjusting footway widths, but it would generally be against policy to remove footway capacity in order to provide more space for parked cars, given that the government wants local authorities to encourage cycling and walking.

In addition to the objections and 'other comments', we also received three comments in support of the proposals, two from residents of Aragon Avenue, and one from Summer Road. The feedback shows support for the idea for safety reasons and to improve traffic flow.

We appreciate that the parking does not usually cause a significant problem for regular passenger cars, however conflict does occur when larger vehicles use the route, and we have had complaints from local representatives about this location for a number of years. Therefore, we have decided to go ahead with the scheme, but in response to some of the objections, we have decided to leave an additional 'gap' in the yellow lines near to Ditton Field. We will monitor the location and consider any feedback post implementation to ascertain the effectiveness of the scheme.

Speer Road, Warwick Road – refer to drawing U07

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (50%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 2 (50%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Two residents of Warwick Road objected to the proposals on the basis that parking is difficult in the road, and that the council should provide them with a dropped kerb in order offset the loss of on street parking space. One resident also said the yellow lines would devalue their property.

As highway authority we have a duty to maintain a safe and accessible highway network. Currently the parking here causes obstruction for larger vehicles and the resultant vehicle overrun around the inside of the bend is damaging the footway, which increases the chances of pedestrian trips and falls. Although we understand people value on street parking, the highway does not exist to provide parking capacity and we don't have a duty to provide parking for people. As such we would not provide a dropped kerb free of charge. Information about how to apply for a dropped kerb is available on our website at:

[Vehicle crossovers or dropped kerbs - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/vehicle-crossovers-or-dropped-kerbs)

We cannot consider property values when making our decisions.

The two comments in support of the yellow lines came from one resident of Warwick Road and another of Aragon Avenue. The former thought that the yellow lines would make it easier - particularly for larger vehicles such as delivery vehicles - to access the road and to turn around.

Speer Road – refer to drawing U08

Overview:

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

Watts Road – refer to drawing V09

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (40%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 3 (60%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We recorded one objection from a resident of Station Road, and one from Linden Close. The former questioned the plan to remove more parking capacity in Thames Ditton, stating that increasing traffic speeds does little to benefit residents.

The reason for this proposal was not to increase traffic speeds, but to enable motorists to negotiate Watts Road without needing to illegally drive along the footway which poses a significant safety risk. Removing that risk is a benefit to all residents and road users. The public highway does not exist to provide parking capacity, but to allow for the safety and expeditious movement of goods and people. This proposal will result in the loss of space for parking of only two or three vehicles.

The resident of Linen Close also raises concerns about the loss of parking capacity, and various other matters such as a suggestion for flashing speed limits signs, bollards, and police enforcement of parking and driving on the pavement. In this particular location, the combination of too much traffic and insufficient forward visibility means that there is often no alternative but to drive on the footway as there is otherwise a stalemate. Therefore, bollards would simply compound the problem, the root cause of which is simply too much parking.

We thank the residents of two properties of Watts Road who wrote to support the proposals on safety grounds.

Ferry Road, Portsmouth Road – refer to drawing W08

Overview:

- Objections: 18 (56%)
- Other comments: 2 (6%)
- Support: 12 (38%)
- Final decision: Cancel the proposal save for the double yellow lines around the junction.

Analysis

All responses have been read and considered as part of this process, but for the purposes of calculating the relative proportions of responses from different stakeholders, we have removed duplicate responses from the same address from the following figures:

- **Ferry Road residents and businesses:** 20 responses of which eight (40%) were objections, two (10%) were 'other comments', and 10 (50%) were in support. This represents a response rate of 69%.
- **Other local residents:** one objection.
- **Non-residents:** seven responses, all of which were objections.

Despite our best efforts to design a scheme that achieves a reasonable compromise between the various interested parties of the road, many residents, including a number of those who 'support' the scheme, still feel that the proposed scheme allows too much non-resident parking, referring to the six proposed uncontrolled parking spaces, and in some cases to the idea of boat residents obtaining permits.

Of course, all other stakeholders such as businesses and visitors to the street have written in objection to the proposal.

Given the feedback to the proposal, and we have decided not to go ahead with the permit scheme as insufficient support for it exists and the needs of different groups, along with divergence of opinion even amongst residents is too great to achieve a compromise scheme that enough people support to go ahead with.

We will go ahead with the conversion of single to double yellow line at the junction as this achieved almost unanimous support from those who mentioned it.

Sugden Rd, Mayfield CIs, Bankside Drv, Scott Farm CIs – refer to drawing W11**Overview:**

- Objections: 11 (85%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 2 (15%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

All of the objections came from residents of nine properties in Mayfield Close, with the concerns being that Mayfield Close is already under extremely high parking stress as the properties are maisonettes without off street parking, and there are many families residing in the street who need to be able to easily access their cars.

The two comments in support of the proposal came from residents of Bankside Drive.

The proposed double yellow lines at the junction of Mayfield Close simply reflect the guidance set out within the highway code and that motorists ought to be complying with already. Failure to do so means that sightlines and access at the junction are compromised, and as a result larger vehicles are cutting the corner causing damage to the footway, kerbs, and verge there. We have therefore decided to go ahead with the proposal unchanged.

Walton division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Rachael Lake](#). The [original drawings](#) are still available on our website for reference.

Walton

High Street (refer to drawing I11)

Please note, proposals for the High Street are explained within the Walton South and Oatlands Division, as the boundary runs down the middle of the road, and the proposals lie on the western side of it which is in Walton South and Oatlands division.

Nelson Close – refer to drawing K11

Overview:

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

Ambleside Avenue and St John's Drive – refer to drawing L11

Overview:

- Objections: 33 (75%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 11 (25%)
- Final decision: Go ahead with reduced scheme.

Analysis

The proposal has drawn a significant number of objections from residents across a wide range of roads in Hersham, Walton and Esher, although responses from the immediate area were split with around seven in favour and seven against.

The overwhelming concern raised by approximately 28 respondents was about the loss of ability to park directly outside the shop and chemist at 5 and 7 Ambleside Avenue, which would be a loss to the community and damage trade. This was particularly concerning for the elderly or those with limited mobility. The objections are understandable, although parking would still be allowed on the opposite side of the road, and blue badge holders have certain exemptions to yellow lines.

The remaining issues raised – in order of prevalence - were:

- no need for the restrictions (6),
- proposals will speed up traffic and therefore reduce safety (4),
- only / main problem is around 'school times' (4),
- proposals will cause displacement (2),
- proposals will reduce parking for residents and visitors (1), and
- residents will be unable to have deliveries (1).

In addition to the above, one person raised a suggestion of implementing time limited parking bays to improve access to the shops, as well as residential parking permits, and EV chargers. Requests for additional parking controls are beyond the scope of the current parking review, please see Requests for additional parking controls for details as to how these may be assessed in future, although it is worth considering that any time limited parking bays would need to be marked fully on

the carriageway so in order to maintain traffic flow, yellow lines would always be needed on the other side of the road. Introducing EV chargers is beyond the remit of the parking team, however there is a dedicated team for this and information about the EV charger rollout across the county is available on our website at:

[Electric vehicle on-street charging policy - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/transport/roads-and-parking/electric-vehicle-charging)

The comments in support of the proposals cited improved safety, traffic flow, sightlines and removal of obstructive parking both on the pavement and on the carriageway.

Given the number of objections to the scheme, we have decided to proceed with the double yellow lines only around the roundabout. Refer to revised drawing.

Walton South and Oatlands division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Tony Samuels](#). The [original drawings](#) to are still available on our website for reference.

Walton

Cleveland Close – no drawing required

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1 (33%)
- Support: 2 (67%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

All of the feedback came from residents of Cleveland Close. We thank the residents who wrote to support the proposal. The on reading the 'other comment' it is evident they support the proposal too.

High Street – refer to drawing I11

Overview:

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

Analysis

The objection states that the removal of free parking spaces would be detrimental to people going about their business.

The proposal is to update the traffic order so as to match the existing on site parking restrictions. The parking bays being removed from the traffic order are located where a bus stop is, so it is not possible to mark them out on site and it is therefore logical to remove them from the traffic order.

We thank the resident who wrote to support the proposals.

Wynton Grove – refer to drawing J14

Overview:

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

Rydens Avenue – refer to drawing K13

Overview:

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

Analysis

The objection stated that parking is already limited and there is no need to introduce further controls.

The proposal is simply to make the existing school keep clear marking enforceable by our enforcement officers by introducing a traffic order. There will be no additional restrictions.

We thank the person who wrote to support the proposals.

Weybridge

Cricket Way – refer to drawing H13

Overview:

- Objections: 43 (98%)
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1 (2%)
- Final decision: do not proceed with the proposal.

Analysis

We received a significant level of feedback to this proposal. Objections came from within Cricket Way (seven objections from six properties), from residents of nearby roads, and from residents of roads outside the immediate area.

Primary concerns were about displacement of vehicles to parts of Cricket Way that some residents felt were obstructive or dangerous, as well as to other surrounding roads, and reducing access to the park.

We received only one response - from a resident of Cricket Way - supporting the proposals.

Given the feedback received, we are happy to cancel the proposal.

West Molesey division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Ernest Mallett MBE](#). The [original drawings](#) are still available on our website for reference.

West Molesey

Central Avenue – refer to drawing O06

Overview:

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

Analysis

The objection – from a local business – states that on street parking is needed for customers particularly considering the tough business conditions at the moment.

We understand that many road users – residents and businesses alike – value on street parking. However our priority and duty as highway authority is to maintain and improve road safety, and we believe the proposals are required in order to address road safety concerns at the location. There will remain significant levels of on street parking capacity in the area, in addition to the off street parking available within businesses' sites.

We thank the person who wrote to support the proposal.

High Street – refer to drawing P05

Overview:

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

Ray Road – refer to drawing P05

Overview:

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

Weybridge division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Tim Oliver](#). The [original drawings](#) are still available on our website for reference.

Weybridge

Barnes Wallis Drive, Sopwith Drive – refer to drawing B26

Overview:

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

Portmore Park Road – refer to drawing C15

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 2 (50%)
- Support: 2 (50%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor amendment.

Analysis

We received two comments in support of this proposal, plus two ‘other comments’, three of which were from residents of Portmore Park Road plus one from Wey Road.

In the first ‘other comment’, a resident states that the proposals at Heath House are not necessary as there are white lines there and no-one parks there anyway, and that in order to be effective the extension of the double yellow lines around the crossing point needs to be at least two more car lengths in each direction.

It is worth considering that introducing more parking restrictions will inevitably cause greater pressure on the surrounding area, and thus we think it appropriate to replace the existing advisory white lines at Heath House with double yellow lines before problems occur.

In the second ‘other comment’ another resident requests the yellow lines are extended to cover the section of raised kerb between Park Villa / York Villa and Milestones to improve visibility from their driveway. They also say – which contradicts the comment above – the yellow lines proposed around Heath House will push cars further up towards their property.

We thank the two residents for their comments in support of the proposals. One of these raised a suggestion that the lines should be extended to Portmore Way, and the other that additional controls were needed near to Chaddesley.

Given the feedback received, we are happy to extend the yellow lines at the crossing point a further car length in the easterly direction.

Any requests for additional controls would need to be considered in a future parking review, for further information please see Annex 3 – General enquiries.

Prince's Road, Hanger Hill – refer to drawing E17

Overview:

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

Analysis

We received four objections from residents of three properties on Hanger Hill, all of which were concerned about losing space that residents or their visitors could use for all day free parking.

One resident also suggested that the proposal would increase traffic speeds.

One complained about scrap vehicles being left at the location – please report abandoned vehicles to the borough council.

Given the objections and overall lack of support for the change, we are happy to cancel this proposal, save for the double yellow lines around the 'inside' of the 'triangle' – see revised drawing.

Pine Grove – refer to drawing E17

Overview:

- Objections: 4 (22%)
- Other comments: 2 (11%)
- Support: 12 (67%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received a strong response to this proposal, including nine comments in support of them from eight properties of Wentworth Dene. The response from Pine Grove residents was more mixed, with four objections, two other comments, and three comments in support from two properties.

The objections were varied, with some on the basis that the lines were not long enough, and some saying that the proposals were too severe and will cause difficulties for residents to have visitors as well as lead to increased traffic speeds.

One objection seemed to indicate a believe the lines should be extended on the north side of the road, whereas two felt the yellow lines needed to be extended on the south side of the road.

Furthermore, two felt the proposed lines on the northern side of the road should be reduced in the area opposite number 35 in order to maintain some capacity for residents and their visitors to park. They also raised suggestions such as a single yellow line or permit parking bays in the space remaining.

One of the 'other comments' supported the proposal but felt more was needed to curb rat running and speeding and to improve safety for pedestrians. Such considerations are outside of the scope of this parking review, please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries.

Given the support for the scheme we have decided to proceed, but change a 10 metre section of the proposed double yellow line to the side of 36 Pine Grove. Please see revised drawing.

Any requests for additional controls would need to be considered in a future parking review, for further information please see Annex 3 – General enquiries.

Queens Road (at Woodview Court) – refer to drawing E17

Overview:

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

Analysis

We received two objections to this proposal, one from a resident of Woodview Court and one from a resident of York Road. The former mentioned that the proposal had been discussed amongst the residents of their building and the general consensus was that double yellow lines for a length of one car would be sufficient to prevent recurrence of two recent accidents. The other objector stated they could not understand the purpose of the proposal, and that the road is wide and the access to Woodview Court already has sufficient sightlines, and proposals will add to parking stress.

The purpose of the proposals is clearly stated in the statement of reasons.

For safety reasons, we will go ahead with the scheme, but reduce the length of double yellow line by five metres. Refer to revised drawing.

Queens Road (bus stop improvements) – refer to drawing E17

Overview:

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

Analysis

We received two objections to this proposal, one from a resident of Woodview Court and one from a resident of York Road. The former stated that the proposals would reduce access to local shops and that the existing stop is rarely used, and that even now when no vehicles are parked and the bus pulls in there is insufficient room for two vehicles to pass.

We believe the bus stop will allow traffic to continue to flow when the bus pulls in. The road is approximately 10.6 metres wide. Allowing 2.1 metres each side for parked vehicles plus 2.5 metres for the bus leaves 3.9 metres, which is insufficient for two way traffic flow. With parking just on the northern side there will be 6 metres for two way traffic flow, which is adequate.

The other objector stated they could not understand the purpose of the proposal, and that the road is wide and the access to Woodview Court already has sufficient sightlines, and proposals will add to parking stress.

The purpose of the proposals is outlined in the statement of reasons, which is to improve bus stop facilities and maintain traffic flow. Currently people wishing to board and alight the bus must do so by navigating their way past park cars which is not safe, difficult, or maybe impossible for those with limited mobility. When the northbound bus stops adjacent to parked vehicles this prevents two way traffic flow causing congestion. As populations destiny increases, it is imperative to make better use of public transport.

South Road – no drawing required

Overview:

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

South Road – refer to drawing F17

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1 (50%)
- Support: 1 (50%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

One resident of South Road wrote to support the proposal and also to check the days of operation of the scheme. We can confirm the advertised proposals was to make the scheme operate every day.

One resident of York Road wrote to confirm that residents of new developments (e.g. the 'Wessex' site) would continue to apply to the amended CPZ. We can confirm this is the case for the Wessex site, but no others in South Road.

York Road, Queens Road – refer to drawing F17

Overview:

- Objections: 3 (30%)
- Other comments: 5 (50%)
- Support: 2 (20%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor amendment.

Analysis

All of the feedback came from residents of York Road.

One residential address outside of the proposed scheme – from which we received two objections - said they had not been considered in the scheme, and that they would have nowhere nearby to park as a result. They also thought that there was no need to introduce the time limited bays as there was already enough space on Queens Road and in the York Road car park.

The other objection from a resident of St James Court said that the scheme needed to be extended to cater for additional residents and also give the opportunity to allow local workers to purchase permits. They also said the car park used to be free and is now charged for, and there should be a free 30 minute period for shoppers to release on street parking capacity. A business owner of York Road made almost identical comments under the 'other comment' category.

The car park is managed by Elmbridge Borough Council and we have no power to adjust its operational conditions, however our understanding is that it is charged in order to encourage turnover of parking space whilst maximising usage. Free parking increases demand, increasing stress on the car park reducing parking opportunities for others, and reducing the attractiveness of other transport modes. The permit scheme planned is already likely to be under relatively high stress due to the number of spaces proposed and properties eligible for a permit. If we were to

expand eligibility criteria this would increase further and ultimately may be unworkable. We have no permit type available for the use of commuters, who would be at the bottom of the hierarchy when it comes to parking priority (below shoppers and residents).

The two letters of support come from two residential addresses included in the proposed scheme.

One 'other comment' said that York Road should be a separate scheme from South Road. We have previously explained why we would not support such an idea at present.

One resident wrote to explain they were concerned the parking bays would block access to their vehicle crossover, and also that they were in the process of applying for a disabled parking bay and that the planned bays would conflict with a disabled bay. We can advise that the planned bays will not block any residential driveways and may actually help stop people overlapping them. We do not think the resident/address in question would meet our criteria for a disabled parking bay.

Two other comments from residents further north along York Road said the scheme should be extended and they should be included so as not to be disadvantaged. The properties further up the street have relatively greater levels of private off street parking so even if we extended the scheme they may not be eligible for permits. Introducing the scheme as it stands would not preclude from being extended in future if the situation warranted it.

Given the support for the scheme, we have decided to go ahead, and add 12A York Road to the list of properties eligible for permits.

St George's Avenue – F18

Overview:

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

Cobham

Redhill Road – refer to drawings E28, E29, E30, E31 and F32

Overview:

- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1 (25%)
- Support: 3 (75%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We thank the residents of two residential addresses in Redhill Road for their comments in support of the proposal.

The 'other comment' stated that the road and footway surface should be renewed before money is spent on yellow lines. Footway and carriageway condition matters are beyond the scope of the parking review, please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries. The footway surface has recently been renewed along part of the road, the costs of which are orders of magnitude greater than yellow lines.

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