

Spelthorne parking review 2022: 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 | 4 |
| Ashford division proposals | 7 |
| Sunbury Common and Ashford Common division proposals | 9 |
| Lower Sunbury and Halliford division proposals..... | 12 |
| Laleham and Shepperton division proposals | 15 |
| Staines division proposals..... | 16 |



Introduction

The Spelthorne Parking Review 2022 proposals, which were agreed at Spelthorne Joint committee on 21 March 2022, and the proposed new electric vehicle recharging point locations, which were agreed by county councillors and the Parking Traffic and Enforcement Team manager in September 2022, were advertised from 14 October to 11 November 2022.

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

The Information was also made available to view at local libraries and council buildings.

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 2022, 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 16 support responses, 3 comment responses and 55 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.

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 [Robert Evans](#).

Stanwell

Long Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-1
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Staines South and Ashford West division proposals

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

Laleham

Berryscroft Road and Templedene Avenue

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-5
- Objections: 8
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed with amendments.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- The parking restrictions will cause displacement putting pressure on other residents.
- Residents require the spaces for themselves as well.
- There is limited parking in this area for residents already without additional restrictions.
- Drivers, including carers, won't be able to stop to pick up or drop off passengers.
- Restrictions will be pointless unless they are enforced regularly.
- Some of the restrictions are being proposed where there is no sight line issue.
- The restrictions would create a blind spot for pedestrians.
- The proposals will make access to a garage impossible.

Analysis

Firstly, it's clear that some objectors have not fully understood the advertised proposals. The points regarding the creation of a blind spot and access to a garage have assumed the restrictions are being revoked on the south side of Berryscroft Road. The proposal is in fact to revoke the existing single yellow line restriction but to replace it with double yellow lines and extending for a new additional length outside numbers 6, 8 and 10.

There is also some misunderstanding as to the legalities of double yellow lines, as drivers are allowed to stop on these restrictions to allow passengers to board and alight or to load or unload goods. Drivers are however not allowed to wait on these restrictions, hence no waiting at any time.

The advertised restriction layout was initially put forward by Surrey Highways following a complete assessment of the vicinity in front of the school in between and including the two junctions on either side of the entrance. This assessment was carried out as part of the scheme to install three new uncontrolled pedestrian crossings which are now in place, considering sight line requirements for those pedestrian crossings, as well as sight lines for drivers and general two-way traffic flow outside the school. Surrey's parking team carried out its own additional assessment of the proposed restrictions and deemed them to be necessary for these same reasons.

It is an offence to park within 10 metres of a bend or junction under the Highway Code, and residents with properties located on bends or junctions are not exempt from this rule. Double yellow lines proposed on the junction with Templedene Avenue leave a car length space after the junction area up to the start of the driveway to number 113, but parking on the junction itself is hazardous and highly obstructive to road users, which is why it is prohibited in the Highway Code.

Regarding the proposed double yellow line outside numbers 6,8 and 10, whilst these were deemed to be necessary as part of Surrey Highways' assessment for the new pedestrian crossings, it is evident that these restrictions are not as crucial as the other proposed lengths for sight line and traffic flow reasons, and **therefore it is decided not to proceed with this specific additional length** extending from the end of the existing school keep clear marking.

Bingham Drive (Electric Vehicles)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0133
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Gloucester Crescent (Electric Vehicles)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 01132
- Objections: 10
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Residents and visitors already struggle to find space as it is.
- These spaces are used by residents who don't have electric cars.
- This would negatively impact on residents living nearby and their guests.
- Chargers would be better in Edinburgh Drive by the parade of shops.
- Parking is already difficult for those without driveways or more than one car.
- Residents will need to park further away from their homes which isn't as convenient or safe.
- This would negatively impact on disabled and elderly residents.
- Displacement parking would cause issues elsewhere.
- Residents cannot afford electric cars here.
- Chargers outside people's homes would look unsightly.

Analysis

Following the number of objections to this location and the lack of comments in support, it is decided not to proceed with charge points at this location.

Ashford

Station Crescent

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-6
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Queens Walk

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-6
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Ashford division proposals

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

Ashford

Feltham Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-7
- Objections: 8
- Comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- A red route would prevent deliveries / loading and unloading.
- A red route would prevent people being picked up and dropped off, especially the elderly and disabled.
- This will negatively impact on already struggling businesses.
- The parking problems here are only caused by one company with vans.
- Parking restrictions would cause displacement to nearby streets.

The comment requested for the lines to be extended up to the junction with Chattern Road.

Analysis

Firstly, it's clear that many objectors have misunderstood or not fully seen or read the information that was provided during the advertisement. A red route has not been proposed or advertised here. Double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) have been proposed, and drivers are allowed to stop on these restrictions to load or unload goods, or to pick up or drop off passengers. A red line is used on our plans to indicate 'no waiting at any time' as referred to in the plan's key. The statement of reasons document provided online during the advert refers to double yellow lines and there was not any mention of a red route (no stopping) restriction in any documents we provided.

In the time leading up to the parking review assessment of this location, we received complaints and photographs of the highly obstructive footway parking taking place here, which not only included photos of vans, but also cars parked side by side after dark preventing anyone from being able to pass without going into the busy main road. We have also seen instances of cars parked heavily on the footway whilst cars are also parked directly in front of the shops up to back of the footway, leaving less than a metre of space in between the two cars, which is also highly obstructive. Therefore, it is not accepted that this issue is solely being caused by vans belonging to one company.

Whilst it is an offence to obstruct a footway to the point where people cannot get past, on unrestricted sections of road such as this, it is only enforceable by Surrey police. However, the police have extremely low resources to deal with ongoing parking type offences and often advise members of the public to raise the issue with their local council to take permanent action.

For enforcement to be carried out by our enforcement officers, traffic regulation orders are required to be in place. Therefore a 'no waiting at any time' restriction and traffic order has been proposed and advertised here. Having road markings in place (double yellow lines) will also highlight to

drivers that they should not be parking here in the first place, unless to load or unload or to pick up or drop off passengers.

Regarding the request for the restrictions to be extended, this would need to be considered as part of a future parking review following an assessment of the restrictions.

Park Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-7
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Sunbury Common and Ashford Common division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Harry Boparai](#).

Ashford

Doris Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-8
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The comment related to there being no point in further restrictions if the additional restrictions on the junction are not enforced.

Analysis

Enforcement of restrictions by schools is carried out on a rotational basis, as the limited number of enforcement officers cannot be at all schools in the borough at the same peak times. Therefore, enforcement will be taking place but shared with other schools in the borough as and when possible.

Chertsey Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-8
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- The restrictions will prevent residents from unloading shopping.
- The restrictions will prevent residents from having deliveries.
- The restrictions will negatively impact residents, especially those without drives.
- The restrictions will make it difficult for residents to have visitors.
- The restrictions will make it difficult for disabled drivers.
- The bus stops are rarely used.

Analysis

Double yellow lines allow drivers to stop to load or unload goods, or to pick up or drop off passengers. Whilst it is understood that there will be an impact on parking for nearby residents and visitors, as stated in the statement of reasons document, these restrictions are required to maintain footway access along this section of Chertsey Road (which at times is completely obstructed for some users) and to maintain access to the bus stop, as well as improving traffic flow in the vicinity of the roundabout.

Sunbury

Saddlebrook Park

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-9
- Objections: 6
- Comments: 0
- Support: 4
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- The restriction will reduce property prices.
- The restriction will inconvenience residents and visitors.
- Parking is already limited enough in Saddlebrook Park as it is.
- There is no issue with refuse lorries or very rarely an issue.
- The restriction will increase vehicle speeds round the corner where children play outside.
- Most residents have more than one car and need to park on-street.
- Residents will be forced to park on nearby roads.

Analysis

As stated in the statement of reasons document, due to Saddlebrook Park being an 'S' bend for its entire length, there is no part of the street suitable for on-street parking, except within the parking layby at the end of the street. However, it is understood that residents and their visitors need to have some space on-street, and this proposal is prioritising a key point for traffic.

Whilst it is understood why drivers park on the south side by the shortest section of the dead end and have done so for a large number of years, drivers additionally parking on the north side by the longer section of dead end is not understood, as this is highly obstructive for all drivers negotiating this 90 degree turn and also completely blocks access along the footway leading to the multiple properties located on this side, which is anti-social. In addition to obstructing turning, it also greatly inhibits the ability of drivers to see any vehicles approaching round the corner, or indeed any pedestrians. This proposal aimed to target this key corner only to keep any loss of space for residents down to a minimum, and the need to park on-street should not jeopardise the turning, access, sight lines and road safety of other road users.

Regarding speed, this is not the type of location where drivers would be able to drive excessively, and parking on the north corner has not always taken place as it has on the south side of the corner, therefore the restrictions are aiming to return the street to how it used to be here and before complaints about parking on this corner were being submitted to the council.

Windmill Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-10
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Brooklands Close

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-10
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Lower Sunbury and Halliford division proposals

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

Sunbury

Nursery Road junction with Sutherland Avenue and Beverley Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-11
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Parents parking for the school have nowhere else to go.
- Parking restrictions will impact on residents and visitors parking on the footway.
- Parking restrictions will prevent deliveries.

The comment requested for the restrictions to be extended up to Stratton Road.

Analysis

It is already an offence to park within 10m of a junction under the Highway Code and the proposed restrictions are aiming to maintain sight lines, access, and road safety on this busy crossroads junction. Double yellow lines prevent waiting on the carriageway and the footway that they are adjacent too, therefore drivers will not be allowed to park on the footway next to the proposed double yellow lines. It should be noted that parking off the carriageway by a junction still restricts sight lines for drivers approaching junctions.

It is understood that parking is difficult in this area during school peak times, but this parking should not jeopardise the safety of other road users. Whilst double yellow lines allow drivers to stop to pick up or drop off passengers, or to load or unload goods, that would not be advisable on a junction as it should be kept clear at all times to maintain sight lines and access for all road users.

No additional restrictions along Nursery Road can be considered at this stage.

Heathlands Close

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-11
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Not aware of any parking problems here.
- No issues for refuse collection lorries.
- No pedestrians use this footpath.
- The water service covers are rarely parked over and should have been placed off the public highway.

- Parking in this area is already difficult, especially at school peak times.
- Parking will displace to Green Street.
- Any parking issues on Heathlands Close are caused by large vans on the north side.
- Residents with no off-street parking need to park on-street.

Analysis

Since 2010, several different residents have logged requests for double yellow lines to be introduced on the south side of Heathlands Close, to prevent parking on both sides to maintain access in and out of the street, for drivers and pedestrians. Residents have also submitted photos showing several different cars parked over the water service covers, which are also next to another service box cover that is parked over as well.

The carriageway of Heathlands Close is less than 4m wide and not suitable for on-street parking on either side. Drivers know this, and so they park as heavily on the footways as possible to keep the already narrow carriageway clear. Whilst parking on one side of this street is understandable, parking on both sides is not, as both footways are completely impassable as a result, and the narrow carriageway width is reduced even further by around half a metre on either side by overhanging vehicles, leaving less than 3m of carriageway remaining for vehicles to squeeze through. The issues residents have been reporting over the past 12 years do not coincide with all the points made in the objections, and often state the opposite.

There is no doubt that parking on both sides is excessive here on this incredibly narrow street, especially with the footways being impassable and with the reduced carriageway widths explained, and there is evidence of parking entirely obstructing the water service covers and service box, which would never be relocated to facilitate footway parking. Therefore, the restrictions are necessary here, and will resolve the longstanding history of complaints regarding parking on the south side.

Blacksmith Close junction with Anvil Road and Forge Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-12
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

French Street junction with Lower Hampton Road, Elizabeth Gardens and The Pennards

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-13
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- The restrictions will cause displacement into Elizabeth Gardens which already has parking issues.
- The restrictions will mean those picking up and dropping off for the infant school will need to walk further, which is difficult with young children.

Analysis

Whilst the preference to park close to schools is understood, especially with young children, this parking should not jeopardise the safety of other road users, including others with young children. Parking by the junction with Elizabeth Gardens and by the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing obstructs sight lines for both drivers and pedestrians, as well as impacting on passing traffic, and it is already prohibited under the Highway Code not to parking within 10m of a junction. The majority of the proposed double yellow lines aim to keep the junction and the crossing point clear, and the proposed restrictions outside the school between the school keep clear marking and the junction with Lower Hampton Road aim to maintain footway access and traffic flow on this side, where parking sometimes causes people into the carriageway to pass.

Whilst it is understood that this wider area, including nearby Elizabeth Gardens, is difficult for parking, the priority for double yellow lines is to maintain access, sight lines and road safety where it is most important to do so, and these restrictions are necessary here to achieve this.

The Avenue Parade

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-13
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Laleham and Shepperton division proposals

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

Shepperton

Hetherington Road (North) junction with Charlton Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-14
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Studios Road and Squires Bridge Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-15
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Manygate Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-16
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Walton Bridge Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-17
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Walton Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-18
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Staines division proposals

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

Staines

Link Road (Formerly Furlong Road)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-2
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

London Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-3
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Allyn Close junction with Penton Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-4
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Commercial Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2022-4
- Objections: 9
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Parking here is already difficult in this densely populated street.
- Restrictions will cause displacement to other residential streets.
- With the existing restrictions already in place, and with all the existing driveway dropped kerbs, residents without off street parking already struggle to park near to their homes.
- Drivers often mount the kerbs to pass even though there is space to pull in at the time and the passing place will not stop this from happening.
- Other traffic management and speed measures should be considered instead, including a one-way system.
- The restrictions will make it harder for residents with disabilities to park near to their homes.

- Additional restrictions on the south side will create conflict between residents trying to park.
- The residents are being penalised in favour of passing traffic.
- The restrictions should only apply during the day.

Analysis

As explained in the statement of reasons document, the passing place prioritised the end closest to the Laleham Road junction, which is very slightly narrower than the rest of the street and the most problematic for passing traffic. However, it is understood that the proposed passing place would not resolve all the issues in this part of Commercial Road between Laleham Road and Octavia Way, and the issue with some drivers mounting the footway to pass would likely continue on other parts of the street, away from the passing place, during busy periods.

From a traffic point of view, there would ideally be three passing places between Octavia Way and Laleham Road on the south side, as the onus is on drivers travelling towards Laleham Road to pull over to let oncoming traffic pass, as the parking 'obstruction' is on their side. However, it was fully understood that this total loss of space would not be accepted by the local community, and therefore the most important location of the three was proposed nearest Laleham Road, as explained.

Whilst this passing place is still deemed to be necessary here, and of a good length and in the right place, it is known that in addition to the objections received, many Commercial Road residents also expressed their disapproval of the proposed passing place restriction at a meeting with Surrey Highways and the local county councillor in September 2022, prior to the advertisement. It is also understood that Surrey Highways are looking into the traffic issues on Commercial Road separately.

Taking all of this into account, as well as there being no record of any support, **it is decided not to proceed with the proposed double yellow line passing place.**

Note: The amendment to the Traffic Regulation Order plan only to reflect the correct termination point on the ground of the existing double yellow lines by the junction with Laleham Road (shown on the plan as a small zigzag) will go ahead to ensure the TRO plan reflects the existing restriction layout.

Richmond Road (Electric Vehicles)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 0121
- Objections: 6
- Comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Parking is already difficult enough for residents on Richmond Road without losing spaces to EV only.
- Many non-residents park on Richmond Road for the town and railway station, which already makes finding space difficult.
- Permit parking should be considered before any parking for electric vehicles.
- Not everyone can afford electric cars yet.
- The on-street parking space is already not enough for residents.
- Other streets such as Laleham Road have more space for EV bays.

Analysis

Providing a cleaner and healthier environment is a top priority for Surrey County Council. One consideration for the transition in favour of a cleaner environment is providing electric vehicle charge point infrastructure for residents. The proposed electric vehicle bays would only be restricted to electric vehicles during specific daytime hours, allowing any vehicle to park outside of these hours.