

Mole Valley parking review 2021 / 2022: Decisions report

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

The Mole Valley parking review 2021/2022 proposals, which were agreed at the Mole Valley local committee on 29 September 2021, were advertised from 11 November 2021 for a period of 28 days. As part of this process, street notices were erected at each location and notification cards were posted to those properties immediately adjacent to the proposed changes. In addition, letters were sent to all properties that would be affected by proposed resident permit schemes and a formal notice was published in the press.

All of these documents referred members of the public to drawings and a statement of reasons available online via our [Mole Valley parking review 2021-2022](#) webpage.

Responses to the advertisement were received via an online form through the webpage, by email or by letter. Responses had to be received by Thursday 9 December 2021.

During the advertising period we received 409 responses, of these, 97 were in support of the proposals, 282 were objections and another 30 were additional comments. All responses have been read and considered in full. For the purpose of this report the responses have been summarised and a decision on how to proceed following these considered responses.

The decisions made in the 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 Mole Valley.

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



Contents

Ashtead division proposals	4
Ashtead	4
Chaffers Mead and Mead End	4
Greville Park Road and Gayton Close	4
Greville Park Road.....	4
Grange Road and Blades Close	4
Ermyn Way and Hatherwood	5
Woodfield Lane	5
Leatherhead and Fetcham East division proposals	7
Leatherhead	7
Teazlewood Park	7
Sandes Place.....	7
Aperdele Road	7
Cleeve Road and Gaveston Road	7
Linden Road.....	7
Highlands Road	8
Upper Fairfield Road.....	8
Upper Fairfield Road.....	8
Cophthorne Road EV bays	8
Church Street EV bays	9
Bookham and Fetcham West division proposals	10
Fetcham	10
Penrose Road and Copperfields.....	10
Eastwick Road	10
Beales Road and Oveton Way.....	10
The Spinney.....	10
Cobham Road EV bays	10
Dorking Hills division proposals	12
Mickleham	12
Old London Road.....	12
London Road slip road.....	12
Westhumble	12
Chapel Lane and Westhumble Street	12
Abinger	13
Felday Road.....	13
Dorking	13

Ansell Road.....	13
London Road EV bays	13
Pixham Lane EV bays.....	13
Dorking Rural division proposals.....	14
Brockham	14
A25 Reigate Road and Brockham Lane.....	14
Beare Green.....	14
Old Horsham Road	14
Charlwood	14
Chapel Road and Swan Lane	14
Dorking South and Holmwoods division proposals	15
Dorking	15
Vincent Road, South Street	15
Rose Hill	15
Knoll Road	15
Tollgate Road.....	15
Glebe Road.....	16
Arundel Road, Howard Road	16
Holmesdale	16
Holmsdale Road, Holmbury Drive, Abinger Close, Shelwood Drive and Spook Hill	16
Harrow Road East EV bays	16
Holmesdale Road EV bays	17

Ashtead division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Chris Townsend](#).

Ashtead

Chaffers Mead and Mead End

Feedback:

- Objections: 39
- Support: 1
- Other comments: 1
- Final decision is not to proceed with this proposal

Analysis:

The proposal was to introduce double yellow lines on the junction to prevent obstructive parking and improve access to and from Mead End. The consensus is that this proposal will greatly reduce the amount of parking available for residents in the road and that the perceived issues do not exist. This proposal was shown on drawing number 1.

Greville Park Road and Gayton Close

Feedback:

- Objections: 1
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

The proposal was to introduce double yellow lines on the junction to prevent obstructive parking and improve access to and from Mead End. The objection is asking where parents should park when dropping children off at school, however parking on a junction is not a safe option for any drivers and the proposal will not significantly reduce parking in the area. This proposal was shown on drawing number 2.

Greville Park Road

Feedback:

- Support: 1
- Other comments: 1
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

The proposal was to introduce a single yellow line restriction operating from Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6pm, on the south western side between Park Road and The Street. The feedback suggested that more restrictions are needed on Greville Close. This proposal was shown on drawing 2.

Grange Road and Blades Close

Feedback:

- Objections: 34
- Other comments: 8
- Support: 21
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

Following receipt of a petition, we had been asked to introduce a single yellow line restriction operating from Monday to Friday 8am to 10am and 2pm to 4pm in order to prevent inconsiderate and obstructive parking around school drop off and pick up times. The current parking situation means that traffic often backs up onto Leatherhead Road causing traffic on Leatherhead Road to back up. This proposal also includes double yellow lines at the junctions, to improve forward visibility, at all times.

Following discussions with the local schools the SCC councillor for the area has considered, with the parking team, that the best and safest option is to proceed with the proposals. Some of the objections were for additional restrictions in Grangemount, however those cannot be added at this stage. This proposal was shown on drawing 3 and 4.

Ermyn Way and Hatherwood**Feedback:**

- Objections: 4
- Other comments: 6
- Support: 3
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

Introduce double yellow lines at the junction of Hatherwood and Ermyn Way to prevent obstructive parking, improve access and increase forward visibility. Extend the double yellow lines on Ermyn Way, from their current end point to the boundary of the properties known as The Crossways and Wimbers. Most comments feel that the restrictions do not go far enough, however we cannot introduce additional restrictions at this stage. This proposal was shown on drawing 4.

Woodfield Lane**Feedback:**

- Objections: 2 including a petition (with 18 signatories)
- Support: 1
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

Extend the current double yellow lines across the length of the existing parking bay opposite Pond Place and number 63 Woodfield Lane. This is because, what was a time limited bay, is now being abused by drivers parking all day causing an obstruction for vehicles on that section of road. The time limited bay worked well whilst the shop was in place but following the new development this is being abused.

The objection cited problems receiving deliveries and unloading shopping. The main points in the petition were that the council should protect residents of Craddocks Parade flats and 88-70 Woodfield Lane and provide them with somewhere to park on street, that the parking bays were in the widest point of Woodfield Lane where parking had been taking place for twenty years, that the bays were not being abused, but drivers parked there all day because of a lack of signs and that there are an insufficient number of electric vehicle charging points in Ashted and the parking bays would be a good location for some more.

The expression of support mentioned that vehicles parking in the space where the bays are caused congestion, obstructed sightlines for drivers coming off the roundabout and caused cars to mount the pavement to allow two way traffic flow.

Deliveries and loading/unloading can still take place on double yellow lines and the single yellow line will remain in front of the cottages. The bays were never somewhere that local residents could park all day and highways are intended primarily for the passage of vehicles, not as somewhere to park. Although some of the bays are at a wider part of the road, it is not really an appropriate location for them, for the reasons mentioned in the expression of support, and their purpose – to provide short term parking for customers of the adjacent shops – is no longer valid. While it is true that the bays were being abused by all day parking because the signs had been removed during the redevelopment and not been replaced after it was completed, that all day parking served to highlight that it is not a suitable location for vehicles to be parked, whether for long or short periods or while their batteries are being recharged.

The county council, as the highway authority, aims to provide for the safe flow of traffic along the highway, which is compromised by vehicles parked in the bays. The decision is to proceed as advertised for safety reasons. This proposal was shown on drawing 11.

Leatherhead and Fetcham East division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Tim Hall](#).

Leatherhead

Teazlewood Park

Feedback:

- Objections: 1
- Support: 10
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Introduce double yellow lines on the first bend as you enter Teazlewood Park from Kingston Road. This is to improve access for all vehicles, especially refuse and emergency vehicles and improve forward visibility. Due to the overwhelming support, the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown on drawing 5.

Sandes Place

Feedback:

- No feedback received
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Introduce double yellow lines on the bend adjacent to number 23 to prevent obstructive parking, improve access and increase forward visibility. As no feedback has been received, we will proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown on drawing 6.

Aperdele Road

Feedback:

- Objections: 1
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

This proposal is to remove the existing school keep clear markings as they are now redundant and no longer required, so the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown on drawing 7.

Cleeve Road and Gaveston Road

Feedback:

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 4
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Introduce double yellow lines at the junction to facilitate better movement throughout the junction, to prevent obstructive parking, improve access and increase forward visibility. The percentage of support is higher than the objections, so the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. The proposal was shown on drawing 8.

Linden Road

Feedback:

- Objections: 3
- Other comments: 1

- Support: 6
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

To introduce a residents permit scheme after having received a signed petition, to enable residents to park near to their properties, as they currently have little or no off street facilities available. This scheme would operate from Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm. All of the objections come from residents of Middle Road, with support from the residents of Linden Road and the other comment asking for inclusion in the scheme as they have access through Linden Road. The proposal was shown on drawing 9.

Highlands Road

Feedback:

- Objections: 1
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Following the introduction of a residents permit scheme on Highlands Road in 2021, the residents have asked that we introduce an additional parking bay to the west of the buildout near Highlands Avenue. The objection was stating that it is currently difficult for staff to park for a local business in Leatherhead, however this would be a new bay and not one that could previously have been used for parking, so the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. The proposals are shown on drawing 10.

Upper Fairfield Road

Feedback:

- Objections: 8
- Final decision is not to proceed with this proposal

To introduce a new parking bay as an extension of the existing resident permit scheme on Upper Fairfield Road, adjacent to numbers 36 and 38 Upper Fairfield Road. Objections mainly came from Middle Road, who state that this will reduce on street parking for them. One objection also came from one of the properties that the proposal was put forward for, so the decision has been made not to proceed. This proposal is shown on drawing 9.

Upper Fairfield Road

Feedback:

- No feedback received
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Convert the existing disabled parking bays at the end of Upper Fairfield Road, near Leret Way, to time limited bays, operating Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6pm, 2 hours, no return 1 hour. This is because the access to these bays is not suitable for disabled users and the bays remain unused. As no feedback was received, the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. This proposal is shown on drawing 9.

Copthorne Road EV bays

Feedback:

- No feedback received
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

As no objections were received, the decision has been made to proceed as advertised, with the best location being on the western side. This proposal was shown on drawing 2 of the Leatherhead electric vehicle bay plans.

Church Street EV bays

Feedback:

- Support: 2
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

As we have only received comments of support, the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown on drawing 2 of the Leatherhead electric vehicle bay plans.

Bookham and Fetcham West division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Clare Curran](#).

Fetcham

Penrose Road and Copperfields

Feedback:

- No feedback received
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

Introduce double yellow lines on both corners and opposite at the junction with Penrose Road to prevent obstructive parking and improve access to and from Copperfields. As no feedback has been received, we will proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown in drawing 12.

Eastwick Road

Feedback:

- Support: 3
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Extend the recently installed double yellow lines, across the access to Highfield Court and close the gap obstructive parking on pavement. All feedback is in support of these proposals. This proposal was shown in drawing 13.

Beales Road and Oveton Way

Feedback:

- No feedback received
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Introduce double yellow lines on the junction to prevent obstructive parking and improve access to and from Oveton Way. As no feedback has been received, we will proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown in drawing 14.

The Spinney

Feedback:

- Support: 1
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Introduce double yellow lines up to and opposite the driveway of number 1 Eastwick Drive to improve access to driveway and prevent obstructive parking. This proposal was shown in drawing 35.

Cobham Road EV bays

Feedback:

- Objection: 3
- Other comments: 2
- Final decision not to proceed

The feedback suggests that the bays would be better located further along the shopping parade, rather than outside Sainsbury's. The final decision is not to proceed.

Dorking Hills division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Hazel Watson](#).

Mickleham

Old London Road

Feedback:

- Objection: 1
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 6
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Introduce a series of double yellow lines along various sections of the road to prevent obstructive parking. Following the ease of Lockdown, visitors to the Box Hill area have parked inconsiderately causing issues with bus routes, access for residents and potential access for emergency vehicles, especially in areas where the carriageway is narrow. As the majority of the feedback is in support of the proposals, the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown in drawings 15, 16, 17 and 18.

London Road slip road

Feedback:

- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 8
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Introduce double yellow lines along both sides of the access road, from The Stepping Stones, southwards towards Pixham Lane. Access to this road has been reduced significantly by visitors to Box Hill and The Stepping Stones, meaning residents cannot gain access to private driveways and other larger vehicles, such as emergency vehicles cannot traverse the road. The other comment and objection are asking where visitors to Box Hill should park. This road has a limited width and cannot accommodate parked cars as well as allowing access, therefore the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown in drawings 22 and 23.

Westhumble

Chapel Lane and Westhumble Street

Feedback:

- Objections: 20
- Other comments: 3
- Support: 11
- Decision is to proceed with amendments

Introduce double yellow lines along the length of Chapel Road, Boxhill and Westhumble Station and the Burney Road junction. This is due to visitors to the local sites parking inconsiderately and reducing the width of the carriageway significantly, preventing access for residents and any potential emergency vehicles. Following the feedback received it is recommended that we proceed with amendments. We will proceed with restrictions on both sides of Chapel Lane from Chaucer Cottage to Tudor Cottage (Pilgrims Way entrance)

where almost all the residents along this stretch of road are in favour of the proposed restrictions and alongside the verge on the north side of Westhumble Street only from the Cleveland Court building, across the vehicular entrance to Cleveland Court, up to and across the point the pavement crosses Westhumble Street (opposite Mulberry Cottage) where, again, the residents on this stretch of road are in favour of such restrictions. These restrictions can be justified on the grounds of necessary road safety. This is a reduced proposal, recognising the 11 supporters of the proposals whilst taking account of the objection to the waiting restrictions throughout the village. These proposals are shown on the revised drawings 19 and 20.

Abinger

Felday Road

Feedback:

- Support: 3
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Introduce double yellow lines on both sides from the end of the existing yellow lines, southwards to the access to Moorland Cottages. This is to remove obstructive parking, which was highlighted throughout the recent pandemic. Following support for this proposal, it has been decided to proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown in drawing 32.

Dorking

Ansell Road

Feedback:

- No comments received
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Include residents of Kian Court into the existing resident permit scheme. What was 'Forge House' listed in the traffic order, has now been converted into flats and renamed Kian Court. As there were no objections, the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. There was no drawing for this proposal.

London Road EV bays

Feedback:

- Objection: 1
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

As we have only received one objection but feel that this bay will benefit the community as a whole, therefore the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown on drawing 1 of the Dorking electric vehicle bay plans.

Pixham Lane EV bays

Feedback:

- Objections: 9
- Other comments: 1
- Final decision is not to proceed

As we have received mostly objections from residents concerned about the current lack of parking, the decision has been made not to proceed with this proposal. This proposal was shown on drawing 1 of the Dorking electric vehicle bay plans.

Dorking Rural division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Helyn Clack](#).

Brockham

A25 Reigate Road and Brockham Lane

Feedback:

- Objections: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

Introduce double yellow lines on the junction to prevent obstructive parking and improve access to and from Brockham Lane. The objection is from a local resident who favours parking in the area, whilst the support is from the local parish council, who are happy with the proposals, but would like them to go further. This proposal was shown in drawing 24.

Beare Green

Old Horsham Road

Feedback:

- Objections: 68
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision is not to proceed

Analysis:

Introduce double yellow lines between Greenfields Place and the A24 Horsham Road. The approach to this junction is hindered by parked cars and is used by large farm machinery, as well as buses and HGVs. The approach to the A24 is often hindered.

Also introduce a 20 minute loading bay that operates from Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm to formalise the existing loading area layby. Due to the overwhelming number of objections to these proposals, we have decided not to proceed. This proposal was shown in drawing 33.

Charlwood

Chapel Road and Swan Lane

Feedback:

- Objections: 20
- Other comments: 3
- Support: 11
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

Introduce double yellow lines on the junction to prevent obstructive parking and improve access to and from Swan Lane. After discussions with the local councillor it has been decided to proceed as advertised, but to look at the area more closely to assess the parking issues and requirements. This proposal was shown in drawing 34.

Dorking South and Holmwoods division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Stephen Cooksey](#).

Dorking

Vincent Road, South Street

Feedback:

- Objections: 14
- The final decision is not to proceed with these proposals

Analysis:

Introduce double yellow lines on South Street prior to the junction and on the northern side of Vincent Road across the access of number 118 South Street. This is to facilitate access to the parking bays that run adjacent to the building line of number 118 South Street and the vehicular access behind the same property. The objections describe how valuable parking would be removed from this area if the proposals were to go ahead. This proposal was shown in drawing 25.

Rose Hill

Feedback:

- Other comments: 1
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

Introduce double yellow lines on the northern corner of Rose Hill and the access to Rose Hill Lodge, to prevent obstructive parking and improve site lines when exiting on to Rose Hill. The other comment suggested that further restrictions are needed on the opposite corner, which we cannot introduce at this stage. This proposal was shown in drawing 25.

Knoll Road

Feedback:

- Objections: 4
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision is not to proceed

Analysis:

Introduce double yellow lines on the junction to prevent obstructive parking and improve access to and from Roman Road (private road). It was felt that introducing restrictions at this location would be detrimental to resident parking in the area and that the junction is very wide and no obstructions are caused by parked cars. This proposal was shown in drawing 26.

Tollgate Road

Feedback:

- Objections: 3
- Support: 1
- Final decision is not to proceed

Analysis:

Reinstate double yellow lines that were removed a few years ago. Access to Martineau Drive is restricted by parking opposite. The objections state that the restrictions were removed to facilitate more parking for residents and that it should remain that way. The road is not so heavily traffic as to cause major obstructions to those exiting Martineau Drive. This proposal was shown in drawing 27.

Glebe Road**Feedback:**

- No comments received
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

Include residents of Sondes Farm in the existing residents permit scheme, to enable them to purchase permits. Although they have some private off-street parking, they do not have enough or any parking for visitors. We have had a few requests recently from Sondes Farm residents asking to be included within the scheme. No feedback was received, so we are proceeding with the proposals as advertised. No drawing for this proposal.

Arundel Road, Howard Road**Feedback:**

- No comments received
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Analysis:

Include the resident of 36 Mount Street in the existing residents permit scheme. They do not have any off-street parking available. No feedback was received, so we are proceeding with the proposals as advertised. No drawing for this proposal.

Holmesdale**Holmsdale Road, Holmbury Drive, Abinger Close, Shelwood Drive and Spook Hill****Feedback:**

- Objections: 49
- Other: 2
- Support: 8
- Final decision is not to proceed with these proposals

Analysis:

There were various proposals for double yellow lines throughout the area, but due to the high number of objections to these proposals it has been decided not to progress any of the proposals on drawings 28, 29, 30 and 31, as it is felt by residents that this will greatly reduce available parking in the area.

Harrow Road East EV bays**Feedback:**

- Objections: 2
- Support: 1

- Final decision is not to proceed

Following the objections and further analysis of the area, we believe that this may no longer be suitable, therefore the decision has been made not to proceed. This proposal was shown on drawing 1 of the Dorking electric vehicle bay plans.

Holmesdale Road EV bays

Feedback:

- Objections: 4
- Support: 1
- Final decision is to proceed as advertised

Following feedback from the county and district councillors the decision has been made to proceed as advertised. This proposal was shown on drawing 1 of the Dorking electric vehicle bay plans.