

Waverley parking review 2024: Decision report

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

Contents

Introduction	2
Farnham North division proposals.....	3
Farnham Central division proposals.....	5
Farnham South division proposals	7
Haslemere division proposals	8
Godalming South, Milford and Witley division proposals.....	9
Godalming North division proposals.....	12
Waverley Eastern Villages division proposals	16
Cranleigh and Ewhurst division proposals	17

Introduction

The Waverley Parking Review 2024 proposals, which were agreed by county councillors and the Parking Traffic and Enforcement Team manager in October 2024, were advertised from 1 August to 29 August 2025.

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 Advertiser.

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/waverleyparking

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: Waverley Parking Review 2024, 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 71 support responses, 13 comment responses and 129 objections (plus two objection petitions). 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 Waverley](#).

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.

Farnham North division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Catherine Powell](#).

Farnham

Rowhills (Private) (by junction with Upper Weybourne Lane)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-01
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection referred to the proposal solving one small problem but creating larger problems elsewhere regarding parking for residents outside their properties and regarding visitor parking for the football club etc.

Analysis

The Highway Code already prohibits parking within 10m of a junction and this proposal for double yellow lines on the junction extending into Rowhills will allow the council to enforce this parking. It is understood that residents on the opposite side of the road on Upper Weybourne Lane can sometimes struggle to park outside their properties, and on football match and sports days the influx of visitors puts further strain on parking in the area. However, the displacement from this relatively short length of additional double yellow lines will be minimal and is not expected to significantly exacerbate these current issues. Ultimately parking on a junction is highly obstructive and dangerous, which is why it is prohibited in the Highway Code, and this needs to be a priority for this location.

Brooklands Road (Private) junction with Upper Weybourne Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-02
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 16
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection referred to the following points: -

- Parking has been taking place outside properties here historically for a very long time and does not cause any safety or visibility issues.
- The restrictions will displace parking further down the road affecting visibility elsewhere and where the road is narrower.
- There is a curve on the junction which helps to maintain sight lines.

Analysis

The objection stating that there is no issue with sight lines on this junction is in stark contrast to the large number of support responses which clearly state that there are. These are in addition to the complaints originally received prior to the parking review regarding safety and sight lines, and in addition to our own site assessments at this junction. The Highway Code also prevents parking within 10m of any junction for sight line and road safety reasons, and no junction is an exception to this rule. Whilst it is true that curved junctions naturally provide better visibility splays than right

angled junctions, the curve itself (if kept clear of parking) does not maintain adequate sight lines, which is why double yellow line proposals often extend beyond the curve, as is the case here. Prior to the parking review, photographs were submitted showing parked vehicles also on the curve of the junction. Whilst the restrictions will displace parked vehicles further along the straight section of Upper Weybourne Lane (which has the same carriageway width) this is not expected to cause issues elsewhere, and the road junction itself must be the priority.

Upper Hale Road (by junction with Ball and Wicket Lane)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-03
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Bankside junction with Weybourne Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-04
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- This space is needed by residents of the cottages.
- The issue is mainly with school parking.

Analysis

Whilst it is understood that school parking becomes very heavy in this area during pick up and drop off times, the proposed double yellow lines cover the junction itself, where drivers should not be parking nor viewing as being parking spaces. The Highway Code already prohibits parking within 10m of a junction. The carriageway outside the cottages on Weybourne Road is not being restricted, only the junction is, with the double yellow lines terminating at the start of the vehicular dropped kerb for number 72 Weybourne Road.

Lea Close junction with Lower Weybourne Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-05
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 5
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

St Georges Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-06
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 24
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Farnham Central division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Andy MacLeod](#).

Farnham

Threadneedle Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-07
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Waverley Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-08
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Weydon Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-09
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection stated that this proposal will do nothing to resolve the issues by Highfield School and the footway parking by the junction with Talbot Road needs to be prevented.

Analysis

The detailed reasons for the revocation of the school keep clear on Weydon Lane are as stated in the statement of reasons document. The existing double yellow lines by the Talbot Road junction with Weydon Lane apply to the entire width of the footway also, but it is understood drivers park here at school times and enforcement is needed to help to deter this.

Talbot Road junction with Ryle Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-09
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The comment stated the proposals do not go far enough and there should be a school keep clear opposite the entrance to the school on Ryle Road as well.

Analysis

It is appreciated there are a lot of parking issues in this area, especially during school peak times, however the proposal is still a significant extent of double yellow lines for the junction to try and prevent the footway parking which has been occurring here for a long time now. Regarding an additional school keep clear, these are only supposed to be used across school entrances and not on the opposite side of the road unless the road is very narrow, which it isn't considered to be here. Double yellow lines opposite the existing school keep clear, which is also the inside of the bend, could be considered here in the future.

Fox Yard (Private)

Overview:

- Drawing number: No Drawing.
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

30 The Borough

Overview:

- Drawing number: No Drawing.
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Whitebines (Private) Located off The Fairfield

Overview:

- Drawing number: No Drawing.
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Woolmead (New Residential Development)

Overview:

- Drawing number: No Drawing.
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Farnham South division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Michaela Martin](#).

Farnham

Weydon Lane junction with The Old Orchard

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-10
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Wey Meadow Close (Private) junction with Wrecclesham Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-11
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Dene Lane

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-12
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Haslemere division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [John Robini](#).

Haslemere

King's Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-13
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The comment referred to the unrestricted length of carriageway to the west of the priority system where a long line of commuter vehicles and others park, with reference to this parking causing obstructions to two-way traffic flow and that these vehicles should be in council run car parks.

Analysis

We are aware that the long row of parked cars on this unrestricted length prevents two-way traffic flow, with drivers forced to wait to allow oncoming traffic to pass. As this is mostly a straight section of road, visibility at each end is good, allowing drivers to see oncoming traffic in the distance at each end of the row of parked cars. Whilst it is appreciated this is certainly not ideal, this has been the situation for many years now and it is generally not subject to local complaints. As residents will be aware, King's Road received widespread permit parking restrictions several years ago, displacing many commuter vehicles from outside people's homes, and this area is one that commuters and other non-residents have been reduced to using. This is not currently a location we are looking to restrict, but it will remain open to review in the future.

Church Road (by Rosemary Court)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-14
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 6
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Godalming South, Milford and Witley division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Paul Follows](#).

Milford

Oxted Green junction with Petworth Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-16
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 2
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The comments referred to having no objections, and that a 20mph limit should be considered.

Analysis

A request for a speed limit change would need to be raised with the council separately.

Church Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-17
- Objections: 38
- Comments: 2
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Restrictions are not needed as drivers do not park on the road here.
- The parking on the footway does not cause an obstruction to pedestrians, pram, buggy or wheelchair users.
- The footway should partly be converted into a layby.
- The church needs this area for parking for funerals, weddings, visitors etc.
- Alternative places to park such as Oak Tree Road are not suitable for the church, especially for funeral and wedding vehicles.
- Parking has taken place on the footway here for decades without any issues.
- The proposal is against the elderly, disabled and church visitors.
- Disabled people and wheelchair users need to be able to park close to the church.
- The parking spaces on Church Close are often full.
- People will stop going to the church.
- People need to be able to drop people off, especially for weddings and funerals.
- Large lorries are the problem, not cars.
- There is no collision or injury record at this location to justify doing this.
- This proposal does not meet the required reasons for introducing parking restrictions.
- No consideration has been given to displacement parking.
- There is no issue with two-way traffic flow between the roundabout and the bend as mentioned in the statement of reasons.
- The Church has no car park, so visitors rely on this footway area for parking.

- People need to be dropped off on the footway so they can walk to the Church.
- Hearses need to be able to park here for funeral services.
- Bridal cars need to be able to park here for weddings.
- The footway is wide enough for everyone to share and use without issues.
- Marked spaces should be installed on the footway to show people where to park.
- This is discrimination against disabled people.
- A time limited parking restriction should be introduced to stop people parking all day.
- Displacement to Oak Tree Road would cause issues to those residents.
- People need to be able to park here to visit the recreation ground and play area.
- A local kabab van uses this footway to park and serve the local community.
- This is the only suitable place for church visitors to park.
- There is no alternative parking within a reasonable distance.
- In the 1970s, the police allowed church visitors to park here as long as they stayed close to the hedge to allow people to pass.

The comments referred to certain points already summarised above.

Analysis

It is clear from the responses received that many members of the church and local community routinely use this wide footway area to visit the church and recreation ground, and that this parking practice has been routine for several decades. However, driving over a raised kerb to access a footway in this way for parking is illegal. Both the kerb and the footway, including the several cable service box covers located here, are not designed to take the weight of vehicles, only pedestrians. There is clear damage to the kerb line which has sunken over time, especially along the angled section at the end of the bus stop layby where many drivers will favour leaving Church Road to access this wider section of footway. Driving and parking on footways damages the raised kerb stones and compresses the footway construction over time, which can cause damage to underground cables and pipelines. Since 2009, there has been a significant increase in cable service boxes installed here, both upright and on the ground, located at the end of the bus stop layby, where many drivers will be driving over and on occasion, parking over. The persistent driving over the ground service box covers damages them, requiring cable companies to replace them. At least one service box cover appears to have sustained damage due to vehicles driving over it routinely.

Church Road is a busy A road, and the Cherry Tree roundabout serves three other busy A roads. Most drivers are accessing this footway shortly after exiting this roundabout. A raised kerb cannot be driven over at speed and so drivers will need to slow right down to gain access to the footway. Any other drivers exiting the roundabout at this time will be forced to also slow down in response to the hazard ahead (the vehicle leaving the carriageway). This hazardous situation would be repeated in a similar fashion when drivers are exiting the footway over the raised kerb to return to the Church Road carriageway. This practice of exiting and rejoining the carriageway here, on a busy A road, so close to a busy roundabout and a bus stop is hazardous to passing traffic and indeed pedestrians, even when carried out with the utmost of caution. It is an illegal driving manoeuvre which is not expected to be happening here by other drivers and pedestrians.

It is understood that drivers leave enough room for pedestrians to get past when parked. However, the act of driving along a footway is illegal, and pedestrians should not have to negotiate vehicles driving along a footway, especially where pedestrians are drawn in larger numbers due to the nearby bus stop.

A number of objections are related to funeral and wedding service vehicles. In Surrey's Traffic Regulation Orders for parking restrictions, vehicles associated with weddings or funeral services (usually deemed to be part of the main procession, including any hearses and bridal cars) are allowed to wait on yellow lines for as long as reasonably necessary.

Drivers are also allowed to pick up or drop off passengers on yellow lines, and to escort a vulnerable person to and from their destination for as long as reasonably necessary.

In the statement of reasons document, the reason relating to maintaining two-way traffic flow and access between the roundabout and the bend was a carriageway reason, in addition to the footway reason, for the proposed restrictions which prevent parking on the carriageway and the adjacent public highway footway by default. It is understood that drivers only park on the footway here and not on the carriageway, however, a reason for restricting the carriageway was still required to be given.

Whilst there have been no reported collisions on this section of Church Road in the last 5 years, there does not need to be any history of collisions to justify parking restrictions for safety reasons to help prevent future collisions on the public highway, and to prevent damage to the public highway, in addition to preventing damage to cable service boxes and underground cables and pipelines, as detailed above.

The county council as highway authority has always objected to the food street trading (kebab van) application submitted to Waverley Borough Council, both initially and during its renewals, due to driving over a raised kerb and along a footway being illegal. However, the applications were approved regardless, and Surrey County Council has obtained legal advice regarding this approval, which is currently ongoing.

It is appreciated that parking for visitors to the Church and recreation ground is limited in this location. The length of unrestricted parking on the south side of Church Road by the houses, along with the 1 hour limited waiting bay by the businesses, is the only nearby on-street parking available on Church Road. In addition to these two locations, Church Close (partly private residential parking) and Oak Tree Road are on-street parking options on the north side near to the church. On the south side, Milford Lodge, which is also public highway, has further on-street parking options and is accessible by pedestrians through an open staggered gate that joins with Church Road.

However, it is understood that the wide footway is considered by many to be most ideal for visitors to park as opposed to any of these alternative locations, especially as the closest of these locations can often not have available on-street space due to parking already being present, as many respondents have highlighted. It is also understood that disabled people and other more vulnerable people need to be able to park as close to the Church as possible, and for these groups of people, these alternative locations would cause great difficulties as part of their routine visits to the Church, and as some have mentioned, may result in them not being able to attend at all.

Whilst all the highway related issues and reasons mentioned above are still valid, taking all local community feedback on board, it is decided best not to proceed with any of the proposed additional double yellow lines at this time, to at least allow for other possible measures, such as the construction of a layby parking area, to be considered.

Godalming North division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Penny Rivers](#).

Godalming

Town End Street

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-18
- Objections: 68 (plus a 17 signature and a 6 signature objection petitions)
- Comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Removing residents parking spaces (with double yellow lines) will put more parking pressure on Carlos Street, Latimer Road and Town End Street as vehicles become displaced.
- Waverley Borough Council should use a smaller and narrower refuse collection vehicle for narrower streets such as this.
- Parking space for residents is already limited, and this will make it worse.
- The proposal is an unfair balance between the needs of residents and access issues.
- Parking should not be stopped just because of occasional issues with a single refuse collection contractor.
- The single yellow line opposite Stuart Court should be removed to mitigate the loss of space.
- The solution is disproportionate to the problem.
- Access issues for the refuse lorry only occur when some vehicles are parked slightly away from the kerb or when larger vehicles are parked.
- The road width here is no different to the rest of Town End Street and other streets inside permit Zone N.
- Alternative solutions should be considered, such as reducing or removing the footway, allowing on-kerb parking, or limiting the number of permits being issued.
- Residents should have been consulted on the issue and possible solutions.
- Residents should be allowed to park for free in the Croft Road car park, or just on refuse collection days.
- Permits should be street specific and not for a whole zone.
- Restrictions should only apply on refuse collection day.
- The proposal is in breach of Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, such as the daily need for 'reasonable access to premises'.
- The statement of reasons lacks the evidence required for a Traffic Regulation Order, such as evidence of vehicle obstruction; evidence of modern vehicles being larger today; or that the issue would affect emergency service vehicles.
- The consultation process was flawed, badly timed and badly communicated.

The comment referred to the proposed restrictions making it easier for drivers to turn in and out of Stuart Court. The two support comments referred to issues with ambulances being unable to access Stuart Court and patients having to be wheeled down the street to the ambulance instead.

The two objection petitions referred to certain points already summarised above.

Analysis

Waverley Borough Council are already using a narrower refuse collection vehicle for this area and are still experiencing issues with passing parked vehicles on occasion, which they also stated would

impact on emergency service vehicles. As stated in the statement of reasons document, this issue would affect emergency service vehicles with similar or identical widths to refuse collection vehicles. A fire engine has an almost identical width (2.55m) to Waverley's larger, normal sized refuse collection vehicles. Fire engines need at least 3m between parked cars to pass safely. This distance between parked cars isn't present along any part of Town End Street, but the carriageway section to the north of the Stuart Court entrance is very slightly narrower than the rest of the street and is the section where Waverley Borough Council has specifically stated and shown with photographic evidence obstruction of their refuse vehicles. A fire engine would not get through here without significantly damaging parked cars in the process of passing. The two support comments both referred to issues with ambulances being unable to access Stuart Court and patients having to be wheeled down the street to the ambulance instead.

It is a fact that the average length and width of UK cars is larger today than in the past, even just comparing now to the early 2000s, and there are multiple different sources online confirming this, and width has been increasing more in comparison to length.

The proposed double yellow lines comply with section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 as they 'secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic'. Reasonable access to properties is maintained with the existing permit scheme, albeit with the proposed reduction in space. The county council as highway authority is not obligated to provide on-street parking for residents and no one has any right to park on the public highway, only a right to pass and repass along the highway, which is what these proposed additional waiting restrictions are intending to maintain at all times.

Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders require a reason for their introduction and a reason, as outlined in the statement of reasons document, was provided for this location and all others as part of this parking review. Specific evidence is not a requirement for a statement of reasons document.

The advertisement running for 28 days, including an advertisement in a local newspaper, street notices being erected on site, and nearby properties being letter dropped, was in full compliance with Traffic Regulation Order advertisement regulations. The minimum required advertisement period is 21 days, and our parking review advertisements are a week longer than this.

The additional parking pressure and displacement to other parts of permit zone N is understood, however, access at all times, especially by emergency service vehicles, must be the priority here. The displacement of most commonly three, to potentially four cars from this location to other parts of zone N is not considered to be significant.

Removing the single yellow line opposite Stuart Court is not considered to be a suitable proposal due to its requirement for helping to maintain turning and access to and from Stuart Court.

Catteshall Lane (Ambulance Station)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-19
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Nightingale Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-20
- Objections: 3
- Comments: 4
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- The 1 hour limited waiting bay must be removed on the opposite side of the road to mitigate the loss of space due to the additional double yellow lines.
- This would cause issues for Farncombe Post Offices trade.
- Residents need to have deliveries and loading and unloading take place here.
- Restrictions would affect visitors to residents, especially the elderly.
- There is already very limited parking on the opposite side of the road.
- The parking helps to slow traffic speeds down.

The comments referred to the following points: -

- The restrictions need to be extended beyond the entrance to Mayen Place where the post box is located to help maintain sight lines for drivers exiting Mayen Place.
- Traffic blocks the entrance to Mayen Place preventing drivers from entering.
- The 1 hour limited waiting bay period needs to be longer such as 4 hours for resident visitors.
- Restrictions not needed as no one parks on this side of the road.

Analysis

Drivers are allowed to stop on yellow lines to pick up and drop off passengers or to load and unload goods. The existing 1 hour limited waiting bay was primarily introduced to allow people to visit the Nightingale Cemetery more easily, following previous requests for such a parking facility in this area. The 1 hour period also helps with other short-term visits to residents as the on-street parking is normally so persistent along Nightingale Road. However, having a longer period of 4 hours would be to the detriment of cemetery visitors as the bay would then more likely be occupied by residents or their visitors longer term, especially those utilising the time the bay is unrestricted as well, to achieve even longer stay parking than 4 hours, which would not create the frequent turnover of visitors here as originally intended. The bay size for two vehicles is also deemed to be adequate here.

It is understood how parked cars can help to slow traffic down, but there is already persistent on-street parking in Nightingale Road on the west side of the street which helps to achieve this. As explained in the statement of reasons document, the parking on the eastern side on and by the bend forces southbound drivers onto the wrong side of the road to pass these vehicles. In addition, when the parking is further north by the limited waiting bay, it can obstruct the passing of vehicles. Having an unrestricted gap in the restrictions would not fully resolve the issues explained and so this is not an amendment that is considered to be practical here.

The entrance to Mayen Place is a dropped kerb entrance and not a road junction, and so drivers are allowed to park up to, but not in front of, the dropped kerb. It is understood how this parking affects sight lines in the same way as junctions, but there is no legal requirement to maintain sight lines for dropped kerb entrances. The dropped kerb for Mayen Place is considerably longer than the actual driveway opening, especially on the south side, so parked vehicles are noticeably further back than they would normally be at similar style dropped kerb entrances. The extent of the restrictions here can be subject to further review, but additional restrictions cannot be proposed at this objection stage.

Farncombe

Wolseley Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-21
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1

- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- The electric vehicle charges are mostly out of use so not justified to prevent parking.
- The parking space being double yellow lined is small but only small cars park there.
- Additional restrictions will just displace parking more outside residential properties.

Analysis

The issue with the electric vehicle chargers has been reported to the relevant team. The unrestricted length between the kerb buildout and electric vehicle recharging bays is 4.2m long, which is shorter than the minimum space for formalised parking bays on-street (4.5m). Whilst it is appreciated that many small vehicles would fit here, vehicles that don't fully fit have been witnessed parking in this space overhanging the buildout and electric vehicle bay. Due to the very tight space, even smaller vehicles will often need to drive partly over the buildout kerb which are not designed to take the weight of vehicles. As also mentioned in the statement of reasons document, restricting the junction up to the electric vehicle bays will help maintain traffic flow and sight lines on the junction and will allow further space for drivers entering from Marshall Road to pull over to allow oncoming traffic to pass. The displacement impact of one parked car would be minimal.

Ballfield Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-22
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Station Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-23
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Waverley Eastern Villages division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Kevin Deanus](#).

Wormley

Combe Lane Incl. Junction with Coopers Place (Private)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-15
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objection referred to the following points: -

- The parked cars provide protection for pedestrians as there is no footway.
- The parked cars help to slow traffic down, especially with no footway for pedestrians.
- Sight lines for Coopers Place will only be marginally improved.

Analysis

The parked cars providing a sense of protection to pedestrians from passing traffic is understood. The verge and paved dropped kerb area by the proposed single yellow line extensions is wide and pedestrians can walk closer to the properties here to be further from the carriageway. South of the single yellow line extension, unrestricted parking is remaining in place where the verge is much narrower, and so that parking will remain unchanged. By Coopers Place where the double yellow lines are proposed, these vehicles are often parked tight up against the hedge and so pedestrians are currently forced further out into the carriageway here and so the double yellow lines will help pedestrians to walk closer to the hedge line. It is appreciated that parked cars can help to slow traffic down, although the unrestricted length of parking remaining will still be significant enough to keep vehicle speeds down. The single yellow line restriction being Monday to Friday 7am to 10am also allows parking by residents or visitors to take place outside of this short, restricted period, and all day on weekends, which could also help to keep vehicle speeds down. The length of double yellow lines proposed by Coopers Place is significant and so sight lines would be more than just marginally improved.

Cranleigh and Ewhurst division proposals

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

Cranleigh

Alfold Road (Incl. Junction with Vine Works Road aka Vine Cottages)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-24
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Object to the double yellow lines south of the junction on Alfold Road.
- The bollards should be removed, and a layby should be installed for parking.

Analysis

The double yellow lines by the junction with Elmbridge Road and Vine Cottages are needed to maintain sight lines, access, road safety and two-way traffic flow in the vicinity of these two junctions. The bollards were introduced to prevent parking on the footway and to maintain the footway for access by pedestrians, as it is intended to be. The public highway extent only covers the footway width and not the grassed area, which is common land, and so there is insufficient public highway width to construct a layby parking area here, which would also require a footway along the back of the layby for pedestrians.

Parsonage Road and Rowland Road

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-25
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections referred to the proposals removing free parking from the village.

The comment referred to a query regarding the proposed double yellow lines around the island by The Paddock.

Analysis

The proposed double yellow lines for Parsonage Road and Rowland Road are to maintain two-way traffic flow, access, road safety and sight lines, for both drivers and pedestrians on the two large bends and on all the uncontrolled crossing points and side entrances off Parsonage Road and Rowland Road. These parts of the road are hazardous to park on and should not be viewed as being parking spaces. The proposed double yellow lines around the island by The Paddock are to prevent parking on the island itself and around the island on the same side, not to prevent parking on the opposite side (the property side) where it mostly takes place, and that parking can continue as normal.

High Street / Bank Buildings Road / Rowland Road (Fountain Square)

Overview:

- Drawing number: 2024-26
- Objections: 10
- Comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- The proposed disabled bay location is unclear and unsuitable.
- The proposed disabled bay location by the junction is a dangerous location.
- The existing parking bays should be retained.
- It is already difficult for disabled drivers to park, and this will make it harder.
- Drivers using the proposed parking bay will be by the main flow of traffic which is dangerous.
- The proposed disabled bay will be difficult to manoeuvre in and out of.
- The existing road layout works well as it is.
- The plan doesn't show where the gate will be located.
- The proposed disabled bay is located where all the traffic enters for the shops and school.
- Fountain square needs to stay as it is for people to visit the shops and have markets etc.
- The proposed parking changes are not an improvement.
- Removing parking spaces will ruin the businesses and trade.

The comment mentioned that parking spaces shouldn't be removed for cycle parking as there is already space for cyclists to park in the village.

Analysis

It is appreciated that the advertised plan just shows the parking changes on the current road layout, using the current mapping. There are notes on the plan referring to this. It is also appreciated that the proposed disabled bay as drawn will appear to be in an unusual position as this junction end of Fountain Square is being entirely redesigned, and this is where the proposed disabled bay would sit based on the current mapping. The junction of Rowland Road and the High Street is to be significantly narrowed with the central pedestrian crossing island removed, to allow the Fountain Square island area to be built further outwards and allowing additional space for the proposed disabled parking bay. The northern end of the disabled bay will be open and not confined by any kerb or footway construction, and so it will be easier for drivers to manoeuvre in and out of the bay after entering from the High Street. The narrower junction will help make drivers more cautious at this location. Drivers entering from the nearby High Street junction will be able to wait for any oncoming traffic to pass before turning towards the disabled bay's open north end, to then reverse into the disabled bay. When leaving the bay, drivers can drive out forwards to rejoin the High Street via either the eastern or western lengths of Bank Buildings Road. When the pedestrianisation scheme is active (on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays between 9am and 4:30pm), then the western length will need to be used. Drivers entering from Rowland Road would drive forwards into the bay and then exit forwards at the High Street junction straight ahead.

As noted on the advertised plan, some parking bays are shown to be longer on our current Traffic Regulation Order plans than they are currently on the ground, so these bays are just being revoked from the plans only. However, there will be some actual parking bay space loss for the cycle parking facilities, which is unavoidable in the scheme design as a more sustainable balance between drivers, cyclists and pedestrians is being created.

Signage indicating the pedestrianisation area will be located on Bank Buildings Road outside number 137, a few metres from the kerb line of Rowland Road. An entry gate is no longer being incorporated into this scheme, which will operate using signage only.

St James's Place

Overview:

- Drawing number: No Drawing.
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.