



# Runnymede parking review 2024: Decisions Report

A document explaining our final decisions on proposed new parking controls and restrictions, following formal advertisement and public feedback

## Contents

Introduction.....	2
Addlestone division proposals .....	3
Addlestone .....	3
Chertsey division proposals.....	5
Chertsey.....	5
Egham division proposals.....	10
Egham.....	10
Englefield Green division proposals .....	14
Englefield Green .....	14
Egham.....	16
Foxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water division proposals .....	18
Longcross .....	18
Lyne .....	18
Ottershaw.....	19
Virginia Water.....	20
Woodham and New Haw division proposals.....	21
Row Town .....	21
New Haw.....	21
Borough wide Business Permits .....	24

## Introduction

This document sets out our final decisions about which new parking controls and restrictions should go ahead, with or without changes, as part of our Runnymede parking review 2024.

We formally advertised our intention to introduce the proposed new parking controls and restrictions by way of a notice published in the Surrey Advertiser on 9 February 2024. There then followed a 28-day consultation period which ended on 8 March 2024, during which people could comment on or object to any of the proposals. To help raise awareness of the proposals, in addition to the press notice, we also erected street notices on lamp columns and signposts near where the new restrictions were proposed, and notified people most directly affected by letter. We published copies of the proposal documents on our website, where there was also an online form for people to use to let us have their views.

This report lists all the proposals and presents a summary of the type and number of comments received, our responses where appropriate, and the final decisions and reasons for them for each one. It does not contain a transcript of each objection made, but as required by the regulations, each and every comment and objection was read and considered before any final decisions were made.

Only themes considered relevant to the proposals have been mentioned in this summary report. People often raise highway issues that are not part of these proposals, such as:

- Resurfacing, potholes, and highway maintenance.
- Additional new or modified parking controls.
- Creation of additional parking spaces in place of grassed areas or verges.
- Speed limits and enforcement, traffic calming, road safety and road layouts.
- Off street car parks.
- Planning issues.

These are beyond the scope of the parking review and therefore such queries have not been addressed in this analysis. For further information and guidance, please see Annex 1 at the bottom of this document.

Having advertised our intention to introduce the parking proposals, the regulations allow us to make minor modifications to them before their introduction without the need for further advertisement. Of course, we can also cancel a proposal entirely.

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

These decisions are now final and there is no appeal stage, although customers can ask us to reconsider any parking controls, whether old or new, at any time as part of the next parking review in the area.

## Addlestone division proposals

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

### Addlestone

#### Bourneside Road

This proposal is shown in drawing AD 01.

Introduce a length of double yellow line from the boundary of No's 105 and 107 south eastwards to join up with the existing double yellow lines to improve sightlines and road safety on the bend. Vehicles parking in this location obstruct the sightline of through traffic, forcing vehicles out into the on-coming carriageway.

#### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 2

Other comments: 1

Support: 0

#### Analysis

The two objectors argue that this is a residential road, doesn't need additional parking restrictions and that on-street parking slows down traffic, forcing drivers to be more careful particularly on this bend.

The one comment is concerned that the restrictions will not be enforced.

#### Final decision

**Proceed as advertised.** Vehicles parking outside these properties do block the line of sight when driving around the bend. Opposite these properties there is a block paved unrestricted parking area that is a safer place to park and can be used instead

#### Ongar Road

This proposal is shown in drawing AD 02.

Install a length of double yellow line alongside the M25, opposite properties 3 and 5 towards the northern end of Ongar Road, leaving a 5-metre gap at the end of the road to allow vehicles to park. Vehicles parking opposite these properties block in residents' vehicles, preventing them from getting in and out when required. Vehicles parking in this space also prevent it being used for its intended purpose, a turning area. Double yellow lines will keep the space clear of parked vehicles maintaining access at all times.

#### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 0

Other comments: 0

Support: 3

#### Final decision

**Proceed as advertised.** No objections have been received.

## School Lane

This proposal is shown in drawing AD 03.

The recommendation that came out of a Road Safety outside Jubilee High School assessment is to extend the existing Monday to Friday 8.30am to 4.30pm single yellow lines on both side of School Lane northwards up to the boundary of No's 43 and 45 on the west side and the boundary of No's 38a and 40 on the east side. This is because 'gridlock was observed by the assessment team due to parents entering and exiting the school loop at the point where both Primary and Secondary school pupils were arriving. This was exacerbated by a couple of vehicles that were parked on School Lane just to the north of where the existing restrictions end'.

### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 6

Other comments: 8

Support: 3

### Analysis

The majority of the commentators and objectors are not against this proposal, they are asking for a more comprehensive parking scheme covering a longer length of School Lane.

They also ask for other highway safety measures and street furniture to be installed to manage school traffic and deter anti-social and inconsiderate parking. These are beyond the scope of this proposal.

Lots of the feedback questions the current level of enforcement of the parking restrictions in School Lane and call for better and more frequent visits by Enforcement staff at the beginning and end of the school day. The County Council is introducing a new policy around school parking enforcement, and that is being rolled out Countywide.

### Final decision

**Proceed as advertised.** The extent of the additional restrictions may not be considered enough, but they have been recommended in a Road Safety School Audit.

## Station Road, Church Mews. (Traffic Regulation Order Amendment)

This proposal is shown in drawing AD 04 and AD 05.

Following discussions with some residents of Church Mews and subsequently obtaining land registry and highway limit plans, it has come to light that the existing double yellow lines shown on the Traffic Regulation Order drawings extend beyond the boundary of the public highway.

Therefore, the double yellow lines need to be shortened by 2.9 metres on both side of the western access (next to the bike shop), on the Traffic Regulation Order and drawing to bring them in line with the highway boundary.

Additionally, the double yellow lines need to be shortened by 3 metres on both sides of the eastern access (next to the building society), on the Traffic Regulation Order and drawing, as shown in drawing AD 05 to bring them in line with the highway boundary.

### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

None

### Final decision

**Proceed as advertised.**

## Chertsey division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mark Nuti](#).

### Chertsey

#### Bridge Road junction Knights Mead

This proposal is shown in drawing CH 01.

Introduce double yellow lines on the junction of Bridge Road and Knights Mead (private). This will prevent vehicles parking on Bridge Road either side of the entrance to Knights Mead. This will improve sightlines and road safety. As Knights Mead is a private road the double yellow lines will only be installed to a point in line with the back of the footway.

#### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 8

Other comments: None

Support: 3

#### Analysis

The eight objectors are concerned that introducing these double yellow lines will result in the loss of on-street parking space for the properties that front Bridge Road. The double yellow lines will force them to seek alternative parking space further away.

The support received highlights how sight lines are blocked when driving out, by vehicles parked right up to the entrance of Knights Mead on both sides.

#### Final decision

**Proceed with an amendment.** Taking the feedback received into account, introduce 8 metres of double yellow line either side of the entrance to Knights Mead. This will still help improve sightlines when exiting Knights Mead and reduce the amount of kerbside parking space lost to one vehicle either side of the junction.

#### Bridge Road junction Rosemead

This proposal is shown in drawing CH 02.

In response to 11 requests received, install double yellow lines at the northern end of Rosemead to prevent vehicles parking close to the junction with Bridge Road. These vehicles block sightlines and restricts the road width to a single lane.

#### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 1

Other comments: None

Support: None

#### Analysis

The objector is concerned about the loss of on-street parking space.

#### Final decision

**Proceed as advertised,** as preventing vehicles parking at the entrance to Rosemead will improve road safety. A series of individual letters from properties in Rosemead was received asking for these restrictions to be introduced.

## Pound Road

This proposal is shown in drawing CH 02.

Introduce a length of double yellow lines either side of the vehicle access into the office block (Krome Technologies) to improve road safety. This new restriction will prevent vehicles parking either side of the building access, blocking sightlines.

### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 3

Other comments: 0

Support: 0

### Analysis

All three objectors raise concerns about the loss of on-street parking space that will result in the introduction of these double yellow lines.

### Final decision

**Proceed with an amendment.** In light of the objections received, on the northern side of the entrance to the office development a reduced 5 metre length of double yellow line will be introduced on Pound Road to improve visibility, help keep the footway clear and maintain access at all times. On the south side of the entrance visible double yellow lines will go up to the existing white zig-zag lines for the crossing.

## Chilsey Green Road

This proposal is shown in drawing CH 03.

Brought to our attention by Runnymede Housing Association, install double yellow lines on the western side of Chilsey Green Road from the junction of Pycroft Road northwards to just past the southern boundary of No.2 Chilsey Green Road. The restrictions are required to stop vehicles parking on the verge behind the knee-high wooden rail and in the dropped kerb access points. The verge is being destroyed blocking access is preventing maintenance taking place.

### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 1

Other comments: None

Support: None

### Analysis

There is one objection, which we acknowledge and have deliberated and considered carefully. The objector highlights how the introduction of these yellow lines will impact upon their life. It is an unfortunate situation, but vehicles should not be parking on and ruining the verge alongside Chilsey Green Road.

### Final decision

**Proceed as advertised.** If you look back at [Pycroft Road in 2010 on Google Streetview](#), there used to be pedestrian access into Lasswade Court from Pycroft Road. It is recommended to ask Runnymede Housing Association if the vegetation could be cleared. If this footway was reinstated, then residents could park on-street in Pycroft Road and access their homes more easily. The resident could then perhaps apply also apply for a disabled bay.

## **Guildford Street (Traffic Regulation Order)**

This proposal is shown in drawing CH 04.

Revoke a 21-metre length of double yellow line shown on the Traffic Regulation Order from the lay-by outside Compass House in Guildford Street. Replace it with a 21-metre-long parking bay with the restriction Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm, 2 hours no return 2 hours.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

None

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.**

## **High Meadow Place**

This proposal is shown in drawing CH 05.

In response to a petition, introduce double yellow lines on the inside of the first bend within High Meadow Place. Also introduce double yellow lines on the junction of High Meadow Place and Gogmore Farm Road, extending into the end eastern end of Erkenwald Close. The restrictions will prevent vehicles parking in these two locations, blocking sightlines, restricting access, and obstructing the footway.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 3

Other comments: 1

Support: None

### **Analysis**

The objectors state that where the double yellow lines have been advertised does not correspond to where they were requested. They were requested on two corners at the end of High Meadow Place.

### **Final decision**

**Do not proceed.** If vehicles are parking in the two corners at the far end of Meadow Place, it must be by residents or their visitors in this entirely residential street. Double yellow lines if proposed would therefore not be uniformly welcomed and if they were introduced, adhered to them would probably be low.

Reconfiguring the layout of parking bays is beyond the scope of a parking review.

## **Free Prae Road junctions with Free Prae Road Service Road**

This proposal is shown in drawing CH 06.

Install double yellow lines on both sides, and at both ends of Free Prae Road Service Road. Vehicles parking on both sides at each end of the service road are obstructing access for residents, deliveries, emergency services and refuse collection to the properties in the service road. Continue the double yellow lines around the inside of the service road, next to the green to maintain access and manage the displacement of any vehicles. Extend the double yellow lines for 10 metres south of the service road on the western side of the main Free Prae Road to maintain sightlines.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 3

Other comments: None

Support: 1

### **Analysis**

All three objectors raise concerns about the loss of on-street parking space that will result in the introduction of these double yellow lines.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed with an amendment.** Install double yellow lines on the north side of the entrance to the Service Road next to No.1/1A Farley Villas as advertised. Install double yellow lines on the southern side (next to the green) from the entrance to the Service Road around to point in line with the property boundary of No.11 Free Prae Road opposite. This will maintain access into and out of the service road. Do not proceed with the rest of the advertised double yellow lines.

Rule 243 of the Highway Code states 'Do not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space. These restrictions will help enforce this.

### **Station Road junction Queen Street**

This proposal is shown in drawing CH 07.

Install double yellow lines on the junction of Station Road and Queen Street to prevent vehicles parking on the junction, blocking sightlines and restricting access.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 2

Other comments: 2

Support: None

### **Analysis**

One commentator states there should be yellow lines on all the junctions in this area. The second comment is about speeding vehicles.

The two objectors raise concerns about the loss of on-street parking space that will result in the introduction of these double yellow lines.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.** Double yellow lines will improve sightlines and road safety on the junction of Station Road and Queen Street.

Rule 243 of the Highway Code states 'Do not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction except within an authorised parking space, and these restrictions will help enforce this.



## **Wheatash Road**

This proposal is shown in drawing CH 08.

Install double yellow lines on the inside of the bend alongside No.73 Wheatash Road to improve sightlines and maintain road safety. Currently a row of cars park on the inside of the bend reducing driver visibility and the carriageway to a single lane which is a hazard.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 8

Other comments: 4

Support: 4

### **Analysis.**

The objectors raise concerns about the loss of on-street parking space that will result in the introduction of these double yellow lines.

There are calls from many responders for the speed limit to be lowered along Wheatash Road.

There is support for the introduction of the restrictions as they will improve sightlines on the bend and improve access. Other commentators say the restrictions don't go far enough and more yellow lines are required to manage the displaced parking.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.** Introducing this length of double yellow lines will improve road safety and sight lines around the bend where visibility is currently limited.

It is recognised that there is high demand for on-street parking space on this estate but improving site lines and road safety has to be priority.

There was a Local Street Improvement scheme proposed that covers Wheatash Road and the adjoining network of residential roads. A Consultation with residents was running until 29 March 2024 on Commonplace, called Chertsey Local Street Improvement. Residents who commented on this proposal about speed limits were directed to this and encouraged to log their views on speeding or other local street improvements they would like to see. Link distributed to every commentator who mentioned concerns about speeding.

## Egham division proposals

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

### Egham

#### Crossways

This proposal is shown in drawing EG 01.

Install double yellow lines on the eastern side of Crossways between Barons Way and Thorpe Lea Road to maintain access at all times for through traffic.

#### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 6

Other comments: 0

Support: 1

#### Analysis

The one supportive response is in favour of residents' permits being introduced.

The objectors raise concerns about the loss of on-street parking space that will result in the introduction of these double yellow lines.

#### Final decision

**Do not to proceed.** This proposal has by and large been objected to. Crossways is a one-way residential street, wide enough to allow vehicles to park on both sides and allow through vehicles to pass down the centre of the road.

### Barons Way junctions with Crossways and Bishops Way (Traffic Regulation Order amendment)

These proposals are shown in drawing EG 01.

Add the existing double yellow lines on all four corners of the crossroads between Barons Way and Crossways to the Traffic Regulation Order.

Add the existing double yellow lines on the junction of Barons Way and Bishops Way to the Traffic Regulation Order.

Add 5.7m of existing double yellow line on the west side of Barons Way, north of the entrance to the garages and opposite the side of No.2 Hythefield Avenue to the Traffic Regulation Order.

All these restrictions improve road safety and sightlines on the junctions in these residential streets.

#### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 2

Other comments: 0

Support: 1

#### Analysis

The supporter for formally adding these double yellow lines to the Traffic Regulation Order is asking that they are enforced.

The objectors raise concerns about the loss of on-street parking space that will result in the introduction of these double yellow lines.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed with an amendment.** Having read through old Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) a Traffic Order already exists for double yellow lines on the crossroads of Barons Way and Crossways, so these restrictions have been readvertised and a reduced length of double yellow line has been introduced on the north side of Crossways, terminating these yellow lines in line with those opposite.

Double yellow lines on the junction of Bishops Way and Barons Way partly exist on street but were incomplete following some carriageway patching. Also, there is a 5.7 metre length of double yellow lines in the northwest corner of Barons Way by the garages.

I could not find any record of a Traffic Order being made to enforce the double yellow lines in both these locations. We have completed the installation of the double yellow lines on junction of Bishops Way and Barons Way. Both locations have now both been formally advertised, and it is recommended to approve making them enforceable.

### **Pond Road junction Harcourt Close**

These proposals are shown in drawing EG 02.

Install double yellow lines on the junction of Pond Road and Harcourt Close prevent vehicles parking around the junction, blocking sightlines and restricting access.

Install a length of double yellow line opposite the junction of Harcourt Close to improve access at the junction area and act as a passing place in this heavily parked street.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 1

Other comments: 0

Support: 1

### **Analysis**

The supporter is in favour of double yellow lines on the junction to improve road safety but has reservations about where the displaced vehicles will move to.

The objector is also concerned about where the displaced vehicles will move to and is worried the grass verges will become muddy parking areas.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.** Double yellow lines on the junction will prevent vehicles parking all over it, blocking sightlines and restricting access, and also help to enforce Rule 243 of the Highway Code which states 'Do not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction except within an authorised parking space.'

Should parking on the verge become an issue, additional double yellow lines could be introduced on the north side of the Close.

### **Meadow Gardens**

These proposals are shown in drawing EG 03.

Install a length of double yellow line on the southern side of Meadow Gardens filling in an unrestricted gap between existing double yellow lines. Vehicles are parking in this gap and over the footway at certain times of the day, blocking the path and residents' access.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 2

Other comments: None

Support: None

### **Analysis**

The objectors raise concerns about the loss of on-street parking space that will result in the introduction of these double yellow lines.

### **Final decision**

**Do not proceed.** There is no support for this proposal. The resident who requested this restriction no longer supports its introduction.

## **Century Road junction Mullens Road and Rowan Avenue**

This proposal is shown in drawing EG 04.

Install double yellow lines on the junction of Century Road, Mullens Road and Rowan Avenue to prevent vehicles parking on the junction, blocking sightlines and restricting access.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

None

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.**

## **Thorpe Lea Road junction Warwick Avenue**

This proposal is shown in drawing EG 05.

Install double yellow lines on the junction of Thorpe Lea Road and Warwick Avenue to maintain access and improve sightlines on the junction at all times.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: None

Other comments: 3

Support: 4

### **Analysis**

Support and no objections have been received.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.**

## **The Causeway**

This proposal is shown in drawing EG 07

Although there is a peak time (7 to 10am and 4 to 7pm) Urban Clearway restriction along the length of The Causeway (A308). This does not prevent vehicles parking on The Causeway in between the two operating times of the clearway restriction. Recently a takeaway bakery and coffee shop has opened in a new unit adjacent to The Causeway on the Hawthorne Trade Park. This is attracting passing trade with vehicles stopping and parking on The Causeway to visit. Double yellow lines are required to prevent parking at all

times along the southern side of The Causeway from the Tyre Garage to Hawthorne Road (private).

These vehicles are causing localised congestion on this busy main through route to the M25, by restricting the road width for through traffic and additionally blocking access and sightlines for vehicles from the neighbouring Tyre Garage and office building.

**Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: None

Other comments: None

Support: 16

**Analysis**

Plenty of support for this advertised proposal

**Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.** No objections have been received

## Englefield Green division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Marisa Heath](#).

### Englefield Green

#### Albert Road

This proposal is shown in drawing ENG 01

Introduce a length of double yellow lines either side of the entrance to Mary Drew Almshouse's in Albert Road, to prevent vehicles parking right up to the entrance. The refuse collection vehicle has tremendous difficulty gaining access each week and improved access will also assist ambulances.

#### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 9 plus 4 petitions totalling 103 signatures

Other comments: 1

Support: None

#### Analysis

There is no support for this proposal.

#### Final decision

**Do not proceed.**

### Bond Street junction Southcroft

This proposal is shown in drawing ENG 02

Install double yellow lines on the junction of Bond Street and Southcroft to maintain access and improve sightlines at all times.

#### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 1

Other comments: 1

Support: 1

#### Analysis

Both the objector and commentor raise concerns about the loss of on-street parking space that will result in the introduction of these double yellow lines. The supporter says the introduction of double yellow lines will improve road safety.

#### Final decision

**Proceed as advertised.** These restrictions will help to enforce Rule 243 of the Highway Code which states 'Do not stop or park opposite or within 10 metres of a junction. There will still be on street parking space in Southcroft. Vehicles will be permitted park further back from the junction with Bond Street which will improve road safety and sight lines on the junction for both drivers and pedestrians.

## **Bond Street junctions Vegal Crescent**

This proposal is shown in drawing ENG 03

On the north side of Bond Street introduce double yellow lines from where they currently end opposite Blays Lane westwards as far as the boundary of No's 62 and 64 Vegal Crescent. This proposal includes extending the double yellow lines into the southern arms of both **Vegal Crescent** junctions.

There is frequent parking along Bond Street restricting the flow of traffic, causing localised congestion. Vehicles travelling eastwards have to do so on the wrong side of the road. A length of double yellow lines on the north side will prevent this from happening and keep all parking to the southern side only. This will improve access and road safety along Bond Street at all times.

Vehicles are parking right up to the southern junctions of Vegal Crescent resulting in dangerous manoeuvres from people either trying to enter or exit Vegal Crescent, in breach of the Highway Code. Double yellow lines on the junctions will improve sightlines, residential access, and road safety for everybody.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 2

Other comments: 1

Support: 2

### **Analysis**

One objector does not see the need for all these double yellow lines and thinks they should only be from Princes Court to Torin Court. The other is a shop keeper concerned about the loss of customer parking space.

The commentator also does not think these yellow lines are necessary.

Two expressions of support have been received. Both highlight the obstructive and inconsiderate parking that can block the road and footway on some occasions.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.** These restrictions will help maintain traffic flow along Bond Street which is a bus route, stop the footway on the north side of Bond Street being parked on and improve road safety on the two junctions with Vegal Crescent.

Both the butchers and the newsagents have a forecourt in front of their shops which can be used for parking, and both premises are close to Vegal Crescent, where customers can continue to park a safely and without restriction a short distance from both shops.

## **Harvest Road**

This proposal is shown in drawing ENG 04

Extend the double yellow lines southwards on the eastern side of Harvest Road as far as the boundary of No's 72 and 74. The double yellow lines will improve residential access and help traffic flow along Harvest Road.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 3

Other comments: 0

Support: 0

## Analysis

The objectors raise concerns about the loss of on-street parking space that will result in the introduction of these double yellow lines. General comments have also been received about the overall shortfall in on-street parking space in the area.

### Final decision

**Proceed as advertised.** This is a pinch point along Harvest Road that can become blocked if vehicles park on both sides. Installing this short additional length of double yellow line will help maintain the flow of traffic and assist with access.

There are possibly places in Harvest Road and Victoria Street when some double yellow lines can be removed to create more on-street parking capacity. These will be assessed in the next Runnymede parking review.

## Victoria Street

This proposal is shown in drawing ENG 04

Revoke a 5 metre length of the Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm 2 hours, no return 2 hours parking bay outside No's 2 and 2a Victoria Street. This site is due to be developed and removing this parking bay is a planning condition.

### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 4 plus 3 petitions totalling 74 signatures.

Other comments: None

Support: None

## Analysis

There are plenty of objections to this proposal, and no support.

### Final decision

**Do not proceed.**

The company who applied for and was granted the Planning permission to redevelop this property have been contacted to confirm if they still intend to proceed. No reply has been received. As there is regularly high demand for the on-street parking spaces in Victoria Street we don't want to lose any unnecessarily, so the parking bay will remain in place.

## Egham

### Wetton Place

This proposal is shown in drawing ENG 05

Revoke the restriction 'disabled badge holder only, 3 hours no return 1 hour' from three parking spaces on the eastern side of Wetton Place alongside the Estate Agents. Introduce the restriction Monday to Saturday 8am to 6pm 30 minutes, no return 30 minutes on these spaces instead.

The redevelopment of Station Road North has seen 4 new disabled bays introduced. There are now more disabled bays than there is regular demand for, so it recommended to make these three parking spaces available to all vehicles for short term visits to the town centre.

### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 1

Other comments: 1



Support: None

### **Analysis**

Both the commentator and objector are concerned about the loss of these disabled parking bays. Both call for more and better enforcement as the other disabled bays in the town centre are frequently occupied by non-blue badge holding vehicles.

### **Final decision**

**proceed as advertised.** There are now more disabled parking bays (4) in the new Magna Square/ Station Road North development than exist in Wetton Place (3). Additionally, the new disabled bays are larger making them easier to access.

There is high demand for the limited 30 min waiting bays in the High Street area, and these additional spaces are anticipated to be well used.

Blue Badge holders will still be able to park in the 3 spaces in Wetton Place with their blue badge and time clock on display. Blue Badge holders can also park on the double yellow lines without causing an obstruction for up to 3 hours with blue badge and time clock displayed.

## **Foxhills, Thorpe and Virginia Water division proposals**

The county councillor for this division is [Jonathan Hulley](#).

### **Longcross**

#### **Longcross Road junction Kitsmead Lane**

This proposal is shown in drawing FTV 01

In response to petition received, install double yellow lines on both sides at the southern end of Kitsmead Lane alongside the Post House. The wording from the petition states: Vehicles' Park to close to the junction on Kitsmead Lane, forcing vehicles to drive on the wrong side of Kitsmead Lane as they turn in from the junction with Longcross Road. Parked vehicles block the sightlines.

#### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: None

Other comments: 1

Support: None

#### **Analysis**

The commentor is the original petitioner and said the advertised restrictions are not long enough and they should continue past The Post House and around the corner to Hurst Lodge.

Request was discussed with County Councillor Hulley and the Parking and Traffic Enforcement Manager. It was agreed that an amendment notice would be advertised, extending the double yellow lines to the length requested. All addresses in The Post House complex were written to along with Hurst Lodge and Little Hersham, asking if anybody objected. No objections have been received.

#### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised and with the additional double yellow lines.**

### **Lyne**

#### **Lyne Lane junction Almnors Road**

This proposal is shown in drawing FTV 02

Install double yellow lines on the junction of Lyne Lane and Almnors Road to maintain access and improve sightlines at all times.

#### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

None

#### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.**

## **Almners Road**

This proposal is shown in drawing FTV 03.

Install a length of double yellow line on the southern side of Almners Road from where the current restrictions end westwards as far as the driveway of No:77. The double yellow lines will maintain access to residential and commercial properties and improve the flow of traffic along Almners Road at all times.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: None

Other comments: None

Support: 1

### **Analysis**

One expression of support has been received for this proposal.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.**

## **Ottershaw**

### **Brox Road**

This proposal is shown in drawings FTV 04 and FTV 05.

Install double yellow lines on the western side of Brox Road from outside No:76 southwards to join up with the existing restrictions on the junction of Chaworth Close.

Install double yellow lines on the western side of Brox Road from outside No:116 southwards to 1 metre past the boundary of No's 122 and 124.

By installing these double yellow lines parked vehicles will be kept to one side of Brox Road only. This will improve access and improve traffic flow on this bus route section of Brox Road at all times.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 2

Other comments: 1

Support: None

### **Analysis**

Both the objectors argue that the restrictions are unnecessary, and that there is only a parking and access issue during the school day. At all other times the street is quite, and the yellow lines will be an imposition on most residents' lives.

The commentator is concerned about displaced parking and where those vehicles will end up.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed with an amendment.** Install the additional double yellow lines outside property numbers 116 to 124. This is the stretch of Brox Road where double parking causes the most congestion. Double yellow lining along this stretch of Brox Road will cover the Bus Stop, clearing vehicles and allowing the bus to pull up at the kerbside at all times.

Do not proceed with installing the double yellow lines outside No's 76 to 92. This will help minimise displacement.

## **Slade Road**

This proposal is shown in drawing FTV 06.

At the eastern end, install double yellow lines on both sides of the bend within Slade Road to maintain access and improve sight lines at all times. Extend the double yellow lines into **Wheatsheaf Close** to also maintain access and sightlines on the junction at all times.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 3

Other comments: 1

Support: 3

### **Analysis**

The objectors argue that on-street parking is all that's available for five properties at the northern end of Spratts Alley, and by introducing double yellow lines as advertised it will take this space away, forcing vehicles to be parked further away from homes. Objectors also say vehicles parked on street slow down through traffic and without them, speeds would increase as Slade Road is increasingly used as a 'rat run'.

Those in support of the advertised parking restrictions say road safety and visibility is compromised on the bend and the approaches to it by parked vehicles reducing the carriageway width leading to on-coming vehicles confronting each other in the centre of the carriageway.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed with an amendment.** Install all the double yellow lines as advertised except for 15 metres on the north side of Slade Road outside No.67. This will retain some on street parking space for the five properties in Spratts Alley.

## **Virginia Water**

### **Trumps Green Road junction Home Close**

This proposal is shown in drawing FTV 07.

Install double yellow lines on the junction of Trumps Green Road and Home Close to maintain access and improve sightlines at all times.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: None

Other comments: None

Support: 1

### **Analysis**

One expression of support has been received.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.** No objections have been received.

## Woodham and New Haw division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Scott Lewis](#)

### Row Town

#### Katherine Close

This proposal is shown in drawing WNH 01

Install double yellow lines on the western side of the junction of Liberty Rise and Katherine Close.

Install double yellow lines on the inside of the junction within Katherine Close.

Vehicles parking on the junction and the bend within Katherine Close are blocking sightlines and causing access issues. Installing double yellow lines in these two places will improve road safety for all.

#### Breakdown of types of feedback received.

Objections: 2

Other comments: 0

Support: 1

#### Analysis

One of the two objectors brings to our attention that a vehicle crossover is likely to be constructed where some of the double yellow lines have been advertised to be installed and there could be a situation of the double yellow lines terminating partly across the new drive. The second objector raises the concern about parked vehicles on the corners of Katherine Close blocking sightlines. These new parking restrictions will help alleviate this issue and improve road safety.

#### Final decision:

**Proceed with an amendment.** If the new driveway is constructed to the specifications stated by one objector, we wouldn't want double yellow lines terminating part way across it. Therefore, the double yellow lines should be reduced to 7.585m at the northern end of 35a to avoid this.

### New Haw

#### The Broadway

This proposal is shown in drawing WNH 02

An informal consultation was carried out from 7 until 28 October 2023, asking people if they wanted limited waiting introduced on the two service roads of The Broadway. Participants were able to nominate hours of operation and days of the week, if they were in favour of a time limit being introduced.

174 people participated in the consultation over the three weeks. Of those, 132 were in favour of introducing limited waiting. 80 of those participants nominated Monday to Saturday as their preferred days of operation. 115 participants nominated 8am to 6pm 2 hours, no return 2 hours as the hours of operation.

The recommendation is therefore to formally advertise the introduction of limited waiting on the two service roads that operate Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6pm, 2 hours, no return 2 hours.

It is also recommended to introduce some double yellow lines at the northern end of the two service roads to prevent long term parking around the junction, maintaining access and sightlines at all times.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: None

Other comments: None

Support: 4

### **Analysis**

We informally consulted about the idea of introducing maximum stay time limits to the parking spaces along the service roads outside the shops on both sides of The Broadway to promote local shopping and support the businesses in October 2023. 173 individuals responded to that consultation. 132 respondents were in favour of limited waiting being introduced. Eighty requesting Monday to Saturday operating days and 115 individuals nominated 8am to 6pm, 2 hours maximum stay, no return within 2 hours as the operating times. The October consultation was seen by the majority of people as the most important, which explains the low response rate to the formal consultation which was advertised the most favoured parking controls.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.** No objections have been received to the formal advertisement.

## **Farleigh Road**

This proposal is shown in drawing WHN 03

Install double yellow lines on the western side of Farleigh Road, alongside No.359 Woodham Lane and No.19 Farleigh Road. Continue the double yellow lines along the north side of Farleigh Road, around the bend into the eastern end of both sides of the **Orchard Avenue** junction.

Install a length of double yellow line on the southern side from the boundary of No's 4 and 6 Farleigh Road west and southwards around the bend and opposite the junction with Orchard Avenue.

Vehicles parking on Farleigh Road, particularly opposite the Orchard Avenue junction block sightlines, creating a hazard for drivers and pedestrians alike. The additional restrictions will manage any potential displaced parking which may relocate to another inconsiderate location and improve road safety and visibility across this whole junction area.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: None

Other comments: None

Support: 2

### **Analysis**

No objections and two expressions of support have been received. One is asking for more parking restrictions to be introduced on Farleigh Road and Orchard Avenue which can be considered in the next Runnymede parking review.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.** No objections have been received.

### **Selsdon Road junction with Farleigh Road**

This proposal is shown in drawing WNH 04

Install double yellow lines on the junction of Selsdon Road with Farleigh Road to maintain access and improve sightlines on the junction at all times.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 0

Other comments: None

Support: 1

### **Analysis**

One expression of support has been received.

### **Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.**

### **Keston Avenue junction with Fullbrook Avenue**

This proposal is shown in drawing WNH 04

Install double yellow lines on the junction of Keston Avenue with Fullbrook Avenue to maintain access and improve sightlines on the junction at all times.

### **Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

Objections: 1

Other comments: None

Support: None

### **Analysis**

The one objection received is concerned about the loss of on-street parking space due to the length of the proposed double yellow lines. They are asking if the streets around can be made *School Streets* like in London Boroughs

### **Final decision**

**Proceed with an amendment.** To maintain more on-street parking install double yellow lines for a distance of 10 metres only into both sides of Fullbrook Avenue. The extent of the double yellow lines on Keston Avenue is intended to create a passing place to assist through traffic travelling along this road. It is understood staff park on Selsdon Avenue for long periods of the day during school term times. If this is the case, it is better to manage this where it is, rather than displacing this parking to an adjoining street.

### **New Haw Road junction Rivermead Close**

This proposal is shown in drawing WNH 05

Install double yellow lines on the junction of New Haw Road with Rivermead Close to maintain access and improve sightlines on the junction at all times.

**Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

None

**Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.**

**Byfleet Road Access Road (New Haw)**

This proposal is shown in drawing WNH 06

Install a length of double yellow line across the dropped kerb where the yellow box hatching used to be to prevent vehicles parking in front of it preventing pedestrians from using it.

**Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

None

**Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.**

**Borough wide Business Permits**

It is recommended to introduce Business Permits in all Controlled Parking Zone and Permit Areas across the borough.

Business permits would be valid for a year at a cost of £150. This cost is to cover the administration and enforcement of the scheme. They will be issued on the following criteria.

The maximum number of business permits that could be issued to a business is calculated by the number of vehicles registered to that business minus the number of off-street parking spaces available at that business premises. For example, if there were 3 registered vehicles and 1 off street parking space it would mean that business could apply for up to 2 business permits. Garages will not necessarily be counted as off-street parking, as it is recognised many are not large enough to accommodate modern vehicles.

Those businesses that have adequate off-street parking cannot have business permits.

The existing price of £50 for the first Business Permit and £75 for all subsequent Business Permits operating in Area D only will be revoked from the Traffic Regulation Order and replaced with this new charge to bring Area D into line with the rest of the Borough.

**Breakdown of types of feedback received.**

None

**Final decision**

**Proceed as advertised.**

**END**

---