

Elmbridge parking review 2023: Decision report

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

Introduction

This document sets out our final decisions about which schemes should go ahead, with or without changes, as part of our Elmbridge parking review 2023.

The proposals were formally 'advertised' by way of a press notice published in the Surrey Advertiser on Friday 24 November, and there then followed a statutory 'objection period' which ended on 22 December 2023, to allow for the public to make representations regarding the proposals.

To further raise awareness of the proposals, in addition to the press notice, we also put up around 200 site notices near where the new restrictions were proposed, and notified people most directly affected by sending around 750 notification letters.

Copies of the proposal documents were made available on our website, where there was also an online form for people to use to let us have their views. We accepted feedback to our proposals from 24 October to 1 January 2024.

We received a total of 431 responses to the proposals via our online form, letters, and emails, with comments about 50 of the new parking scheme proposals.

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

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

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

These are beyond the scope of the parking review and therefore such queries have not been addressed in this analysis. For further information and guidance, please see Annex 3 – General enquiries towards the bottom of this document.

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

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

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

If you are unsure of the meaning or effect of a parking restriction or control that we've proposed, please refer to [Annex 1 – Explanation of restriction types](#), found towards the back of this document.

[Annex 2 – Further information](#) provides some background information about the legal and policy aspects of our work in this area.

For information about other issues please see [Annex 3 – General enquiries](#) for guidance.

[Annex 4 – Information about Electric Vehicle ChargePoint proposals](#) provides further background information about these.

If you would like to know the existing parking restrictions in a given area, please refer to our online [parking restrictions maps](#).

Table of Contents

Introduction	0
Cobham division proposals	5
Cobham	5
Freelands Road – refer to drawing K31	5
Cedar Road – refer to drawing K31	5
Fairacres – refer to drawing M27	6
Canada Road, Lockhart Road – refer to drawing L29.....	6
Freelands Road – refer to drawing L30.....	7
Freelands Road, Four Wents, Haleswood, Tartar Road – refer to drawing L30.....	7
Canada Road – refer to drawing L30	7
Tilt Road – refer to drawing L33.....	8
Stoke D’Abernon	9
Station Road – refer to drawing N34	9
East Molesey and Esher division proposals	10
East Molesey	10
St Mary’s Road, Bell Road, Molesey Park Road – refer to drawing S06.....	10
Ember Farm Way, Ember Farm Avenue, Esher Road, Hampton Court Avenue – refer to drawing S07	11
Orchard Lane, Esher Road, Broadfields – refer to drawing S08	11
East Molesey controlled parking zone – refer to drawing T04.....	12
Esher	13
Mill Road, Farm Road, Douglas Road – refer to drawing P12	13
Esher Park Avenue – refer to drawing Q16.....	13
Hersham division proposals	14
Hersham	14
Hersham Road, Rydens Grove – refer to drawing L16	14
Molesey Road – refer to drawing L17	14
Faulkner’s Road – refer to drawing L17	15
Molesey Road – refer to drawing M15	15
Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott division proposals	16
Claygate	16
Station Road – refer to drawing T18	16
Foley Road – refer to drawing T20.....	16
Coverts Road, Foxwarren – refer to drawing U21	16
The Dittons division proposals	17

Thames Ditton	17
The Broadway – refer to drawing T10	17
Weston Park and Weston Park Close – refer to drawing T11	17
Speer Road – refer to drawing U08	17
Station Road – refer to drawing U09	18
Giggs Hill Road and Watts Road – refer to drawing V10	18
Portsmouth Road – refer to drawing W09	19
Rectory Lane, Betts Way – refer to drawing W11	19
Walton division proposals	20
Walton	20
Dudley Road – refer to drawing J09	20
Thamesmead – refer to drawing J09	20
Walton South and Oatlands division proposals	21
Walton	21
Ashley Close – refer to drawing H11	21
Ashley Park Avenue – refer to drawing I11	22
Ashley Road and Hersham Road – refer to drawing J11	22
Oakfields – refer to drawing J11	23
Kings Close – refer to drawing K11	23
Weybridge	24
Vale Road – refer to drawing F14	24
St Mary’s Road – refer to drawing G16	24
West Molesey division proposals	25
West Molesey	25
Molesey Road – refer to drawing N07	25
Hurst Road – refer to drawing P03	25
Beauchamp Road, Ray Road, Priory Lane, Grange Road, Glebelands, Green Lane – refer to drawing Q05	26
Weybridge division proposals	27
Weybridge	27
Portmore Way – refer to drawing C15	27
Bridge Road – refer to drawing C16	27
Staniland Drive, Dixon Drive – refer to drawing C24	28
Thames Street – refer to drawing D13	29
Thames Street, Grotto Road – refer to drawing D14	29
Elmgrove Road – refer to drawing D15	29
High Street – refer to drawing D15	30

Springfield Lane – refer to drawing D15.....	30
Springfield Meadows – refer to drawing D16	31
York Road – refer to drawing E17.....	32
Annex 1 – Explanation of restriction types	33
No waiting at any time	33
No waiting (at a time non-continuous throughout the year)	33
No loading	33
Controlled Parking Zone	33
Restricted Parking Zone	33
Permit parking schemes	33
Traffic signs and road markings.....	34
Annex 2 – Legal and policy information	35
Policy and Strategy.....	35
Surrey Transport Plan.....	35
Parking Strategy	35
Parking Reviews	36
Legislation	36
Annex 3 – General enquiries.....	37
Speed limits, traffic calming, and speed enforcement	37
Road safety and sustainable travel for schools	37
Creation of additional parking space on verges or grassed areas.....	37
Requests for permit parking schemes	37
Requests for additional parking controls.....	37
Enforcement	38
General enquiries	38
Annex 4 – Information about Electric Vehicle Chargepoint proposals.....	39

Cobham division proposals

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

Cobham

Freelands Road – refer to drawing K31

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (100%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 0 (0%)
- Final decision: do not proceed.

Analysis

We received two objections, both from local residents. One said the bays would not make it easier to park in Cobham. The other thought that the bay closest to the junction was too close, and that it should be removed in the interests of road safety.

With regard to the proximity of the bays to the junction, the current layout has been in place since 2017, and we haven't received any negative feedback about it before. There is no accident record to substantiate any concerns here. The 'standard' distance of yellow lines at a junction is 10 metres, and we have about 20 metres here, therefore we do not believe there is a need to adjust the layout.

Given concerns raised about reserving the existing spaces for EVs only, we have decided to proceed with installing the charge points but leave the bays as they are. No revised drawing provided.

Cedar Road – refer to drawing K31

Overview:

- Objections: 4 (100%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 0 (0%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

All the objections to this scheme were from non-Cobham residents. Three of these say that there is a lack of free or affordable parking for workers in the town, whilst the other felt that the changes would drive away customers from the shops. One suggested that the time limited on the proposed bays should 'at least' be extended to allow four hours parking.

The changes are proposed in order to increase turnover of parking space and therefore improve the scope for short term parking to be available for those visiting local amenities. We recognise that this is unfortunately at the cost of some free unlimited parking, although many roads in the surrounding area are uncontrolled, and we recommend using public transport or active travel where possible.

Fairacres – refer to drawing M27

Overview:

- Objections: 1 (11.1%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 8 (88.9%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Seven of the responses came from residents of Fairacres, including two from the same address; all of these were supportive of the proposal.

Two responses came from Amblecote, one in favour and one against. The grounds for objection were based on potential for displacement and aesthetics of the lines. We do not believe that displacement is a significant risk in this location. Whilst we understand the concerns about aesthetics, safety is our paramount consideration.

The responses in favour cited road safety concerns.

Canada Road, Lockhart Road – refer to drawing L29

Overview:

- Objections: 6 (46.2%)
- Other comments: 1 (7.7%)
- Support: 6 (46.2%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor modification.

Analysis

Of the objections, three were from residents directly fronting the proposals opposite the junction, and one was a visitor of those properties. These objections were based primarily about concerns of the loss of ability for residents and their visitors to park outside their houses, along with some concerns about impact on property prices. A couple of responses said that kerbside parking had always been allowed here and was part of the reason for purchasing their properties. One suggested that the restriction should operate during school times only, if it must go ahead.

Whilst we recognise that on street parking is valuable to residents, it is stated in the highway code that motorists should not park opposite a junction.

Of the remaining two objections, once came from a resident of Lockhart Road, who was worried about displacement of parked vehicles, and the other one was a local worker who parks in the road.

We do not believe that displacement will be a substantial problem resulting from this scheme. Whilst we recognise that on street parking is valuable to local workers, safety is our top priority.

The 'other comment' received was also from a resident directly fronting the proposals opposite the junction, who felt the restrictions were a good idea for safety reasons but should only operate between 8am and 5pm.

We thank those who wrote in to support the proposal, of which five were residents of Canada Road, and one was a resident of Tartar Road.

Given the feedback received, we think it is appropriate to change the proposed double yellow lines opposite Lockhart Road to a single yellow line, operating Monday-Friday 8am-6pm. Please see revised drawing L29.

Freelands Road – refer to drawing L30

Overview:

- Objections: 1 (25%)
- Other comments: 1 (25%)
- Support: 2 (50%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objection – from a resident of Haleswood – stated they would support the removal of the yellow line here if the road were subject to speed control.

Traffic speeds are directly correlated to forward visibility and (effective) carriageway width. We believe that in allowing additional parking and thereby narrowing the effective width of the road, a 'natural' traffic calming effect will be achieved.

The 'other comment' raised concerns that the plans on the website were insufficiently clear. We provide written descriptions alongside the plans to remove any doubt as to what's proposed.

The supports – from residents of Canada Road and Tartar Road – supported the yellow lines but were concerned about speeding and enforcement of parking controls. Please refer to the response above. Introduction of speed bumps or similar is beyond the scope of the parking review. Enforcement of parking controls is provided by our contractor NSL. Please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information about both of these topics.

Freelands Road, Four Wents, Haleswood, Tartar Road – refer to drawing L30

Overview:

- Objections: 15 (100%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 0 (0%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor modification.

Analysis

The responses feature seven objections from residents of Four Wents, with the remainder from Haleswood. The overwhelming theme in the feedback was that allowing parking outside 1 Four Wents would cause significant traffic and safety problems.

We thank residents for their feedback, and are happy to adjust the proposal to retain that section of single yellow line as it currently exists. Please refer to revised drawing L30.

Canada Road – refer to drawing L30

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (33.3%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 4 (66.7%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The two objections were from residents of Lockhart Road and Canada Road. The former agreed with yellow lines on the bend but was concerned about displacement and suggested a permit

parking scheme instead. The latter was concerned about the loss of parking space, speeding, and that parking controls in the town centre force people to park further out.

The yellow lines on the northern side of the road between Tartar Road and the bend are proposed where currently no parking takes place, they are simply to prevent scope for it taking place in future as the road is too narrow to support it. Parking restrictions on the bend may cause some displacement but not a significant amount. Safety is our top priority, and parking too near to the bend poses a safety risk.

Please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information about request for traffic calming, and permit parking schemes.

Parking controls in the town centre, i.e. time limited parking bays, are there to support turnover of parking space to support the local shops and are in line with good parking management practice.

The support came from residents of Canada Road, Tartar Road and a nearby resident whose parents live on Canada Road. We thank those who wrote in to support the proposal. One resident suggested further controls. Please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information about requesting additional controls.

Tilt Road – refer to drawing L33

Overview:

- Objections: 1 (25%)
- Other comments: 1 (25%)
- Support: 2 (50%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The objection – from a resident in the vicinity of the proposal – stated that the people of visibility at the bend is due to the fact that residents of 52, 54 and 56 have removed low bushes and replaced them with taller bushes on the common land in front of their properties, and that a simpler solution would be to ensure residents park on their driveways.

Whilst the taller vegetation (which according to our information is on Highway Land, not Common Lane), may exacerbate the problem, vehicles parked on the bend would pose a risk in any case because they would block sightlines and force south / eastbound vehicles onto the incorrect side of the road to get through. The council has no mechanism to force anyone to park on their driveways, but yellow lines are a simple effective way to prevent parking on the highway.

We thank the two residents of Tilt Road and Farm View who supported the proposal based on safety grounds.

The 'other comment' from a resident of Tilt Road requested further parking controls - please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information.

Stoke D'Abernon

Station Road – refer to drawing N34

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (28.6%)
- Other comments: 2 (28.6%)
- Support: 3 (42.9%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received two objections, one from a former resident of Station Road, and one from a resident of the adjacent Vincent Road. The former objection stated that the lost parking space would negatively impact on trade at the local pub, whilst the latter felt that the proposals would lead to increased traffic speeds and make it difficult for pedestrians to cross the road.

The pub has a large carpark and on street parking will still be permitted nearby.

No part of Station Road is currently unrestricted in terms of parking. As parking will still be permitted at times along substantial lengths of Station Road, we do not believe that traffic speeds will be significantly impacted by the proposed changes.

The two 'other comments' were from residents of Station Road, both of whom supported the scheme but suggested changes for improvement. One suggestion was to introduce traffic calming to slow traffic speeds and improve safety, and the other was to extend the proposed restrictions east of their most easterly point to improve safety at the access to the recreation ground and remove parking that causes congestion outside the pub.

Consideration of traffic calming measures are beyond the scope of the parking review, please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information.

The remaining three comments in support of the proposals all came from residents of Station Road who cited safety and access reasons for their support. One of these mentioned the double yellow lines should be extended to cover the gate at the recreation ground, and one mentioned that these should be reinstated following resurfacing.

We thank those who wrote in to support the proposals, and we will ensure that the double yellow lines are installed in front of the pedestrian gate as per the existing traffic order having been incorrectly replaced as single yellow following resurfacing. It does not seem necessary to extend them any further than that; parking alongside the recreation ground provides somewhere for visitors to the recreation ground and the local pub somewhere to park.

East Molesey and Esher division proposals

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

East Molesey

St Mary's Road, Bell Road, Molesey Park Road – refer to drawing S06

Overview:

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

Analysis

We received two objections. One was from a resident of the far end of Molesey Park Road who complained that the restrictions would make it difficult for parents to pick up and drop off children at the nearby Orchard School. The proposals are made for safety reasons, in order to prevent dangerous, selfish and obstructive footway parking; no-one should park in such a way for any reason.

The other objection was from a resident of Bell Road (not fronting the proposals), who raised concerns that parking stress in the road was high, that it was difficult for residents to find a parking space, and that the proposal would worsen the situation. They suggested that a permit parking scheme should be introduced to remove commuter parking and to make it easier for residents to park.

The proposed yellow lines are in locations where parking would otherwise take place on the footway, posing a danger and an obstruction, or near the junction / bend at Molesey Park Road / Bell Road. None of these areas are suitable for parking and as such should not be considered 'lost space'. For further information about permit parking schemes please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries.

All of the 'supports' and 'other comments' came from residents of St Marys Road and Bell Road, all fronting the proposed restrictions. One supported the proposals but was concerned that the increased effective width of the road would lead to higher traffic speeds and that therefore a 20mph speed limit should be imposed for safety reasons. The road will continue to have parking along one side; presently it is only occasional parking that takes place on the (footway) on the western side of the road, therefore there is likely to be little to no impact on traffic speeds. A further three of the comments/supports also raised this issue, of which a couple also suggested that bollards should be implemented to prevent people driving on the footway. Please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information about speed limits and bollards, both of which are beyond the scope of the parking review. It would be a difficult location to install bollards due to the number of vehicle crossovers to private driveways.

A couple of the responses suggested that parking restrictions should be introduced on the inside of the bend outside the church, and another suggested that the proposed restrictions between the nursery and Molsesey Park Road were unnecessary and would encourage further parking on the outside of the bend of Bell Road.

Whilst parking on the inside of the bend by the church compromises sightlines it does serve to slow traffic. There have been no recorded accidents here. Parking around the outside of bend by 24/26 Bell Road appears to be preferable from a visibility / safety perspective than the inside.

There was one suggestion to extend the lines further north of their currently proposed extent. Any requests for further controls would need to be considered as part of a future parking review, please see Annex 3 – General enquiries for details.

At the request of residents, we have agreed to go ahead with the scheme including a small extension of the double yellow lines across the driveway of number 22. Please see revised drawing S06.

Ember Farm Way, Ember Farm Avenue, Esher Road, Hampton Court Avenue – refer to drawing S07

Overview:

- Objections: 0 (0%)
- Other comments: 2 (33.3%)
- Support: 4 (66.7%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

All of the feedback was from residents of Ember Farm Avenue, including two in support from the same address. Four of the responses recommended the lines were extended further into Ember Farm Way, as parking on both sides of the road near the junction causes obstruction. One specifically stated that they should not be extended any further, and one also requested that lines were extended across number 55 Esher Road.

Given there is no consensus on the idea of extending the lines further than initially proposed, we will go ahead 'as advertised'. If problems materialise in future, we can reconsider the location as part of a future parking review.

Orchard Lane, Esher Road, Broadfields – refer to drawing S08

Overview:

- Objections: 0 (0%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 4 (100%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

All of the feedback came from residents of affected roads. These included suggested for extension of controls in some areas, namely:

1. on Orchard Lane near the junction with Esher Road (1), and
2. on Orchard Lane opposite the junction with Orchard Farm Avenue (2).

The proposed double yellow lines at 1) above, are around 18 metres long (generous in comparison to the 10 metre 'rule' in the highway code) and it does not appear necessary to extend them further at this stage. The lines proposed at 2) above result from a road safety inspection and again do not appear to need further adjustment.

Any requests for further controls could be considered as part of a future parking review, please see Annex 3 – General enquiries for details.

East Molesey controlled parking zone – refer to drawing T04

Overview:

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

Analysis

All of the responses came from residents of East Molesey but none from roads within the controlled parking zone.

The 'supports' both came from the same address, citing support for the proposal to resolve the problems of vehicles parking too near to the car park for the Prince of Wales pub.

One objection says that the existing zone works well, and scrapping it is madness. The proposal is only to convert the type of scheme from a controlled parking zone to a 'normal' parking scheme, there will be no material change other than those relatively minor adjustments specified in the statement of reasons.

The other objection raises concern that those who need longer than 30 minutes e.g. for hair and beauty treatments, meals, shopping etc will be negatively affected. As this may technically be true, since the change only applies to just two spaces, we think that the negative impact will be minimal if any at all.

Esher

Mill Road, Farm Road, Douglas Road – refer to drawing P12

Overview:

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

Analysis

Two objections from residents directly fronting the proposals within Mill Road near the junction with Farm Road. They stated that parking directly outside their homes is beneficial and allows them / their visitors to park, and to load / unload heavy goods. One also mentioned the impact on property prices and parking displacement along Mill Road, and the other also added that whilst parking restrictions on the junction would be beneficial, they do not need to extend so far along Mill Road.

The two comments in support said that there are regular problems with access in this area particularly for HGVs and buses, and general congestion. One felt that facilities for loading and unloading for the café and convenience store needed to be considered, and that some parking bays for customers would be beneficial too.

While we want to facilitate access for larger vehicles, given the concerns raised, we'll reduce the extent of yellow lines as per the revised drawing P12.

Esher Park Avenue – refer to drawing Q16

Overview:

- Objections: 1 (100%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 0 (0%)
- Final decision: do not proceed.

Analysis

Objection stated that EV bays would be better suited to Civic Centre where they are more easily found and allow for more time than the insufficient two hours provided within these proposals.

Bays already exist within the Civic Centre car park. The projected numbers of EVs coming onto the roads over the next few years will require ever more charging locations. The two-hour time limit will not provide a full charge from empty, but will provide a significant boost whilst the owner is visiting the facilities of Esher. EV owners know how to find spaces (via an app or in-car technology).

Given concerns raised about reserving the existing spaces for EVs only, we have decided to proceed with installing the charge points but leave the bays as they are.

Hersham division proposals

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

Hersham

Hersham Road, Rydens Grove – refer to drawing L16

Overview:

- Objections: 1 (25%)
- Other comments: 1 (25%)
- Support: 2 (50%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

All of the feedback was from residents of the road.

The objector felt that the bays were unnecessary and caused a problem in reducing local parking capacity for residents.

We believe that the parking bays will be beneficial for those visiting local amenities. The parking bays will not be in operation during peak parking stress times which is when most residents are at home, i.e. in the evenings and overnight.

The 'other comment' was concerned about enforcement of the controls – we will ensure that these restrictions will be suitably enforced.

We thank those who wrote in to support the proposals. One of these responses raised concerns about people not making the most of the available space by not using their off street parking – we can't force people to use this. They were also worried about commercial vehicles using the street for parking. You may wish to contact the Department for Transport's Traffic Commissioners to check that the operators of these vehicles are compliant with their licence conditions. Their contact details are available here:

[Office access and opening times - Traffic Commissioners for Great Britain - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

Molesey Road – refer to drawing L17

Overview:

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

Analysis

The objection states that accessing the off street parking at number 35 will be dangerous with vehicles parked in the proposed parking bays, and states that a vehicle exiting this driveway will need to reverse across two lanes of traffic before being able to turn in the correct direction.

The visibility from the driveway will be the same as it is for number 37 at present. We do not feel there is a safety concern arising from these proposals. It is safest to reverse into a driveway to ensure good visibility when leaving it again, as per the guidance in the highway code.

Faulkner's Road – refer to drawing L17

Overview:

- Objections: 7 (58.3%)
- Other comments: 3 (25%)
- Support: 2 (16.7%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor modification.

Analysis

Most of the objections relate to the proposed EV bays, although none of them were from residents of the road. Most of the objections relate to the loss of space for use of visitors or workers at the Guide Hall, Preschool, or Nursery (5), plus a resident of a nearby road.

One objection queried what the commercial arrangements behind the proposed EV bays were. We went through a tender process and appointed Connected Kerb as sole supplier (or they are at least given 'first refusal' on any site). As part of this contract, we will receive a fixed revenue per kwh sold.

Suggestions for alternative locations of chargers were raised – New Berry Lane car park, outside the shops (presumably in Pleasant Place) or in the new spaces on Queens Road.

One objection stated that the ban on HGV parking would make it difficult for them to do their job as a heavy vehicle recovery operator.

Of the other comments – all of which expressed support for the proposal – various topics were raised. One was concerned that the HGV ban would prevent deliveries / loading / unloading and we can advise that this is not the case. One raised concerns regarding the existing permit parking bay which have already been responded to outside of this process, and the other raised a request for further controls. Any requests for further controls would need to be considered as part of a future parking review, please see Annex 3 – General enquiries for details.

We thank those who wrote in to support the proposal, which was apparently on the basis of the HGV ban.

Given concerns raised about reserving spaces for EVs only, we have decided to proceed with installing the charge points but not the bays so leaving the space available for general use. No revised drawing provided.

Molesey Road – refer to drawing M15

Overview:

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

Analysis

Both responses came from residents fronting the proposal.

We thank the resident who wrote in to support the proposal on safety grounds.

The objector stated that the proposals were unacceptable because they would take away or block vehicle access to their property. It is unclear how the proposals would achieve this. Double yellow lines only apply to the highway, they do not prevent people parking on private land.

Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott division proposals

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

Claygate

Station Road – refer to drawing T18

Overview:

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

Foley Road – refer to drawing T20

Overview:

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

Analysis

We thank the respondent, who corrected an error in the Statement of reasons, referring to '79' instead of '75'. The response also suggests that the 8 metres section should be extended further. The eight metres proposed is already an exceptionally long length of restriction at a private driveway serving one property on an unclassified road. We see no justification to extend it further. A standard driveway is 2.7 metres wide.

Coverts Road, Foxwarren – refer to drawing U21

Overview:

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

Analysis

The feedback received supports the proposal but also suggests conversion of grass verge to additional parking capacity. This is beyond the scope of the parking review please see Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information.

The Dittons division proposals

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

Thames Ditton

The Broadway – refer to drawing T10

We received no formal objections to this proposal, but Elmbridge Borough Council raised concerns about reserving the existing spaces for EVs only, so we have decided to proceed with installing the charge points but not the bays so leaving the space available for general use.

Weston Park and Weston Park Close – refer to drawing T11

Overview:

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

Analysis

The objections came from residents of Weston Park including two from the same address, whilst the support came from a resident of Weston Park Close.

Objectors stated that the proposals are unnecessary as there has never been an accident here, and that losing 6 to 8 parking spaces is counterintuitive in a road with high levels of parking stress. One suggests an advisory sign would help to keep the area clear, particular on Wednesday mornings when refuse collection takes place.

Whilst there are fortunately no accidents on record at this location, we feel that introducing parking controls in this location will reduce risk of accidents occurring, as well as improving access. If refuse collection vehicles struggle to access the Close at present, then it follows that all service vehicles would do so, thus confirming the requirement for parking restrictions.

We recognise that parking stress is high in the street - primarily due to residents' vehicles - and we have therefore proposed the minimum length of restrictions possible.

We thank the resident who wrote in to support the proposal, who requested that the controls were extended further. Please see above paragraph.

Speer Road – refer to drawing U08

Overview:

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

Station Road – refer to drawing U09

Overview:

- Objections: 16 (64.0%)
- Other comments: 5 (20.0%)
- Support: 4 (16.0%)
- Final decision: cancel proposal.

Analysis

All the feedback - bar one support - came from residents of Station Road, including four objections from two addresses. All the objections share broadly the same concerns, namely:

- traffic speeds and volume will increase and therefore safety will be reduced,
- loss of parking space will negatively impact on residents who don't have access to off street parking, and visitors to the village.

Many objections mention things beyond the scope of the parking review, such as requests for further traffic signs, speed cameras, traffic calming or traffic filtering.

Some people mentioned the idea of bollards. This idea has been investigated but is unfeasible without first removing the on-street parking, because at present it is necessary for vehicles to sometimes take to the footway in order to get past each other due to insufficient carriageway width. If we install physical measures to prevent this, the road will at times become completely blocked.

Some objections also cited problems with driving on the footway and resultant safety concerns. The only way to stop this from happening is by preventing the parking that is causing vehicles to take to the footway which is the purpose of this proposal.

A number of people suggested that perhaps the restrictions could only apply during peak times. Whilst this could be an alternative idea, parking stress is not significant during off peak times, so there is little to be gained in this suggestion, and it also requires signage which adds to implementation and maintenance costs, is less well understood by motorists, and is more visually intrusive.

Some responses suggested locations where restrictions should be extended, or other ideas such as permit parking schemes. Any requests for further controls could be considered as part of a future parking review, please see Annex 3 – General enquiries for details.

We thank those who wrote in to support the proposals.

Giggs Hill Road and Watts Road – refer to drawing V10

Overview:

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

Portsmouth Road – refer to drawing W09

Overview:

- Objections: 1 (14.3%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 6 (85.7%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We thank those who wrote in to support the proposal which includes four in total from Fernbank and Albany Lodge, one from another nearby address, and one from an address outside the area.

The objection came from a nearby address who said that the restrictions are unnecessary, and Portsmouth Road provides parking for those who have no ability to create off street parking.

We understand that residents value on street parking, however we have to find a balance and safety is always our top priority.

Rectory Lane, Betts Way – refer to drawing W11

Overview:

- Objections: 5 (45.5%)
- Other comments: 2 (18.2%)
- Support: 4 (36.4%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

Of the objections, three were from residents within in the affected area, and two were from other nearby roads.

The feedback was mainly concerned about the loss of parking space for residents, for the shops, and that traffic speeds would increase as a result.

The proposal is only to introduce yellow lines on corners and junctions, where it is posing a safety concern, therefore the 'loss of parking space' is minimal, and the effect on traffic speeds will be zero; on street parking will still be permitted on Rectory Lane and this will still serve to slow traffic.

The 'other comments' both came from residents of Rectory Lane; one was concerned about displacement of parked vehicles, and the other was about loss of space for residents (see above). We believe there will be minimal displacement caused by these necessary parking restrictions.

We thank those who wrote in to support the proposals based on safety grounds, of which three were from residents within the affected area, and one was from another nearby road. One response suggested that the space adjacent to number 67-69 should be reserved for loading by specific users – that is not possible within the regulations, but the proposed yellow line will prevent parking and allow loading/unloading (during the operational period of 8am-6pm).

Walton division proposals

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

Walton

Dudley Road – refer to drawing J09

Overview:

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

Analysis

We received three objections to this proposal plus one 'other comment', all of which were from residents of Dudley Road.

This proposal follows our receipt of nine separate requests for something to be done about parking on yellow lines at this junction, all of which came from residents of Dudley Road. Whilst enforcement of the existing yellow lines is part of the answer, this parking occurs because here is no nearby space available when customers visit the business on the corner. Therefore, this proposal was designed to alleviate the problem.

The feedback centred about concerns about displacement of parked vehicles from the premises mentioned above, concerns regarding antisocial behaviour from the same, and about a loss of parking for residents.

The proposal only relates to three 'spaces', and therefore in relation to the area as a whole the effect and potential for displacement is negligible, but the reduction in risk owing to parking on the yellow lines at the junction will be appreciable. Safety is our top priority.

Antisocial matters should be reported to the police.

Thamesmead – refer to drawing J09

Overview:

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

Analysis

We received one objection from a resident of Dudley Road based on 'lack of legal basis', 'adverse impact', and 'absence of due process'.

We have explained the rationale for this proposal in the Statement of Reasons and are comfortable this is sufficient 'legal basis'. The proposal relates to one parking space, so the 'adverse impact' is negligible; the benefits of car clubs outweigh the disbenefits. We have complied with the relevant legislation for the introduction of parking controls.

Walton South and Oatlands division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Ashley Tilling](#). The [advertised drawings are still available on our website](#) for reference.

Walton

Ashley Close – refer to drawing H11

Overview:

- Objections: 16 (20.5%)
- Other comments: 1 (1.3%)
- Support: 61 (78.2%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor modification.

Analysis

We received 61 comments in support, 16 objections and 1 other comment. Many respondents wrote in to support the proposals, and then wrote in again to say they should only apply Monday – Friday. Filtering out such duplication leaves:

- from Ashley Close residents:
 - 7 objections from 4 addresses,
 - 35 supports from 21 addresses,
- from the wider Walton / Weybridge area:
 - 3 objections from 3 addresses
 - 6 supports from 5 addresses, and
- from further afield:
 - 4 objections from 3 addresses,
 - 1 support.

There are 30 addresses within Ashley Close, giving the overall level of support from within the road as 70% of addresses and 84% of responses. A few of these are conditional on the controls being reduced to Monday-Friday, and the vast majority of respondents were in support of this change to the proposal.

We thank those who wrote in to support the proposal, which in the main was based on safety and access concerns.

The objections were primarily of the view that there were no safety concerns, and that the restrictions would reduce ease or availability of parking for residents, and that existing on street parking provides a natural traffic calming effect. Most residents enjoy ample off street parking, and substantial parking will still be available on street, which will also help limit traffic speeds.

We have put forward this proposal following our receipt of a parking scheme request form signed by the vast majority of residents, and the response to this proposal is overwhelmingly positive, so it is agreed to proceed with a revised scheme operating Monday-Friday 8am-6pm only. Please see revised drawing H11.

Ashley Park Avenue – refer to drawing I11

Overview:

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

Analysis

The 'objection' stated that the map was incorrect and that we maintain the road up to the gates with Ashley Park Crescent, and that further no waiting restrictions should be considered.

Thank you – we will correct the map. Any requests for further restrictions would need to be considered as part of a future parking review - please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information.

We are thankful for the comments in support for the EV, car club, and limited waiting bays, which was received from the Walton Business Improvement District representative. They also commented regarding the usage of the existing car club bays in the layby on New Zealand Avenue. Any requests to amend these would need to be considered as part of a future parking review - please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information.

Ashley Road and Hersham Road – refer to drawing J11

Overview:

- Objections: 7 (100%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 0 (0%)
- Final decision: do not proceed.

Analysis

All of the objections received were from or on behalf of parents or careers, who said that the existing time limited bays on Ashley Road were useful for school pick-up and drop off.

Given the number and nature of objections regarding this proposal, we will cancel it and explore other options for locations for EVCPs.

Oakfields – refer to drawing J11

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (66.7%)
- Other comments: 1 (33.3%)
- Support: 0 (0%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The feedback was from residents of the road. One objection stated the residents were in the process of applying for the road to become 'private' and the other said that parking is already difficult and further control will make it harder for residents.

The 'other comment' supported the proposals.

We have proposed this scheme following a parking scheme request form signed by residents of 19 properties in the road, so there is overwhelming support for it.

Kings Close – refer to drawing K11

Overview:

- Objections: 0 (0%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 11 (100%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Weybridge

Vale Road – refer to drawing F14

Overview:

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

Analysis

The objections were from a resident of each of Vale Court, Vale Road, and Cross Road. They cited concerns about displacement from Vale Road to other roads in the area. One respondent suggested that the operational hours of the permit scheme should be increased, and one that the cause of the problem was the permit scheme and parking changes outside Orchard Place.

The permit scheme was put in place at the request of and following consultation with residents. There are many factors that could lead to changes in parking patterns, and we have regular parking reviews in order to address any displacement problems.

We have no plans to extend the hours of the permit scheme which is beyond the scope of the current parking review in any case.

It is illegal to park so as to obstruct the highway including the footway and carriageway and so the proposed restrictions are entirely reasonable.

We thank the residents who wrote in to support the proposals.

St Mary's Road – refer to drawing G16

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (66.6%)
- Other comments: 1 (33.3%)
- Support: 0 (0%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor modification.

Analysis

All of the feedback came from residents of the road.

The 'other comment' was that the proposals fall short of changes required for the road for safety reasons, and raises a number of concerns that are beyond the scope of the parking review. Please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information about how to raise these matters.

The objections were primarily about the section of proposed yellow lines outside number 77, stating that they should be removed entirely or reduced in length so as to provide a space for the residents of number 77 to park there.

It seems reasonable to reduce the length of yellow lines as requested by objectors, please see revised drawing G16.

West Molesey division proposals

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

West Molesey

Molesey Road – refer to drawing N07

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (28.6%)
- Other comments: 1 (14.3%)
- Support: 4 (57.1%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We thank those who responded to support this proposal.

The objections, which came from one address within Knights Close, said they park where the restrictions are proposed, and that the restrictions are unnecessary as there has never been an accident here. Whilst there are fortunately no accidents on record at this location, we feel that introducing parking controls in this location will reduce risk of accidents occurring by improving sightlines for motorists joining the busy and fast flowing Molesey Road. Parking is available within Knights Close.

The 'other comment', plus one of the 'supports' requested the lines to be extended to Pool Road. Requests for further restrictions would need to be considered as part of a future parking review - please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information.

Hurst Road – refer to drawing P03

Overview:

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

Analysis

We thank the respondent who wrote in to support the proposal, but also recommended the lines be extended further in both directions and added on the opposite side. Requests for further restrictions would need to be considered as part of a future parking review - please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further information.

Beauchamp Road, Ray Road, Priory Lane, Grange Road, Glebelands, Green Lane – refer to drawing Q05

Overview:

- Objections: 4 (66.6%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 2 (33.3%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received two objections from resident of Beauchamp Road, one from Priory Lane, and one from Eastcote Avenue.

The objections are concerned about the loss of parking capacity for residents, and state that they are unnecessary. We respond to concerns raised with us by the public. The locations where yellow lines are proposed are all on junctions, where the highway code advises motorists not to park.

One response stated that parking by their house was required in order to use the dropped kerb and access their electric vehicle charging point. Yellow lines do not prevent the 'use' of the dropped kerb – the function of which is to provide legal means of access from the public highway to a private parking area (not to 'reserve' a parking spot on the public highway). We do not allow the public to trail charging cables across the public footway due to the trip hazard.

Parking is not at capacity within this area, and it is available further away from the junctions where the controls are proposed.

We thank those residents who wrote in to support the proposals based on safety grounds.

Weybridge division proposals

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

Weybridge

Portmore Way – refer to drawing C15

Overview:

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

Analysis

We thank the resident who wrote in to support the proposal.

Bridge Road – refer to drawing C16

Overview:

- Objections: 8 (72.7%)
- Other comments: 1 (9.1%)
- Support: 2 (18.2%)
- Final decision: cancel proposal.

Analysis

We received feedback from a number of residents and businesses. The general trend of comments raised concerns that the existing spaces were well used by local people to park for a short time and visit local shops and amenities, thereby supporting businesses. Business raised views that lack, or loss, of general use parking and reduction of parking turnover would add to existing challenges on the high street.

Some felt that EVs need to be charged overnight at residents' homes, and that public EVCPs should be placed in off street car parks.

Given the number and nature of objections regarding this proposal, we will cancel it and explore other options for locations for EVCPs.

Staniland Drive, Dixon Drive – refer to drawing C24

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (11.8%)
- Other comments: 7 (41.2%)
- Support: 8 (47.1%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

All of the feedback came from local residents, except one which was a visitor to the same.

The objections - one from Dixon Drive and one from Mays Close - were based on the fact that parking restrictions are not required 'at any time' and should only operate at specific times, and that parking would be displaced to adjacent, narrower roads which would pose a significant problem.

We have proposed restrictions at junctions and shared accesses, i.e. locations where parking is inappropriate at any time, so the restriction time is suitable. Additionally, 'timed' restrictions require signage which presents a greater installation and maintenance cost, and a vandalism risk.

Many of the 'other comments' and 'supports' came with suggestions for additional controls, such as extending restrictions:

- further into Dixon Drive, both sides (1).
- on Staniland Drive, opposite Dixon Drive (2)
- further into Staniland Drive (spur) (2).
- to the road and corner opposite 28 Staniland Drive (2).
- to cover the east side of Staniland Drive by numbers 1-17 (1).
- to cover the west side of Staniland Drive from Wellington Way to Dixon Drive (1).

We are unable to consider introducing further restrictions at this stage of the process, however any requests could be looked at in a future parking review. It is of course still the case that it is illegal to obstruct the highway (carriageway or footway) regardless of the absence of formal parking controls.

Eight responses highlighted problems specifically relating to HGV or van parking along with associated safety and antisocial issues.

We do not have any parking measures in place to address such concerns, but again these could be considered within a future parking review. It is relatively straightforward to prohibit parking by HGVs. However, as 'vans' are generally of the same vehicle class as regular cars, any measure to restrict them would equally apply to cars belonging to residents and their visitors, so this idea requires careful consideration.

Given the number of suggestions and complexity of the issue, we think the best way to approach this would be for residents to complete a parking scheme request form as per the information on our website, at:

[The parking review process - Surrey County Council \(surreycc.gov.uk\)](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk)

One response stated that articulated delivery HGVs for the distribution centres get lost, especially when Wellington Way is shut and have to do 3-point turns in the Staniland/Dixon junction, and therefore suggested a "No HGVs except for access" restriction. This is beyond the scope of the parking review – please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries.

Another response noted that the road is within a conservation area, and the parking is unsightly.

Thames Street – refer to drawing D13

Overview:

- Objections: 0 (0%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 2 (66.6%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We thank those who wrote in to support this proposal.

Thames Street, Grotto Road – refer to drawing D14

Overview:

- Objections: 0 (0%)
- Other comments: 5 (100%)
- Support: 0 (0%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

The feedback to this proposal was all suggestions for further improvements. Please refer to Annex 3 – General enquiries for further details as to how these may be considered.

Elmgrove Road – refer to drawing D15

Overview:

- Objections: 17 (65.4%)
- Other comments: 4 (15.4%)
- Support: 5 (19.2%)
- Final decision: do not proceed.

Analysis

We received feedback from a number of residents and businesses. The general trend of comments raised concerns that the existing spaces were well used by local people to park for a short time and visit local shops and amenities particularly the post office and café. Business raised views that lack, or loss of general use parking and reduction of parking turnover would add to existing challenges on the high street.

Some felt that EVs need to be charged overnight at residents' homes, and that public EVCPs should be placed in off street car parks, and that the two hour limit isn't long enough to charge in any case. Several objections raised concerns that limiting bays to EV use only is discriminatory and has a negative impact on people who can't afford an EV.

A couple of objections mentioned that existing EVs bays in Churchfield Road car park are underutilised.

We thank the residents who wrote in in support of additional EVCPs.

Given the number and nature of objections regarding this proposal, we will cancel it and explore other options for locations for EVCPs. Please note, we will proceed with an amendment to the traffic order to correct it to reflect the existing yellow lines on the road at the access to the Royal Mail site.

High Street – refer to drawing D15

Overview:

- Objections: 20 (95.2%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 1 (4.8%)
- Final decision: do not proceed.

Analysis

The comments received were broadly as per Elmgrove Road, although with the additional concern that the area was recently redesigned for use as a flexible area. The bays are often suspended to allow the market to take place, and this will not be possible with all the new street furniture, some suggested that the bays opposite would be a better location.

Given the number and nature of objections regarding this proposal, we will cancel it and explore other options for locations for EVCPs.

Springfield Lane – refer to drawing D15

Overview:

- Objections: 6 (31.6%)
- Other comments: 1 (5.3%)
- Support: 12 (63.2%)
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

Analysis

We received six objections, two from residents of Springfield Lane, one from a resident of the High Street, and three from the same address in Mays Close. All of the objections mentioned were essentially on the grounds there wasn't enough parking in the nearby area for residents.

The lack of available parking does not excuse obstructive parking. We have no obligation to provide or enable on street parking, but we do have a duty to ensure the highway is safe and users are able to move about it expediently.

We thank those who wrote in to support this proposal.

Springfield Meadows – refer to drawing D16

Overview:

- Objections: 2 (66.6%)
- Other comments: 1 (33.3%)
- Support: 0 (0%)
- Final decision: go ahead with minor amendment.

Analysis

We received two objections to the proposal here, plus one letter written on behalf of 32 residents from 17 addresses within Springfield Meadows, which we have classified as 'other comment'. The letter requests:

1. That the permit scheme operates at any time, and that in doing so the access problems at number 2 Springfield Meadows would be resolved by retaining a parking space in front of the access.
2. That the (proposed retained) shared use parking bay at the northern end of the road becomes 'permit holders only'.
3. That the turning head is converted to additional parking capacity as it is not used – larger vehicles instead tend to use the access to St James Mews for this.

It is beyond scope of the current parking review to consider significant changes to the existing or proposed parking arrangements in Springfield Meadows. Changes could be looked at as part of a future parking review, however it is worth noting that Springfield Meadows is a road within a controlled parking zone which covers a large part of Weybridge. The zone helps to balance parking stress across the area; having largely consistent restrictions helps with this and improves understanding of, and so compliance with, the restrictions.

The two objections came from a local resident, and a resident of the road itself.

The former's comments were along the same lines as that of the letter mentioned above but added that signage should be installed at the beginning of Springfield Meadows to state that parking within the road is for permit holders only. This is not possible to do with the current or proposed scheme.

The other objector felt that the best option would be to remove the parking bay from in front of number two but retain the access protection marking, as it would allow the resident to park but discourage others from doing so. As this is within a controlled parking zone, it is not possible for us to agree to this request. We have decided to retain the existing layout of a parking bay and access protection marking, but with the bay becoming permit holders only rather than shared use. Please see revised drawing D16.

York Road – refer to drawing E17

Overview:

- Objections: 11 (72.6%)
- Other comments: 0 (0%)
- Support: 4 (26.3%)
- Final decision: do not proceed.

Analysis

Whilst all but one of the pieces of feedback were from Weybridge addresses, four of the objections were from immediately local residents, and two from businesses. Some objections were primarily concerned about the parking changes that were made previously and felt these should be undone or amended, although generally speaking residents and businesses felt that the further suggested changes would worsen the parking situation.

One response said the recently introduced 30-minute bays were valuable and at a premium and extending the maximum wait time to two hours was a poor use of this space.

One objection felt that a dual use overnight EV only but short term parking bay during the day would offer the 'best of both worlds'.

Respondents provided some suggestions for alternative locations, such as car parks, or the other end of York Road (or EV owner's homes).

We thank those who wrote in to support this proposal.

Given the number and nature of objections regarding this proposal, we will cancel it and explore other options for locations for EVCPs.

Annex 1 – Explanation of restriction types

No waiting at any time

This means that parking is not allowed at any time. This restriction is nearly always indicated by double yellow lines marked on the ground; no upright signing is required (or indeed permitted) in this case. The only exception to this would be a restriction that applied within a 'restricted parking zone', or 'pedestrian / pedestrian or cycle zone', wherein no road markings are needed but upright signage is required.

There are standard exemptions for loading and unloading, picking up and dropping off of passengers, and parking by blue badge holders for up to three hours (provided it's safe).

No waiting (at a time non-continuous throughout the year)

An example may be 'No waiting Monday – Friday 8am – 6pm'. These restrictions are the same as those above, with the same exemptions, the only difference is the times at which they operate. This restriction is usually indicated by a single yellow line marked on the road, which must be accompanied by upright signing. The only exemption to this would be within a controlled parking zone (see below).

No loading

A loading restriction is indicated through small yellow marks on the kerb at right angles to the road and repeated approximately every 3 metres. A single kerb blip means that loading is prohibited at specific times/days, a double kerb blip means loading is prohibited at any time.

Loading restrictions would always be in addition to waiting restrictions. Stopping to allow passengers to board and alight is allowed even where loading restrictions apply. There are no exemptions for blue badge holders.

'Loading / unloading' generally refers to items too large or bulky to be practicably moved very far, such as a refrigerator.

Controlled Parking Zone

This is simply an alternative way of signing waiting restrictions. In a controlled parking zone, the times at which the single yellow lines are in operation (i.e. when parking is prohibited), are displayed on zone entry signs (unless signed otherwise locally). The main benefit of a controlled parking zone is to reduce sign clutter within the zone. Any type of parking bays – signed and marked in the normal way - may or may not be provided within the zone.

Further information about [controlled parking zones is available on our website](#).

Restricted Parking Zone

This is where waiting restrictions (and loading restrictions if applicable) are indicated on zone entry signs, and on frequent upright repeater signs within the zone. There are no road markings to indicate the restriction. Any type of parking bays may be provided within the zone, which would need to be individually marked and signed.

Permit parking schemes

Permit parking may be provided as 'normal' marked parking bays with accompanying upright signing. These may or may not comprise part of a controlled parking zone or a restricted parking zone.

Permit parking areas are schemes where there are no road markings to indicate the parking controls, only signs which read, "Permit holders only past this point", at the entry points to the area. Repeater signs are provided within the area. Waiting restrictions (single or double yellow lines) can be included within a permit parking area.

Further information about [permit parking schemes](#) is available on our website.

Traffic signs and road markings

Further background information on common road markings and traffic signs may be found on the Department for Transport webpage [Know your traffic signs](#).

Annex 2 – Legal and policy information

Policy and Strategy

Our decisions around parking schemes are based on a number of policies and strategies.

Surrey Transport Plan

The [Local Transport Plan](#) is a statutory document that sets out our strategy to help people to meet their transport and travel needs effectively, reliably, safely and sustainably within Surrey, in order to promote economic vibrancy, protect and enhance the environment, improve the quality of life, and reduce carbon emissions.

Based on this vision there are four objectives for the Surrey Transport Plan:

- **Effective transport** - to facilitate end-to-end journeys for residents, business and visitors by maintaining the road network, delivering public transport services and, where appropriate, providing enhancements.
- **Reliable transport** - to improve the journey time reliability of travel in Surrey.
- **Safe transport** - to improve road safety and the security of the travelling public in Surrey.
- **Sustainable transport** - to provide an integrated transport system that protects the environment, keeps people healthy and provides for lower carbon transport choices.

There are 13 strategies that form the Surrey Transport Plan, one of which is the Parking Strategy.

Parking Strategy

The [Parking Strategy](#) is designed to help shape, manage and deliver the county council's vision for parking, "Provide parking where appropriate, control parking where necessary".

The objectives of the Parking Strategy are:

- Reduce congestion caused by parked vehicles.
- Help enable greener and more sustainable travel choices.
- Make best use of the parking space available.
- Enforce parking regulations fairly and efficiently.
- Provide appropriate parking where needed.

To achieve these objectives and realise the vision for parking, work will be channelled through three main areas:

- Manage on street parking space to ensure optimum use through our parking review process.
- Operation of civil parking enforcement – fair and cost effective with greater use of technology to achieve compliance.
- Promotion of parking controls that can help improve sustainable and greener transport and communities. At the same time, the policies are intended to help achieve other objectives of the council, such as improving journey times, sustaining and enhancing the vitality of town centres and contributing to a reduction in carbon emissions.

Parking Reviews

We receive hundreds of requests for new parking restrictions within our boroughs and districts every year. We use the parking review process to efficiently prioritise requests and manage the implementation of those requests following prioritisation and approval. Engineers consider a number of factors when assessing those requests, including:

- road safety
- accessibility
- congestion
- the possibility of just displacing a problem, and
- how many people support the request.

Legislation

The list below provides the most relevant pieces of legislation to our work around parking restrictions and controls. It is not an exhaustive list.

- [Highways Act 1980](#) - this is the primary legislation that governs local authorities' powers and duties relating to the public highway.
- [Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984](#) – this is the legislation that provides the power for local authorities to regulate or restrict traffic on the public highway.
- [The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders \(Procedure\) \(England and Wales\) Regulations 1996](#) – this dictates the procedures which authorities must follow in order to lawfully make a traffic regulation order.
- [Traffic Management Act 2004](#) – this legislation provides powers and duties in relation to managing traffic on the public highway network, and provides the power for enforcement of a number of parking related contraventions.
- [The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016](#) – this is a Statutory Instrument that provides instruction to authorities as to the road markings and traffic signs that may / must be installed on the public highway.

As defined by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the reasons for which authorities may introduce a traffic order for waiting, loading and stopping restrictions are:

1. Avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising.
2. Preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road.
3. Facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians).
4. Preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property.
5. Preserving the character of the road in a case where it is especially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot.
6. Preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.
7. Any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995, relating to air quality.

No such explicit list exists for the creation of parking controls, e.g. parking bays, permit schemes etc.

Annex 3 – General enquiries

This annex contains information about topics that are quite often raised by people when making comments in response to parking proposals, but are generally things that are not considered within a parking review, or not possible to consider at that time.

Speed limits, traffic calming, and speed enforcement

Speed limits are introduced by the county council provided Surrey Police agree with the limit proposed. Further information about speed limits can be found on our website at:

[Speed limits](#)

Speed limits and traffic calming measures are considered by our highway engagement team, and you can raise queries regarding these subjects using the contact details on the next page. The police are the only authority with powers to enforce speed limits.

Road safety and sustainable travel for schools

Surrey County Council provides a range of services to help schools on this matter, more information can be found at:

[Road safety and sustainable travel for schools](#)

Creation of additional parking space on verges or grassed areas

This is not something that is considered by the parking team or within a parking review. The council has essentially no funding to carry out this type of work at the current time, but any requests for these types of schemes would need to be considered by the highway engagement team, who can be reached via the contact details on the next page. Note, it is not aligned to our policies around climate change to remove green space to provide additional parking for vehicles, and therefore officers would rarely recommend such action.

Requests for permit parking schemes

We can consider introducing permit parking schemes under appropriate circumstances. However, such significant changes can't be considered based on only one or two comments. Anyone wanting to find out more about permit parking should first look at our webpage which explains where, why, and how a scheme could be introduced, and how they work, at:

[Permit parking schemes](#)

Having read that information, any customers interested in pursuing the idea of permit parking further, should consider raising a parking scheme request form (petition), as explained online at:

[The parking review process](#)

Requests for additional parking controls

Due to the legal processes involved, we cannot generally consider further parking restrictions over and above those already 'advertised'. The best way to put forward any ideas for new parking controls is to raise them to be considered as part of the next parking review in the area. Information about parking reviews, including how and why we do them, and how to raise any further requests, is available on our website at:

[The parking review process](#)

Enforcement

Parking controls on street in Elmbridge are administered and enforced by Surrey County Council via its contract with NSL. If you have any queries about this, you may email them via the following address:

SurreyParkingEnforcement@nslservices.co.uk

Elmbridge Borough Council own and enforce public off street car parks. If you have any queries about this, you may reach them on:

- **Telephone:** 01372 474474 (Monday to Friday 8.45am - 4.30pm)
- **[Online](#)**

General enquiries

Any other enquiries regarding highways can be raised via the electronic forms on our website:

[Contact our roads and transport service](#)

Or using the contact details below:

- **Telephone:** 0300 200 1003 (9am to 5pm, Monday to Friday, excluding bank holidays. Emergencies only at all other times)
- **Email:** contact.centre@surreycc.gov.uk
- Textphone (via Text Relay): 18001 0300 200 1003
- **SMS:** 07860 053 465
- **Fax:** 020 8541 9575
- **Address:** Contact Centre, 1st Floor, Fairmount House, Bull Hill, Leatherhead, Surrey, KT22 7AH

Annex 4 – Information about Electric Vehicle Chargepoint proposals

In July 2018 the Government published Road to Zero, an ambitious roadmap towards delivering zero-emissions transport across the UK. Within transport, we at Surrey County Council believe that electric vehicles offer an excellent opportunity to help the county on a pathway towards this vision and we are excited about the potential benefits they may have for Surrey residents, businesses and visitors. Surrey is an area that is well-suited to adopting electric vehicles and we are keen to help realise this potential through our [Electric Vehicle Strategy \(PDF\)](#).

From November 2019 to now, Surrey installed over 165 on street fast charging points across 8 out of its 11 districts and boroughs funded through 2 separate pilot projects. Surrey County Council has now partnered with Connected Kerb to rollout thousands of additional electric vehicle chargepoints across the county in the coming years.

As we provide more recharging points across the county, we help to make it easier for electric vehicle users to charge their vehicles, which encourages other drivers to switch to electric vehicles over time.

The locations put forward as part of this parking review have been selected following consideration of a number of factors including:

- the anticipated demand for chargepoints by local residents and visitors – for example, shoppers, and,
- numerous technical considerations such as suitability of local grid infrastructure, footway and carriageway geometry and traffic flow, existing highway and service provider apparatus and street furniture, and anticipated installation costs.