

# Spelthorne parking review 2023: Decision report

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

## **Contents**

Introduction .....	2
Staines division proposals.....	3
Staines South and Ashford West division proposals .....	8
Laleham and Shepperton division proposals .....	12
Lower Sunbury and Halliford division proposals.....	15
Sunbury Common and Ashford Common division proposals .....	16
Ashford division proposals .....	17

## Introduction

The Spelthorne Parking Review 2023 proposals, which were agreed by county councillors and the Parking Traffic and Enforcement Team manager in October 2023, were advertised from 5 July to 2 August 2024.

As part of this process, street notices were erected at each location, and notification cards were hand delivered to those properties immediately fronting proposed changes. In addition, a formal notice was published in the Surrey Advertiser.

All these documents referred members of the public to drawings and a statement of reasons document available online via the webpage: <http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorneparking>

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

Responses to the advertisement were received via an online form through the webpage above, or by letters being sent to the following address: Spelthorne Parking Review 2023, Parking Team, Hazel House, Merrow Lane, Guildford, Surrey, GU4 7BQ. Members of the public were asked to submit either a support, comment or objection response.

During the advertisement period, there were 102 support responses, 70 comment responses and 1,602 objections. There was also a 1,280 signature objection petition to one of the proposed schemes. All these responses have been read and considered in full, and the total number of responses for each location have been listed. However, for the purpose of this report, the responses have been summarised into key points only, followed by analysis and a decision on how to proceed following these considered responses.

The decisions made in this report are final and there is no appeal process. Any further requests for changes to these agreed restrictions will need to be submitted as part of a future [parking review of Spelthorne](#).

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

# Staines division proposals

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

## Staines

### Moor Lane

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-1
- Objections: 4
- Comments: 0
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Mede Court residents and visitors who currently park here for free would have to pay for permits.
- Existing permit bays are not always full.
- Existing yellow line outside Mede Court should be removed to make more unrestricted space.
- Parking on Moor Lane is dangerous.
- Impact on people accessing open public space for exercise.

#### Analysis

Since this permit scheme was first introduced in this part of Staines, there have been persistent requests from some permit holding residents for additional permit spaces on Moor Lane, and this proposal for a bay that can hold 7 cars is intended to permanently resolve this issue both now and in the future. Mede Court residents have always been eligible for permits and will be able to use the bay or others if they wish to obtain permits, but if they or their visitors do not want to do this then there is unrestricted space further along Moor Lane to park unrestricted. The single yellow line is located on the apex of a gradual bend and helps to maintain sight lines and two-way traffic flow for traffic travelling around that bend, as well as helping with driveway access and sight lines, but its primary reason is for safety on the bend and there are no plans to remove this. The existing permit parking scheme greatly reduced the number of parking spaces on Moor Lane and in combination with the double yellow lines, made Moor Lane much safer and more passable, especially for larger vehicles. This reduction in on-street parking capacity on Moor Lane meant that there was a greater demand for parking within the bays, both when the scheme is operational and in the evenings when it's not, and the additional proposed bay will be the final extent of permit parking for this scheme to address this issue over demand for more spaces.

### Richmond Road / Eton Court / Augur Close

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-2
- Objections: 49
- Comments: 10
- Support: 36
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- This permit scheme would cause displacement parking to nearby streets.

- Similar restrictions should be proposed for the surrounding streets as well.
- Residents inside the proposed permit scheme area may still struggle to park near to their homes.
- Many residents inside the proposed permit scheme area have off street parking whereas residents in surrounding streets do not.
- The permit scheme might force non-permit holders to park in nearby private parking areas without permission.
- This scheme was proposed before and dropped due to displacement parking, so why is it being proposed again as this same issue remains.
- Richmond Road residents and visitors would still be allowed to park in nearby streets, but nearby residents would not be allowed to park in Richmond Road.
- The number of spaces inside the permit scheme area will still not hold all resident and visitor cars so these will still need to be parked in surrounding roads.
- The scheme will cause more problems than it will solve.
- Residents with off street parking would not be able to obtain permits which isn't fair.
- The problem is residents with too many cars not commuters, which have reduced in number over recent years.
- There is no guarantee of a space, and the scheme does not operate in the evenings or overnight.
- Residents of Gresham Road need to be able to park on Richmond Road as there isn't always enough space on Gresham Road.

The comments related to the following points: -

- Permits should be offered to Laleham Road properties south of Richmond Road as well.
- General support of the scheme for residents and their visitors.
- Permits should be offered to Gresham Road properties as well.
- Council's previous stance on permit parking in this area has changed.
- Parking will be displaced to Gresham Road.
- Scheme should be expanded to other streets nearby as well.

## Analysis

12 out of the 49 objections (representing 10 households) were from residents inside the proposed permit scheme area.

32 out of the 36 support responses (representing 25 households) were from residents inside the proposed permit area.

There were around 120 notices hand delivered to the properties located inside the proposed permit area, in addition to multiple street notices erected both inside and outside the same area.

In terms of households located inside the proposed permit scheme, the number of supporting households is lower than what was expected for this advertisement, and the number of objecting households was higher than what was expected.

However, it is understood that several residents inside the proposed permit area have access to off street parking, either driveways at the front of their property off Richmond Road or private parking areas off Richmond Crescent, and that these residents may not necessarily reply to the advertisement as it would not affect them as much as those without off-street parking. It is also understood that residents who do not have objections to make do not necessarily respond with a support response and compared to the total number of households inside the proposed permit area, the number of those objecting is relatively low.

37 out of the 49 objections (representing 31 households) were from residents outside the proposed permit scheme area, but only 26 out of these 37 objections (representing 21 households) came from residents located in the surrounding streets where multiple street notices were erected to make these residents aware of the proposed permit scheme. These surrounding streets were Gresham

Road (part), Beehive Road, Edgell Road, Budebury Road, Wyatt Road and Langley Road. The remaining objections mostly came from residents elsewhere in Spelthorne.

The number of objections from residents of these surrounding streets was much lower than what was expected.

Whilst we ideally would have liked to have seen more support from residents located inside the proposed permit scheme area, considering all of the above broken down detail, the number of objections are not considered to be significant enough to justify not proceeding with this scheme, and it is therefore decided to proceed with this scheme and the associated slight double yellow line and electric vehicle bay revocations as shown on the plan.

Regarding the history of this proposal, in 2017/18, Surrey County Council carried out a large consultation on permit parking for all streets south of Staines Railway Station, but there was very little support for permit parking outside of the Richmond Road, Eton Court and Augur Close area. Whilst Edgell Road showed some higher levels of support for permit parking, with that street being located in the middle of several adjoining others, it was not deemed suitable for a permit parking scheme without incorporating all its adjoining streets, but as those adjoining streets generally did not support permit parking, this area was not taken any further for permit parking. As Richmond Road, Eton Court and Augur Close is a clearly defined area with only two junctions to enter from, and as these residents did show strong support for permit parking, as also reflected in their previous petitions for permit parking, it was decided to propose a scheme for these streets. However, this scheme was not approved for advertisement by the Spelthorne committee at the time, and they deferred the decision to the Spelthorne parking task group, where it was agreed the scheme should not be proceeded with due to concerns regarding displacement parking to the wider area.

Following plans for Thameside House to be redeveloped, there was a public exhibition for this development and Richmond Road residents raised concerns regarding the impact of that development on parking in Richmond Road and its adjoining streets. In response to these concerns, at the end of 2019, Surrey County Council and Spelthorne Borough Council agreed that permit parking should be reconsidered for Richmond Road, Eton Court and Augur Close when the Thameside House redevelopment was at a more advanced stage, which is the current situation. Therefore, as part of this 2023 Spelthorne parking review, the permit scheme was proposed again and subsequently agreed for advertisement, which this report is a summary of.

Displacement parking to nearby streets remained a concern, and to make the surrounding streets aware that this permit scheme was being proposed again and being advertised, multiple street notices were erected in all the surrounding streets (as detailed previously above) inviting residents to support, comment or object to the proposals. These same street notices were also erected inside the proposed permit scheme area, so any resident from a surrounding street parking inside that area would be able to see those same notices there in addition to those within their own street. As mentioned above, the number of objections from this wider area was much lower than what was expected.

## **Park Avenue junction with Laleham Road**

### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 2023-3
- Objections: 6
- Comments: 4
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed with amendments.

### **Summary**

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Double yellow lines should not be outside the houses.

- Deliveries will not be allowed to stop.
- Just pushes the problem further down the street.
- Parking in the whole street needs assessing.

The comments related to the following points: -

- A box junction should be installed.
- Double yellow lines should be on both sides of the road for the same length as proposed on the north side.
- Sight lines coming out of Park Avenue are poor to the right and those restrictions need to be extended.

### **Analysis**

The 6 objections represented 3 households.

Drivers are allowed to stop on double yellow lines to load or unload goods or to pick up or drop off passengers, so deliveries and stopping will not be prevented. The lines are only shown as red on the plan to indicate their extent clearly, but they are double yellow lines on the ground.

As explained in the statement of reasons document provided online during the advertisement, these proposed extensions of double yellow lines are to address sight line issues, particularly when exiting the junction and looking right, and to address access issues in and out of the junction for larger vehicles, including buses serving the Grovebarns sheltered housing located at the far end of the street. For several years now, there have been cones placed by someone unknown on the verge on the north side of Park Avenue to prevent parking, and this proposed extension of double yellow lines is to formalise this but extending further to allow larger vehicles to pass through.

Considering the objections received, it is proposed to proceed with the following amendments: -

On the north side of Park Avenue, terminate the proposed double yellow lines at the western boundary of number 1 Park Avenue (the boundary by the two garages) so the double yellow lines will not be in front of any properties. As this northern extent will be shorter, the proposed extension of double yellow lines on the south side of Park Avenue will not be proceeded with to avoid parked vehicles on that south side from being moved further into Park Avenue, which would no longer be suitable now that the north side extent will be shorter, as the distance between the parked cars would be reduced.

The proposed extension on Laleham Road will proceed as advertised to improve the poor sight lines for exiting drivers on that side.

### **Raleigh Court**

#### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 2023-4
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### **Summary**

The objection has confused this proposal, which is for double yellow lines, with a proposed permit parking scheme, which isn't being proposed here.

#### **Analysis**

As above.

## Leacroft junction with Georgian Close and Shortwood Common

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-4
- Objections: 5
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- There shouldn't be any more parking restrictions in the vicinity of the railway station until suitable and affordable railway parking provision is available.
- There is no issue here, leave it as it is.
- Will reduce space for fisherman visiting Shortwood Common which is the only nearby place to fish.

### Analysis

Some objections confused these proposals for double yellow lines with permit parking, which is not being proposed here.

The proposal for additional double yellow lines on Raleigh Court is to address an issue with staggered parking preventing access by larger vehicles, especially refuse collection vehicles and is needed to maintain access at all times, which will include the need for emergency service vehicle access. The proposal for additional double yellow lines at the end of Leacroft by Georgian Close and Shortwood Common is to maintain sight lines and access on these junctions, including the ability for drivers to see cyclists and pedestrians travelling under the bridge. There are still plenty of opportunities to park nearby in this area for the purpose of fishing and other activities on Shortwood Common without needing to be right by the junctions and the by-pass bridge. Parking within 10m of a junction is already prohibited under the Highway Code.

## Broadway, Kingston Road

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-5
- Objections: 11
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Restrictions will affect trade.
- Will impact residents.
- There are no reasons for this proposal.
- Shops will go out of business.
- There shouldn't be any parking charges introduced here.

### Analysis

The objections have confused these proposed changes with other proposed schemes in Spelthorne such as permit parking and paid parking, or they have misunderstood what is being proposed. As explained on the plan and in the statement of reasons document provided online during the advertisement, these proposed changes to parking bays and single yellow lines in Broadway, Kingston Road are just for our Traffic Regulation Order plans to reflect the current installed layout on the ground, and nothing will change on the ground itself.

# Staines South and Ashford West division proposals

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

## Staines

### Stainash Parade, Kingston Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-5
- Objections: 22
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections and comments referred to the following points: -

- Paid parking should not be introduced here.
- Parking spaces should not be reduced.

#### Analysis

All but one of the objections have confused these proposals with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre, which is not being proposed here. The proposals are just to amend our Traffic Regulation Order plans so that they reflect the current installed bay locations in Stainash Parade, Kingston Road. Nothing will change on the ground itself.

### Stainash Crescent

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-5
- Objections: 4
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Paid parking should not be introduced here.
- People need to be able to park by their houses.

#### Analysis

Most of the objections have confused these proposals with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre, which is not being proposed here. The proposal for additional double yellow lines by the junction with Kingston Road is not outside any property frontages but needed to maintain sight lines, traffic flow and road safety by the junction.



## Laleham

### Bingham Drive

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-6
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Northfield Road junction with Staines Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-7
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objection referred to the following points: -

- Already limited parking in this area and this would reduce it further.
- Would make it harder for residents to park near to their houses.
- Will increase pollution.

The comment referred to pedestrians crossing this junction being dangerous and needing improvement.

#### Analysis

As explained in the statement of reasons document provided online, this proposal for additional double yellow lines is to significantly improve sight lines and access in and out of the street following a meeting held between Surrey Police and Surrey Highways where inadequate sight lines and access issues were identified. Whilst these extents of double yellow lines are longer than what is normally done on junctions, Staines Road is a busy main road and drivers will often be travelling around the speed limit along here, with southbound drivers' attention being split between the junction and the approaching bend. All these things considered it was believed a greater extent of double yellow lines was needed here to make a noticeable difference to sight lines.

With these extended double yellow lines, access in and out of Northfield Road will be greatly improved as the double yellow lines currently do not go far enough into the road and this causes issues for meeting traffic (those exiting meeting those entering). Whilst it is understood that residents without off-street parking would need to park further away than currently, the remaining length of Northfield Road is unrestricted and there are many opportunities to park in this street without needing to be right by the junction and causing issues for other drivers.

These proposals would not impact on pollution, although improving traffic flow in and out of a junction is more likely to reduce pollution in the immediate area than to increase it.

Pedestrian sight lines for those crossing this junction would be improved with the extension of the double yellow lines.

## Ashford

### Avondale Road junction with A30 London Road (National Highways)

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-8
- Objections: 5
- Comments: 2
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections have all confused this double yellow line proposal with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

The comments referred to sight lines being difficult when exiting on the A30.

#### Analysis

As explained above, the objections have confused this double yellow line proposal with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

Regarding exiting onto the A30 from Avondale Road, this is indeed difficult due to parking taking place in the laybys located on the A30 and this has previously been reported to National Highways who are responsible for the A30 London Road as it is a trunk road and not under the jurisdiction of Surrey County Council. National Highways were looking into several issues along this part of the A30, but it's not known what the latest is on that project, but they are aware of issues on this junction. Residents can also report this issue to Highways England via their webpage.

<https://report.nationalhighways.co.uk/>

### Woodthorpe Road (Salvation Army)

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-24
- Objections: 29
- Comments: 1
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Parking outside the Salvation Army building does not cause any problems.
- There isn't anywhere else to park nearby.
- People don't park here for very long.

The comment stated that lines are needed by the traffic islands.

A support response requested that the lines stop before the dropped kerb for number 78.

#### Analysis

The vast majority of objections have confused this double yellow line proposal outside the Salvation Army building with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

This proposal for double yellow lines is to limit the parking taking place outside the Salvation Army building to 4 car lengths near the junction with The Wickets but away from the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing and island where parking has been obstructing sight lines for people crossing.

The extent of the double yellow lines terminating at the boundary of numbers 78 and 80 is necessary to maintain access for vehicles passing the traffic island and without these restrictions,

displacement parking is likely to occur alongside the raised kerbs outside numbers 78 and 80, which is too close to the central island and would obstruct the carriageway.

# Laleham and Shepperton division proposals

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

## Shepperton

### Watersplash Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-9
- Objections: 24
- Comments: 6
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- The proposals will impact on local residents.
- Not clear why proposals are being made.
- Pett's Lane should be closed off to vehicles.
- Many different large vehicles access this road without issue (delivery, building supplies, minibuses etc).
- Large lorries have accessed the road recently.
- Restrictions will prevent residents from being able to park outside their homes.
- Parking will be moved to other parts of the road causing issues elsewhere.
- The parking helps keep traffic speeds down.
- The remaining width of the road is adequate for large vehicles to pass.
- Parking restrictions will affect business for the local pub.
- Residents already park considerably for passing traffic.
- Never known any vehicles not being able to pass along this section.
- The 574 bus has altered its route and operates perfectly on it so this should be made permanent, but it is able to pass down Watersplash Road.
- Will affect residents without off street parking and their insurance policies of not being able to park outside their homes.
- Parking will move to Stewart Avenue.
- Property value will be reduced.
- Proposals will create animosity amongst residents.
- Proposals will affect vulnerable residents more significantly.
- Residents should have been consulted on this before these proposals were made.
- Issues on the slight bend only occur when larger vehicles are parked there.
- Access issues in this part of Watersplash road rarely occur.
- Many residents have more than one car and have visitors so it will affect residents.
- The refuse collection vehicle is a similar size to the bus and does not have issues.
- The bus should be re-routed down Wood Road instead which is more suitable.
- A smaller bus should be used, especially as it's rarely full.
- The bus only operates a couple of days and week, and this is too much inconvenience just for this.
- Disabled parking bay needed where double yellow lines are proposed.

The comments related to the following points: -

- Proposals are long overdue, but displacement is a concern.
- Understand the need for proposals but where will the residents park.

- Issues relating to parking by carers vehicles and those visiting more vulnerable residents.
- Restrictions are needed on Pett's Lane.
- Footway parking should be addressed.
- Displacement parking concerns.

### **Analysis**

The 24 objections represented 19 households, with 12 of those households being in Watersplash Road and the others being elsewhere in Spelthorne or further afield.

The 574 bus was re-routed to avoid Watersplash Road due to access issues in this part of the street where parking restrictions have been proposed. Buses are rigid vehicles and will not be as manoeuvrable as other vehicles of a similar size with articulated fronts, such as refuse collection vehicles.

However, it is clear from all the objections and comments received that residents believe there is no issue with access here for larger vehicles, or that such related incidents are rare, and that permanent parking restrictions would cause far more issues for residents than they would solve for passing traffic.

Taking all of this on board, it is decided not to proceed with these proposed double yellow lines, but the location will continue to be monitored for access issues.

## **Thurlstone Parade, High Street**

### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 2023-10
- Objections: 8
- Comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### **Summary**

The objections referred to the following points: -

- The electric vehicle spaces should be removed as it's not fair to take space away from those shoppers who may not be able to afford electric vehicles.

### **Analysis**

7 out of the 8 objections have confused these proposals with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

The changes shown for Thurlstone Parade are just for our Traffic Regulation Orders to match the currently installed layout on the ground and nothing will change on the ground itself.

Regarding the electric vehicle spaces at this location, they occupy only a very small proportion of the total number of parking spaces available in Shepperton High Street for non-electric vehicle users, including on the opposite side of the parade and at each end of the electric vehicle spaces, where there is disabled parking and 3 hour parking nearby.

## **Manygate Lane**

### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 2023-11
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 3
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### **Summary**

The comments referred to the following points: -

- Double yellow lines should be extended all along this side of the road.

- There are issues with vehicles overhanging driveways on the opposite side of the road.

**Analysis**

Whilst the continuous line of parked cars along the west side of Manygate Lane up to the junction with Green Lane is not ideal for two-way traffic flow, a lot of double yellow lines have been introduced in this street previously which reduces on-street parking each time and the double yellow lines focus on the most hazardous and obstructive parts of the street. Extensively preventing parking throughout larger extents of Manygate Lane would not be best for the local community, but we do try to address the most concerning parts of this street by introducing double yellow lines and school keep clear markings where they are most needed. Regarding drivers overhanging residential dropped kerbs, this can be reported to our enforcement company NSL via [surreyparkingservices@nslservices.co.uk](mailto:surreyparkingservices@nslservices.co.uk).

# Lower Sunbury and Halliford division proposals

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

## Sunbury

### Green Street including junction with Sutherland Avenue

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-12
- Objections: 9
- Comments: 1
- Support: 7
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Restrictions will negatively affect people picking up and dropping off children for school.
- Will cause more traffic problems.
- It is hard to find space in the health centre car park.
- It will push school parking into the health centre car park.
- There shouldn't be any more parking restrictions in Sunbury and other restrictions should be removed.

The comment requested additional restrictions for Church Street by Thames Street.

A number of support comments mentioned how this will improve footway access as parking on both sides of the road here reduces the footway width as well as the carriageway width.

#### Analysis

One of the objections has confused this proposal with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

As explained in the statement of reasons document, this section of Green Street is both on and on approach to a bend and is also on or near to four side road junctions. Parking on bends and junctions is already prohibited under the Highway Code. On street parking forces passing traffic further out into the carriageway to pass those parked cars, and on a bend, this is much more hazardous, especially if oncoming vehicles are also doing the same thing on the opposite side. Whilst it is not advisable here for the reasons explained, drivers are allowed to stop on double yellow lines to pick up or drop off passengers, or to load or unload goods, and these restrictions will not legally prevent that. However, the long straight section of carriageway to the south of the Sutherland Avenue junction is far more suitable for parking than this bend outside the health centre and would be more in compliance with the Highway Code.

# Sunbury Common and Ashford Common division proposals

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

## Ashford

### Alexandra Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-13
- Objections: 3
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections appear to have confused this proposal to revoke a disabled bay which is no longer needed with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

#### Analysis

As above.

## Sunbury

### Juniper Gardens (Private) junction with Vicarage Road

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-25
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.



# Ashford division proposals

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

## Ashford

### Feltham Hill Road (Gatehouse Close)

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-14
- Objections: 6
- Comments: 1
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- The parking issue is mainly caused by Royal Mail vans rather than residents.
- This location is used as overflow parking for Royal Mail staff.
- The parking is mostly residents without parking provision.
- The parking restrictions will cause more issues on Poplar Road, especially with accesses.
- Parking will be displaced further along Feltham Hill Road to outside the houses.

The comment requested additional restrictions on the other side of Poplar Road.

#### Analysis

As explained in the statement of reasons document, these restrictions are to prevent drivers parking on the footway along this section of Feltham Hill Road, which has continued to take place after the development construction had finished and the new access road built. This footway parking not only obstructs the footway which pedestrians and others are trying to use, but here it is also obstructing and damaging the multiple street boxes located in this footway, and obstructing sight lines to the newly constructed entrance to Gatehouse Close.

Footways are not designed to take the weight of vehicles, and drivers should not be parking entirely on footways in the first place, or driving over raised kerbs, and drivers should not be viewing this wide footway as any overflow parking area, either for Royal Mail staff or for residents and visitors.

These restrictions, which will apply to the entire width of the footway, are necessary here for the reasons explained above, and the location will remain under review should further restrictions be required to prevent similar footway parking issues occurring elsewhere in this street.

### Feltham Hill Road junction with Orchard Avenue

#### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-14
- Objections: 2
- Comments: 1
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Chessholme Road junction should be included in these proposals.

The comment has misunderstood the current road layout as the warehouse shown on the mapping has been superseded by a new residential development not yet shown on current mapping.

## Analysis

One objection confused these double yellow lines proposals with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

The Chessholme Road junction with Feltham Hill Road is currently on the 2024 Spelthorne parking review for assessment for possible double yellow lines as well.

## Feltham Hill Road junction with Garden Close

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-14
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 1
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Summary

The comment requested restrictions for the Chessholme Road junction.

## Analysis

The Chessholme Road junction with Feltham Hill Road is currently on the 2024 Spelthorne parking review for assessment for possible double yellow lines as well.

## School Road junction with Glenfield Road

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-15
- Objections: 4
- Comments: 0
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Restrictions will push school parking onto other streets.
- Stop trying to stop people parking.
- Won't be able to visit friends.

## Analysis

Some of the objections have confused these proposals for double yellow lines with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

The proposed extensions of double yellow lines on this junction are needed to improve sight lines for vehicles exiting this junction, especially during school peak times.

## Sandells Avenue junction with Wrens Avenue

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-16
- Objections: 6
- Comments: 1
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Quiet road. No need for this.

- Parking will move further into Wrens Avenue.
- Road is congested enough.
- Restrictions will prevent residents and visitors parking near to their homes.
- Not practical.

The comment expressed support for the proposals.

### **Analysis**

Parking within 10m of a junction is already prohibited under the Highway Code, and these proposed double yellow lines are intended to enforce that rule and maintain road safety, sight lines and access on the junction at all times. Whilst parking will likely move further into Wrens Avenue, parking should never have been occurring on the junction in the first place as it is highly hazardous and obstructive to other road users.

## **Poplar Road junction with Coolgardie Road**

### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 2023-17
- Objections: 1
- Comments: 0
- Support: 5
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### **Summary**

The objections referred to the following points: -

- There are already enough parking restrictions.
- This is just to make money.

### **Analysis**

As explained in the statement of reasons document, these restrictions are to help maintain sight lines for drivers travelling around the bend, and to also make it easier for meeting traffic to see each other and pass each other when negotiating this turning and its approach. These proposals will also make it easier and safer for drivers and pedestrians to access the business centre, especially when other drivers are negotiating the bend at the same time.

Surrey county council, as highway authority, is obligated to maintain a safe and passable road network, and parking restrictions help towards meeting this obligation, especially on locations where parking is already prohibited under the Highway Code, which some drivers are choosing to ignore routinely.

## **Rosary Gardens**

### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 2023-18
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## Feltham Road

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-18
- Objections: 6
- Comments: 0
- Support: 2
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Would impact people visiting local shops.

### Analysis

The objections do not seem to make any specific points in relation to this location and most seem to be confusing it with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

There is a limited waiting bay outside the parade of shops at this location for visitors to park in.

## Feltham Hill Road (by Fontmell Park)

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-19
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 2
- Support: 3
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Summary

The comments referred to the following points: -

- Existing restrictions are not enforced so no point doing further restrictions.
- Parking restrictions should extend further.

### Analysis

The extent of the additional double yellow lines is all that's deemed to be necessary here to resolve the issues that have been report. Enforcement is carried out by our enforcement company NSL. Enforcement by schools has to be rotated to share resources around all schools in the borough.

## Chesterfield Road junction with Ford Road

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-20
- Objections: 7
- Comments: 2
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Parking will move further into the streets.
- No more restrictions are needed in this area.

### Analysis

Many of the objections appear to have confused this proposal for double yellow lines with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre. Parking within 10m of a junction is already prohibited under the Highway Code, and these proposed double yellow lines are intended to enforce that rule and

maintain road safety, sight lines and access on the junction at all times. Whilst parking will likely move further into Ford Road, parking should never have been occurring on the junction in the first place as it is highly hazardous and obstructive to other road users.

## Ashford Town Centre (Paid Parking)

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-21, 2023-22 and 2023-23
- Objections: 1,190 (Plus a 1,280 signature objection petition, plus 134 borough councillor leaflet objection responses)
- Comments: 23
- Support: 12 (Plus 1 borough councillor leaflet support response)
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- It will be the end of the town.
- This will cause small businesses to close.
- People will visit the big supermarkets nearby (Tesco and Lidl) instead where parking is free.
- There are no problems with parking in Ashford town centre.
- Shops and businesses are already struggling and closing down.
- Parking will be moved to residential roads to avoid the charges.
- There is already a lack of spaces since the multi-storey car park closed.
- The multi-storey car park should be re-opened.
- People will stop coming to Ashford and will go to other towns instead.
- The existing 2 hour limit just needs to be better enforced.
- Many people visiting Ashford only want to stop for a short period of time (5 or 10 minutes) and these people will not want to bother with the hassle of paying with cash or using an app just for these brief visits and will go elsewhere.
- Local residents should have free permits to park.
- It will affect elderly people who are not blue badge holders.
- The first 20 minutes, 30 minutes or 1 hour should be free (mentioned by less than 5% of all responders).
- Having to pay 12p surcharge for using a phone seems excessive.
- 2 hours is not long enough.
- This is just a money-making scheme for the council.
- Pay by phone is terrible and will not work for everyone, especially elderly people.
- Not everyone has a smartphone and uses apps.
- Free parking works well for Ashford and must be kept.
- The cost of living is high enough as it is.
- Residents with driveways will have more issues with dropped kerb obstructions.
- Many people visit Ashford simply because the parking is free.
- The machines will just be vandalised so people will have to pay by phone.
- People will not want to pay extra to visit their dentist or doctor.
- People will not pay 62p or £1.12p to park just to quickly buy items of a similar cost as it would effectively make those items much more expensive.
- Everyone shouldn't be penalised just because some people overstay 2 hours.
- People will go to Staines, Sunbury, Shepperton or Feltham instead.

The comments referred to points already summarised above.

## Analysis

The reasons for proposing paid parking for Ashford town centre are explained in detail in our Statement of Reasons document provided [on our website](#) and made available during the advertisement.

Whilst this proposal was made to improve the ability of people visiting Ashford town centre to park near to their destination by helping to prevent overstay parking and freeing up more spaces for shoppers and visitors, it is adamantly clear from the incredibly high number of objections and petition signatures received, that the local community and those from further afield who park in Ashford town centre, do not feel paid parking is best for the town and believe that it will have a significant negative impact upon it, for its visitors, businesses and residents. It is therefore decided not to proceed with paid parking for Ashford town centre.

Feedback from the parking review, along with the data captured, provided valuable insight into the community's needs and preferences. Based on this information, we will be exploring alternative solutions that the county councillor for Ashford will consult with residents and businesses on as and when they are developed. In the meantime, we will ask our enforcement company NSL to enhance their enforcement efforts in Ashford town centre to ensure parking spaces are freed up more regularly.

## Ashford Town Centre (Double Yellow Lines)

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 2023-21, 2023-22 and 2023-23
- Objections: 176 (Plus 126 borough councillor leaflet objection responses)
- Comments: 6
- Support: 10 (Plus 1 borough councillor leaflet support response)
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised (there will be a slight amendment for Woodthorpe Road as detailed below).

### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Will affect shops and businesses.
- Will affect local residents.
- Will force people away from the town.
- Parking is already limited.
- The restrictions work fine as they are and there's no need for this.
- Funeral and wedding vehicles will not be able to stop outside St Michael's Church on Fordbridge Road.
- Will affect the Fordbridge centre on Fordbridge Road.
- Will affect blue badge holders parking outside shops.
- More people will park in residential streets.
- No need to stop people parking on straight roads, only on junctions.
- Current restrictions just need to be better enforced.
- Will not allow people to stop to pick up prescriptions, fish and chips, dry cleaning, post letters etc.
- Will stop people picking up or dropping off passengers, especially the elderly.
- This is just to make money.
- Since the multi-storey car park closed parking has become more difficult.
- Parking outside restricted hours (Monday to Saturday 7am to 7pm) is useful for evening trade.

The comments referred to the following points: -

- Footway parking is an issue in the town.

- General support for double yellow lines.
- Existing restrictions are not enforced.
- Footway parking outside Superdrug is an issue that needs addressing.

## Analysis

The advertised proposal is to convert the existing single yellow lines (no waiting Monday to Saturday 7am to 7pm) to double yellow lines (no waiting at any time). The rules and exemptions for these waiting restrictions are the same, and the only difference being that single yellow lines prevent waiting during certain times of the day and week, whereas double yellow lines prevent waiting at all times (24/7).

Drivers are allowed to stop on double and single yellow lines to pick up and drop off passengers, and to escort a vulnerable person to their destination.

Drivers are allowed to stop on double and single yellow lines to load or unload goods, provided no loading restrictions are in operation at that location during that time, as indicated by signage and yellow kerb markings. Generally speaking, goods are considered to be items that it would be hard to carry for a long distance, for example because they are large or heavy.

Blue badge holders can park on double and single yellow lines for up to 3 hours whilst displaying their badge and clock, provided they are not parked in a hazardous or obstructive location, such as within 10m of a junction for example, and provided there are no loading restrictions in effect.

Funeral and wedding vehicles are exempt from double and single yellow line waiting restrictions.

Whether on single or double yellow line waiting restrictions, tasks such as picking up dry cleaning, prescriptions, a take-away, posting a letter or popping into a bank are all **not** permitted, as drivers can park legally nearby to do these things, which are not classed as loading or unloading goods. Therefore, drivers who are not blue badge holders risk receiving a Penalty Charge Notice whilst carrying out such tasks when parked on single or double yellow lines.

Parking in Ashford town centre was only ever intended to take place in the on-street parking bays. The single yellow lines operate for the same times as the parking bays (Monday to Saturday 7am to 7pm) but all these lengths of roads are not suitable for parking to take place at any time, as it will obstruct traffic flow, obstruct footways for pedestrians or obstruct sight lines for both drivers and pedestrians, negatively impacting on road safety in and around the town. The parking bays are the intended and safest locations for drivers to park for any period or reason up to 2 hours, even for very short visits, and the parking bays can still be used out of restricted hours. However, as explained above, the exemptions for parking or stopping on double yellow lines are still the same as they are for single yellow lines, and the town will not change in this respect, but having double yellow lines will benefit the town in several ways by: -

- Maintaining traffic flow, sight lines and road safety at all times of the day and night and for the entire week.
- Reducing the number of signs and street clutter in the town as double yellow lines do not require any sign plates.
- Making the waiting restrictions more noticeable and clearer to drivers as abuse of the single yellow lines is high in certain parts of the town.
- Making the waiting restrictions easier to enforce by eliminating the need to maintain any visible signage and having more obvious yellow lines on the carriageway.
- Ensuring that these areas are clear more often for drivers to load and unload goods or to pick up and drop off passengers.
- Helping to keep the footways clear for pedestrians.

Regarding Fordbridge Road by the junction with Clarendon Road, the pedestrian crossing already prevents vehicles from stopping here, but between that crossing and the Church Road junction by the War Memorial, that has never been a suitable place to park as it will be impacting on pedestrians using the footway or on passing traffic moving towards the left and right carriageway lanes. However, as explained above, normal exemptions apply for blue badge holders and funeral

and wedding vehicles, and for loading and unloading and picking up and dropping off passengers. To the south of the Clarendon Road junction, outside the Fordbridge Community Centre, this section of road is remaining unrestricted, and parking will be allowed to continue there as it has been doing.

Some objectors reading the newspaper advertisement may have misunderstood that the double yellow lines are only proposed as shown on the plans and not necessarily for the entire length of street listed in that advertisement.

The majority of drivers visiting Ashford do not park on the single yellow lined areas, and as drivers would be more expected to park in nearby parking bays than in nearby residential streets, displacement parking to such residential streets is not expected to occur in any noticeable numbers as part of this double yellow line proposal.

On **Woodthorpe Road**, there will be a slight amendment to the proposed length of double yellow lines on the south side outside number 32, where the restrictions will terminate 5m east of the boundary line of numbers 32 and 34, to allow unrestricted parking to take place for small cars in between the two dropped kerbs.

## **Ashford Town Centre (Electric Vehicle Parking)**

### **Overview:**

- Drawing number: 2023-23
- Objections: 24
- Comments: 3
- Support: 1
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### **Summary**

The objections referred to the following points: -

- Prevents non-electric vehicle drivers from parking.
- Bays should be dual use.
- Existing spaces should be maintained.
- No more electric vehicle spaces are needed.
- Charging spaces should be away from the town centre.
- Not many electric vehicles in Ashford.
- Electric vehicle bays are for recharging, not for visiting the town.

The comments referred to the following points: -

- Signage should be clearer.
- Paying to park and paying to charge vehicle here is unfair.
- Electric vehicles damage the environment (short lifetime and batteries)

### **Analysis**

The proposed electric vehicle spaces are formalising those currently installed on Woodthorpe Road, as part of a countywide scheme to help meet the county's current and future demand for electric vehicle recharging spaces on the public highway.

They are located amongst existing 2 hour bays but have a 4 hour time limit so that they can be used by those visiting the town or by residents living nearby. Having an electric vehicle only restriction ensures that these charge points are serving their intended road user, especially as they are expensive to install and maintain. Electric vehicle spaces can encourage new visitors to a town as electric vehicle owners look to find more spaces to charge their vehicles in Spelthorne. These spaces compliment those already installed at the eastern end of the town on Church Road by the church and roundabout by providing spaces at this western end of the town as well.

Whilst drivers have to pay to charge their vehicle, these spaces are not part of the proposed paid parking scheme and therefore they would not have to pay to park as well.