

WALTON-ON-THAMES - 2009 INFORMAL CONSULTATION SUMMARY								
<i>N.B. - The first number in the 'responses received' column relates directly to the number of documents delivered, i.e. by property, as do the 'percentage return' figures. The figure in brackets relates to the total number of responses received, i.e. where more than one response has been submitted by one property. It should also be noted that the figures relate only to individual responses received and do not include petitions, although the content of the petitions themselves has been taken into account in making the recommendations.</i>								
Road Name	Number of properties off-plan	Responses received	Percentage return	Support scheme	No definite view	Other (state)	Recommendation	Decision
Accommodation Road	0	1	n/a	0	0	1	It is assumed that this response came from the proprietor of a High Street shop. A request was made to introduce a 15 minute limited waiting period for the purposes of loading and unloading. As it is proposed to introduce No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow lines) along both sides which legally allow loading and unloading to take place, it is recommended that the proposals be progressed as consulted.	(a)
Alexandra Close	12	0 (0)	0	0	0	0	Do not proceed.	(f)
Alpine Road	40	4 (4)	10%	1	0	3	It is recommended that the proposal to prohibit waiting at all times at its junctions with Montague Close and Sidney Road be progressed as consulted.	(a)
Annett Road	88	2 (2)	2.27%	2	0	0	It was proposed to limit waiting within the immediate vicinity of its junction with Terrace Road to stop long-term parking by non-residents. However, responses received state that the areas in question provide valuable on-street parking for those residents of Terrace Road that do not have off-street parking facilities. On that basis it is recommended that only the proposed junction protection at Terrace Road is progressed as consulted.	(b)
Ashley Close	27	8 (9)	29.63%	5	0	4	It was proposed to only protect junctions in this road but one resident states that he has received responses from 20 of the 29 residences and that 17 of those request that consideration be given to introducing resident permit parking. As further consultation would be necessary to formally determine the majority view and some negative response was received in relation to the junction protection, it is recommended that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junction with Oatlands Drive only, at this time.	(c)
Ashley Park Avenue	6	2 (2)	33.30%	0	0	2	It is recommended that the proposal to introduce a short length of 1hr limited waiting on the west side and to prohibit waiting at all times on all remaining lengths be progressed. It is also recommended that the said length of limited waiting be increased, having due regard to road safety requirements.	(b)
Ashley Park Crescent	22	5 (6)	22.73%	6	0	0	This is a privately owned road but will possibly be affected by the introduction of more restrictive measures proposed on the adjacent adopted length of Ashley Park Avenue. It is recommended that the proposal to prohibit waiting at all times on the adopted length of its junction with Ashley Park Avenue is progressed as consulted.	(a)
Ashley Road	93	7 (7)	7.53%	0	0	7	It is proposed to prohibit waiting at all times on both sides of Ashley Road with the exception of the north-east side of the War Memorial island which will be a combination of Permit Holders only spaces and Permit Holders spaces with a 1hr waiting facility for other road users. It is recommended that the proposals as be progressed as consulted.	(a)
Betley Court	28	7 (7)	25.00%	2	1	4	It is proposed to introduce lengths of Permit Holders Only bays, together with a short length of No Waiting Mon-Sat 10am-11am with waiting prohibited at all times on all remaining lengths. Despite the low response rate, as this road suffers from commuter parking it is recommended that the proposals be progressed as consulted.	(a)
Bishops Hill	35	0	0	0	0	0	There have been no responses from this road. It is recommended therefore, that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junction with Manor Road only at this time.	(c)
Bowes Road	55	28 (30)	50.90%	0	0	30	It is proposed to prohibit waiting at all times at its junction with Sidney Road, Crutchfield Lane and Hershams Road and on specified lengths where road narrowings exist with 'by-pass' facilities for pedal cycles, which are often blocked by parked cars. Despite the overwhelming opposition, it is recommended that the proposals to prohibit waiting at all times be progressed but that the lengths in question be reduced where appropriate having regard to road safety requirements.	(b)
Bridge Close	5	0	0	0	0	0	It is recommended that the proposed prohibition of waiting at all times be progressed as consulted.	(a)
Bridge Street	64	14 (16)	22%	7	0	10	It is recommended that the proposed measures in Bridge Street be implemented as consulted with the exception of the proposed double yellow lines on the north-west side fronting Nos.36 to 48 which will be adjusted as requested by residents.	(b)
Chestnuts (The)	20	2 (2)	10%	1	0	1	It is recommended that the proposed No Waiting at Any Time at the junction with Hershams Road is progressed as consulted.	(a)
Churchfield Road	62	5 (6)	10%	4	0	2	A petition was submitted containing signatures from 25 out of 42 properties objecting to the implementation of the proposed restrictions. It is recommended that waiting is prohibited at its junctions with Sidney Road, Esher Avenue, Highfield Road and High Street, together with the short loading bay on the north-west side close to its junction with High Street as consulted and that no further action is taken in respect of the proposed permit parking facilities.	(c)
Church Street	34	1 (1)	2.94%	0	0	1	It is recommended that the proposals for Church Street are progressed as consulted.	(a)
Cleveland Close	15	0 (0)	0	0	0	0	It is recommended that the proposals for Cleveland Close are progressed as consulted.	(a)
Crutchfield Lane	56	7 (7)	12.50%	0	1	6	The responses received relate mainly to the issue, distribution and cost of permits. As permit parking is not proposed in this road it is recommended that the proposed prohibition of waiting at all times at its junctions with Sidney Road, Bowes Road and Kings Road be progressed as consulted.	(c)
Dale Road	30	13 (17)	43%	9	2	6	Dale Road forms the west arm of the Dale Road, Harvey Road, Mayo Road triumverate. There is a general view in these roads that parking controls are required but residents are concerned that the proposals will reduce the number of spaces overall. As the narrow carriageways do not allow formal parking along both sides residents and other road users park partly on the footways, sometimes inconsiderately. The proposals prohibit footway parking by requiring vehicles to be parked in marked bays on-carriageway and prohibiting parking on Mon-Fri 9am-5pm along the opposite side of the road. A possible solution to this issue is to investigate the possibility of applying to the Department for Transport (DfT) for permission to use a sign that states 'Permit Holders Only parking past this point'.  The strict criteria applied to the authorisation of this sign by the DfT can be met in this situation. As employment of the sign means that parking bays do not have to be marked, residents could continue to park as they do now. It would, however be necessary to ensure that junctions and corners are kept free of parked vehicles for road safety reasons. The downside to this suggestion is that any resident requiring to park a vehicle on-carriageway during the operational hours would be required to purchase a permit. It is therefore recommended that the proposals as consulted are not progressed at this time and that application is made to the DfT in respect of the aforementioned sign authorisation.	(e)

Danesfield Close	58	1 (1)	1.73%	1	0	0	It was proposed to prohibit waiting at all times on the bend at its junction with Betley Court only. It is recommended that the proposal as consulted is progressed.	(a)
Dudley Road	105	6 (6)	5.72%	4	1	1	The issues raised in respect of Annett Road apply equally to this road. As the proposed limited waiting lengths close to its junction with Terrace Road are likely to create problems for some residents of Terrace Road it is recommended that they are not progressed and that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junction with Terrace Road only, as consulted.	(c)
Egmont Road	0	0 (0)	0	0	0	0	This road lies to the north of Willowhayne Drive and as such is situated outside the consultation area. No waiting restrictions were proposed.	n/a
Elm Grove	2	0 (0)	0	0	0	0	No restrictions were proposed for this road.	n/a
Esher Avenue	48	12 (16)	25.00%	2	0	11	The responses indicate that residents are unhappy with the conditions relating to the issue of permits but in any event are of the view that on-street parking is not currently an issue in this road. It is recommended therefore that no further action is taken with regard to permit parking but that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junctions with Churchfield Road, Winchester Road, Royston Close and Sidney Road as consulted and on the bend at the juncture of both arms of Esher Avenue.	(c)
Fir Close	8	6 (6)	75.00%	0	0	6	The objections received were concerned mainly with the proposal to position parking bays on the opposite side of the road to the houses and not to the proposed introduction of permit parking. It is recommended therefore that as this is a short cul-de-sac that application is made to the DFT for permission to use the 'Permit Holders parking only past this point' sign at this location which will allow residents to continue parking as they currently do.	(e)
Grange Court	20	3 (4)	15%	3	0	0	Although 77% of the responses received in 2007 indicated a preference for permit parking in this road only one response has been received on this occasion which would suggest that the majority of residents are not unhappy with the existing arrangements. It is recommended therefore that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junction with Ashley Road only and that no further action is taken with regard to the proposed permit parking scheme for this road.	(c)
Harvey Road	19	9 (10)	47.37%	5	0	5	Although there is opposition to the scheme as proposed the responses indicate that residents would like non-residential parking controlled. As this road forms the north arm of the Dale, Harvey and Mayo Roads traverse the course of action previously proposed for Dale Road would apply in this instance. It is therefore recommended that the proposals as consulted are not progressed at this time and that application is made to the DFT in respect of the aforementioned sign authorisation.	(e)
Heart (The)	350	3 (3)	0.86%	0	0	3	The three responses received were from residents of the flats above the shopping centre and all state that as they only have one off-street space that the proposals for the area will mean that they will no longer be able to park a second vehicle on-street. Assuming that all of the residents have access to an off-street space, which they don't, there are still potentially a further 350 cars requiring spaces adjacent to the town centre, which might explain some of the heavy non-residential parking currently taking place in nearby residential roads.	(c)
Hepworth Way	8	1 (1)	12.50%	0	0	1	This response was from a retailer who is concerned that the proposed restrictions in and around the town centre will result in staff leaving and his being unable to recruit staff in the future due, in part to the high charges currently employed in the off-street Pay & Display car parks.	(c)
Hersham Road	117	16 (18)	13.68%	3	6	16	A total of 10 responses were received from the Veterinary Surgery (6) and Westwood School (4) regarding non-provision of parking for staff, visitors to the surgery and for parents dropping-off and collecting children from school. With the exception of junctions where parking is prohibited at all times and in the vicinity of the Post Office where is also a part-day loading ban, parking is generally unrestricted. Long-term parking currently takes place along the south-west side between Stompond Lane and High Street. The veterinary surgery is located within this length. Parking on the length between Stompond Lane and Rydens Road tends to occur along the north-west side until reaching the Post Office where it occurs both sides, some of which is long-term. As Hersham Road is an 'A' class road and a main traffic route into and out of Walton it was considered necessary to regulate existing parking and to ensure that displaced vehicles would not simply move onto the other side of the road. To that end it is proposed to prohibit waiting at all times on all lengths of carriageway between Rydens Road and High Street apart from where limited waiting bays are placed. The carriageway varies in width between 8.5m at its north-western end and 9m in the vicinity of the Post Office. On-street parking can therefore be safely accommodated along one side without obstructing through traffic movements. It is proposed to limit waiting to 1 hour in a number of bays along the south-west side between Stompond Lane and High Street and to 2 hours in a number of bays along the same side between Stompond Lane and Rydens Road, apart from in the vicinity of the Post Office where waiting will be limited to 1 hour. Objections have been received from Elmbridge Borough Council and a resident to the proposal to introduce limited waiting bays opposite each other in the vicinity of the Post Office on the grounds that this will obstruct through traffic movements. Although there will still be 5m of available carriageway width and opposing cars will still be able to pass through this 10m restricted length it is accepted that large vehicles will not and that short delays will occur. However, as drivers will continue to park on the north-east side regardless of what road markings are employed it is considered safer to indicate where they should park rather than leave them to their own devices. It is therefore recommended that: (i) waiting is prohibited at all times along the entire length of the north-east side between its junction with High Street and the Post Office; (ii) waiting is prohibited at all times along the south-west side at its junctions with Stompond Lane and Red House Lane and that all other lengths are left unrestricted; (iii) waiting is prohibited at all times along the north-east side between High Street and Rydens Road; (iv) the proposed 1hr parking bay to the front of Nos.69/71 be removed; (v) the proposed 2hr parking bays on the south-west side between Stompond Lane and Rydens Road be introduced as consulted; (vi) waiting is prohibited at all times on all other lengths on this side between Stompond Lane and Rydens Road; (vii) the existing part-day loading ban between the Post Office and Rydens Road be	(c)
Highfield Road	15	4 (5)	26.67%	1	0	4	Although 80% of responses received in 2007 indicated a preference for permit parking the responses to this consultation suggest that that is no longer the case. It is recommended therefore that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junctions with Churchfield Road and Winchester Road as consulted and that no further action is taken in respect of the proposal to introduce permit parking for residents.	(c)

High Street	84	2 (1)	2.38%	0	1	1	Both responses related to the proposed scheme in general but not to the proposed restrictions in High Street. The proposals for High Street are promoted in their current format so that they will not require further adjustment following the construction of the small environmental enhancement scheme scheduled to be implemented by Elmbridge Borough Council early next year. It is recommended therefore that the proposed restrictions in High Street be progressed as consulted.	(a)
Hurley Close	15	1 (1)	6.67%	0	0	1	Although 58.3% of the 2007 responses indicated a preference for permit parking only one response was received to this consultation. This response points out that parents dropping-off and collecting children from Westwood School already create problems for residents and the proposed measures in Hershams Road and Stompond Lane will make matters worse. As there is limited carriageway space available in Hurley Close owing to the closeness of driveways it is unlikely that the current levels of short-term residential parking will increase to any great degree. On that basis it is recommended that waiting is prohibited at its junction with Hershams Road only, as consulted.	(c)
Hurst Grove	15	5 (7)	33.33%	3	2	2	The responses received indicate that permit parking is required but that the end time should be extended from 6pm to 10pm as residents have difficulty finding a space when there is an event/show at the adjacent The Playhouse theatre. It is recommended that end time be amended to read 10pm and that the proposals be otherwise progressed as consulted.	(b)
Kings Close	17	2 (2)	11.76%	1	0	1	Although 57% of responses in 2007 indicated a preference for parking permits only one positive response was received on this occasion. In view of the fact that permit parking is not proposed in the adjacent Kings Road and that proposed re-development of the adjacent Swimming Pool is likely which may significantly alter the character of this road, it is recommended that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junction with Kings Road only, at this time.	(c)
Kings Road	120	17 (22)	14.17%	0	0	22	Permit parking was not indicated as a requirement in 2007 and did not therefore form part of the current proposals. Some residents feel that the measures proposed in the town centre are will push on-street parking further out which, of course is possible. It is recommended that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junction with Sidney Road and at the south-western end, as consulted. Also, that it is prohibited at all times on the north-west side only at its junction with	(c)
Long Lodge Drive	36	4 (5)	11.11%	3	0	2	Permit parking was not proposed in Long Lodge Drive. However, it is proposed to prohibit waiting at all times in the vicinity of its junction with Rydens Road where some long-term parking occurs. It may be that the vehicles in question will move further into Long Lodge Drive but the closeness of driveways should discourage this to some extent. In the event that long-term parking is displaced further along this road it can be reviewed and if appropriate treated at the 6 month review stage. It is recommended that waiting is prohibited at all times as consulted.	(a)
Manor Road including Hill Rise	86	28 (37)	32.56%	15	1	22	The majority of responses oppose the proposal to introduce permit parking. A number of residents state that it is unnecessary as they have little or no difficulty parking on-street close to their homes. Thames Walk residents expressed the opposite view and welcomed the proposals. Other residents state that the proposals will reduce the available road space for residents and there is also concern over the conditions attached to the issue of permits. One resident expressed concern over the lack of motorcycle parking spaces in the town centre. It is understood that a petition will be submitted in due course by residents opposing the restrictions as consulted. A number of residents also suggested that conditions in Manor Road would be much improved if action was taken to curb peak hour traffic using Manor Road as a short-cut between Bridge Street and Terrace Road. Whilst the petition can be dealt with as and when it arrives the issue of inconsiderate parking in the vicinity of its junctions with Thames Street, the access road leading to the river, Stonebanks, Bishops Hill and the junction with the access road leading to the Pay & Display surface car park should be addressed at this time. It is recommended therefore that waiting is prohibited at all times at all side road junctions along Manor Road.	(c)
Mayo Road	42	10 (11)	23.81%	5	1	5	Although there is opposition to the scheme as proposed the responses indicate that residents would be likely to accept a permit parking scheme provided that the restrictions that currently apply to the issue of permits was made less restrictive. As this road forms the west arm of the Dale, Harvey and Mayo Roads it is recommended that the course of action previously proposed for Dale Road and Harvey Road also applies in this instance. It is therefore recommended that the proposals as consulted are not progressed at this time and that application is made to the DfT in respect of the aforementioned sign authorisation.	(e)
Montague Close	108	4 (4)	3.70%	1	0	3	None of the responses received objected to the proposal to prohibit waiting at all times at its junctions with Alpine Road, Sidney Road and Montague Close. Instead, comment was made to the effect that town centre car parking charges should be reduced and free for residents. There is a general consensus that the proposals overall will not solve any of the parking problems in Walton and that additional off-street parking provision for workers should be provided. It is recommended that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junctions with Alpine Road, Sidney Road and Montague Close as consulted.	(a)
Mount Felix	66	4 (4)	3.70%	0	0	4	Mount Felix is unique in Walton insofar as it is the only adopted road that can only be accessed via a privately owned road. Responses to the 2007 consultation indicated that a small majority of residents felt that permit parking was necessary. However, as there is limited carriageway space it was felt that it would be more appropriate to prohibit all-day parking on Mon-Fri 9am-5pm on the basis that there was sufficient private off-carriageway parking available for residents. Two of the responses object to the proposal for Mount Felix and comment is also made about the lack of suitable parking in Walton for other road users. It is recommended therefore that no further action is taken at this time in respect of the proposals for Mount Felix.	(f)
Nelson Close	40	5 (6)	12.50%	0	1	5	Nelson Close is a cul-de-sac which can be easily reached on foot from the town centre. It was proposed to introduce permit parking to address possible displacement caused by similar restrictions implemented nearby. Although the response rate was very low, all of the responses objected to the proposed action. On that basis it is recommended that waiting is prohibited at all times only at its junction with Sidney Road at that no further action is taken in respect of the proposed permit parking.	(c)

<b>New Zealand Avenue</b>	70	10 (11)	14.29%	9	1	1	This is designated an 'A' class road and is a main traffic route into and out of the north-west of Walton. It also forms the south-eastern arm of a busy crossroads junction with Oatlands Drive and Bridge Street. Congestion regularly occurs during morning and evening peak periods due to inconsiderate parking along both sides between the crossroads junction and The Heart shopping centre. Waiting is currently prohibited along both sides between 8.30am-6.30pm Mon-Sat between The Heart shopping centre and the junction with High Street. None of the responses received object to the proposed action but one requests consideration be given to permit parking for residents. This could be provided by incorporating them into the proposed scheme for Sandy Way and after 6pm on the two lengths of New Zealand Avenue currently proposed as No Waiting 8am-6pm. It is recommended that the proposals, as consulted, be implemented and that further consideration is given to the request for permit parking.	(a)
<b>Oakfields</b>	18	0	0	0	0	0	No responses were received from this road. Permit parking was not proposed. It is recommended therefore that waiting is prohibited at all times at the junction with Hershams Road, as consulted.	(c)
<b>Oatlands Drive</b>	28	2 (4)	7.14%	0	0	4	There is concern that the proposal to prohibit waiting at all times to a point south-east of its junction with Ashley Close may not be far enough from the town centre and that the prohibition should be extended to Oatlands Village. As it is likely that the proposals for the Walton area as a whole are likely to be significantly reduced, the possible displacement of parked vehicles will also be much lower than expected. It is therefore recommended that the proposal for Oatlands Drive is progressed as consulted and that any requirement to extend the prohibition further is considered at the 6 month review stage.	(a)
<b>Orchard Court</b>	27	0	0	0	0	0	Orchard Court is a private development on the south-west side of Bridge Street close to the town centre. As such no restrictions were proposed. No responses were received in relation to the Walton proposals as a whole.	n/a
<b>Red House Lane</b>	16	15 (17)	93.75%	1	0	16	This road returned the highest number of responses per property relative to the number of consultation documents delivered. Although the high number of responses are against the proposals as consulted being introduced, the residents themselves have put forward suggestions for controls, that have the approval of the vast majority. The principle of the consulted restrictions was to provide some dedicated parking for permit holders together with lengths of 2 hour limited waiting for other road users, persons visiting the dental surgery on Ashley Road and parents dropping-off/picking-up children from the nearby school. Residents prefer to have a combination of No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm with parking spaces limited to 2 hours during the same hours but within which permit holders will be exempt. Waiting will be prohibited at all times at its junctions with Ashley Road and Hershams Road. Concern is, however expressed over the conditions relating to permit issue. It is recommended that the restrictions requested by residents be progressed.	(e)
<b>Rembrandt Way</b>	23	1 (1)	4.76%	0	0	1	As only one response was received from this road it would suggest that the majority of residents do not see non-residential parking in their road as being an issue despite a significantly higher response rate in 2007, a small majority of whom felt that permit parking was required. It is recommended therefore that no further action is taken with regard to the proposals for this road.	(c)
<b>Rodwell Court</b>	73	0	0	0	0	0	Rodwell Court is a small development of privately owned flats situated in the apex of Hershams Road, Rydens Road and Sidney Road. Although restrictions were not proposed for the development itself those proposed for Sidney Road and Rydens Road in particular could affect overspill parking from the flats. As no responses were received from the flats it must be assumed that residents of the same have no objections to the proposals.	n/a
<b>Royston Close</b>	9	2 (4)	22.22%	4	0	0	A combination of No Waiting at Any Time and No Waiting Mon-Fri 9am-5pm was proposed for this road in anticipation of displaced parking from other roads closer to the town centre. Although the proposed permit parking in the adjacent Esher Avenue and Churchfield Road is not being recommended it is nevertheless felt that as there could still be some displacement it would be appropriate, due to the restricted carriageway width to proceed with the proposals for this road. It is recommended therefore that the proposals for Royston Close be progressed, as consulted.	
<b>Rydens Road (part)</b>	14	0	0	0	0	0	It is recommended that the proposals for this length of road are progressed, as consulted.	(a)
<b>Sandy Way</b>	49	9 (11)	18.37%	10	0	1	Residents are concerned that the conditions attached to permit issue are too restrictive but are otherwise supportive of the proposed measures. However, as there are only two ways in and out of this road it would be appropriate to consider applying to the DfT for permission to use the 'Permit holders only parking past this point' sign previously proposed for use in the Dale, Harvey and Mayo Roads area. It is understood that this would be more acceptable to residents from an environmental point of view. It is therefore recommended that with the exception of prohibiting waiting at all times at its junction with New Zealand Avenue, the proposals as consulted are not progressed at this time and that application is made to the DfT in respect of the aforementioned sign authorisation.	(e)
<b>Sidney Road</b>	241	20 (23)	8.30%	7	0	16	No Waiting Mon-Sun 9am-5pm was proposed on the north side close to its junction with Terrace Road and a short length of No Waiting Mon-Sat 10am-11am on the south side close to its junction with Rydens Road. Elsewhere, it was proposed to prohibit waiting at all times at all side road junctions along its length. Permit parking was not proposed in this road. Therefore, comments received relate mainly to the Walton proposals as a whole. There is however concern that displaced vehicles from nearby areas will park in Sidney Road thereby making on-street parking more difficult for residents, particularly near its junction with Terrace Road. As it is likely that a number of roads local to Sidney Road will not be restricted as consulted, there is less likelihood of drivers using Sidney Road in preference to unrestricted roads closer to the town centre. It is recommended therefore that the proposals for Sidney Road be progressed, as consulted.	(c)
<b>Stompond Lane</b>	32	3 (3)	9.38%	1	0	2	There were only 2 responses from this road, one of which agreed with the proposed measures. The other objected to the proposed scheme in general and the apparent lack of investigation into current and future parking problems, together with the time delay between the 2007 consultation and the current one. It is recommended therefore that the proposals for Stompond Lane are progressed, as consulted.	(a)
<b>Stonebanks</b>	54	13 (13)	24.07%	4	3	6	Residents are concerned that the proposals to prohibit waiting at various times on the length of road leading into this small estate from Manor Road will simply displace parked vehicles further into the estate. Also, that the restrictions will unduly restrict residents. In light of the fact that it is unlikely that all of the measures proposed in Manor Road will be progressed at this time it would be prudent to leave this road mainly unrestricted for the time being. It is recommended therefore that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junction with Manor Road only, as consulted.	(c)
<b>Sullivan's Reach</b>	69	1 (1)	1.45%	1	0	0	No restrictions were proposed for this road. The response requests that off-street parking charges be reviewed to ensure that local businesses do not suffer.	n/a

<b>Terrace Road</b>	58	14 (15)	24.12%	2	0	15	Residents living in the length between Manor Road and Dudley Road request that permit parking provision be made available to them. It was also suggested that restriction should be extended as far as the junction with Cottismore Lane. When the proposals were first drawn-up it was assumed that the garages located to the rear of the maisonettes on the south-east side were available to those residents. As that is not the case some provision should be made for them on Terrace Road where road safety considerations allow. It should be noted that the recommended removal of the proposed limited waiting lengths in Annett Road and Dudley Road will create additional unrestricted parking spaces. It is recommended therefore that the length of Terrace Road in question be re-visited with a view to introducing lengths of permit parking where road safety consideration allow.	(e)
<b>Thames Street</b>	58	13 (18)	22.41%	12	0	6	Three of the four objections raised the issue of reduced parking spaces and also the effect the proposals would have on residents of Dale, Harvey and Mayo Roads. There was, however no objection to the proposed introduction of permit parking. In view of the unlikelihood of Manor Road being progressed in its proposed form at this time, it would still be possible to treat Thames Street and the other three roads as one zone for the purpose of the issue of permits, thereby allowing residents in all four roads access to all permit parking lengths. It is recommended therefore that the proposals for Thames Street be progressed as consulted.	(e)
<b>Wellington Close</b>	132	3 (3)	2.27%	0	1	2	The roads within this development of flats close to the town centre are privately owned and have had restrictions imposed by the owner which effectively prohibits any vehicle larger than a car from parking on the estate. This results in owners/drivers of transit vans and similar vehicles seeking-out spaces on the surrounding roads and in particular Bridge Street. The residents of Orchard Court (opposite) have also objected for much the same reason, i.e. insufficient off-street parking within their estate (see Bridge Street for recommendations).	n/a
<b>Willowhayne Drive</b>	76	4 (5)	5.26%	0	1	4	No restrictions are proposed for this road. Responses received are concerned that restrictions imposed elsewhere will cause displaced vehicles to park in Willowhayne Drive. This is unlikely at the present time as it is likely that there will be other unrestricted roads closer to the town centre. There is also comment made in respect of town centre car parking charges being unreasonable.	n/a
<b>Winchester Road</b>	53	22 (30)	41.51	9	1	20	Although the responses indicate that residents in the length between High Street and Highfield Road favour the introduction of permit parking more than those living between Highfield Road and Esher Avenue, the subsequent submission of a petition indicates that that is perhaps not now the case. It is recommended therefore that waiting is prohibited at all times at its junction with Esher Avenue, Highfield Road and High Street and a short loading bay is provided on the north side close to its junction with High Street, as consulted.	(c)