



## **OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE (ELMBRIDGE)**

### **CLAREMONT LANE PARKING CONTROLS: CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS**

**7 DECEMBER 2009**

#### **KEY ISSUE**

To acknowledge the result of the formal consultation and consider any resultant objections, following the advertisement of a proposed scheme to control parking in Claremont Lane, Esher; and to decide whether or in what form the scheme should proceed.

#### **SUMMARY**

Following numerous representations concerned with the problems and dangers caused by all day parking in Claremont Lane, Esher, Surrey County Council formally advertised proposals to make a traffic regulation order to allow parking controls to be introduced in the road.

In accordance with the legal process the scheme was formally advertised in the Surrey Advertiser on 13 November 2009, with the formal objection period closing on 4 December 2009. Annex A provides details of the objections that require consideration prior to any controls being implemented.

Annexes A and B were not available at time of publication and will be tabled at the Local Committee meeting.

#### **OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

**The Local Committee (Elmbridge) is asked to agree:**

- (i) The recommendations detailed in Annex A;

- (ii) That the County Council amends the necessary traffic regulation orders as necessary for the recommended parking controls to be implemented;
- (iii) That the recommended parking controls are implemented.

## **1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The County Parking Team, Surrey County Councillors and Elmbridge Borough Councillors have all received numerous representations from local residents and other members of the public regarding the dangerous situation in Claremont Lane, caused by all day commuter parking.
- 1.2 Site visits carried out by county and borough officers, and the police have confirmed the seriousness of the situation, and, following an onsite assessment, county officers drew up plans to introduce restrictions on parking in the road. A copy of the plans are attached as Annex C.
- 1.3 The proposed new restrictions have been advertised in the local press in accordance with the statutory process and the Local Committee is now being asked to consider the objections.
- 1.4 In addition to the advertisement, street notices outlining the proposals were placed along the length of Claremont Lane, and letters outlining the proposals and objection procedure were delivered to the houses fronting the road.

## **2 ANALYSIS**

- 2.1 Annex A outlines the objections to the making of the required traffic regulation orders, which were received following the advertisement. A summary of each objection is provided and the recommended action considered in turn.
- 2.2 A copy of the full response from the person or persons making the objections is included separately in Annex B with personal data omitted.

## **3 OPTIONS**

- 3.1 Agree the recommendations as outlined in Annex A, and proceed to implementation.
- 3.2 Amend the recommendations and proceed to implementation, however, any amendment would have to be lesser than the restriction advertised.
- 3.3 Add to the recommendations in Annex A, over and above the advertised proposals. This would mean that further consultation would be

necessary and that some or all of the proposals would need to be re-advertised. This would require further funding and would delay implementation.

3.4 Withdraw the scheme in its entirety.

#### **4 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 The funding of this report is covered by the budgetary allocation outlined in the Integrated Transport Schemes report presented to the Local Committee on 27 July 2009.

#### **5 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no equalities and diversity implications.

#### **6 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

#### **7 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.1 There are considerable problems in Claremont Lane caused by long-term commuter parking, which has adverse implications for road safety.

7.2 The recommendation is to make the necessary changes to existing traffic regulation orders and introduce new orders to enable the implementation of new parking controls, as detailed in Annex A.

#### **8 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 The proposals are designed to help overcome the negative affects of the long term parking by non-residents and will help:

- to improve road safety
- to improve access for emergency vehicles
- to ease traffic congestion

**LEAD OFFICER:** Rikki Hill, Parking Projects Manager  
**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 03456 009 009  
**E-MAIL:** parking@surreycc.gov.uk  
**CONTACT OFFICER:** Rikki Hill, Parking Projects Manager  
**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 03456 009 009  
**E-MAIL:** parking@surreycc.gov.uk  
**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** Local Committee Report 'WALTON CONTROLLED  
PARKING SCHEME – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS'  
21 September 2009