



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

**TILT ROAD – PROPOSED CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE  
CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS  
ANNEX A – OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

**7 DECEMBER 2009**

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

**1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 This Annex should be read in conjunction with the main report and Annexes B & C.
- 1.2 This Annex contains either the full-transcribed comments made by a respondent to the official consultation, or in the case of the more lengthy replies, a summary of the comments. For each comment the Officers response has been detailed alongside.
- 1.3 The full letters from each of the respondents is enclosed within Annex B.

**2 ANALYSIS**

- 2.1 There are 35 official objections to the scheme which can be broken down into the three following main areas of concern:
  - 6 objections concerned that there will be insufficient resident parking bays.
  - 10 objections requesting that the restrictions are reduced or increased on Tilt Road with the junctions with the cemetery access road and/or Ashford Gardens.
  - 8 respondents that support the proposals but would like further restrictions.
- 2.2 In addition to the objections there have been 23 responses fully supporting the proposals as advertised.
- 2.3 It should be noted that despite the 35 objections received - the majority of the respondents are supporting the proposals but are concerned about various elements of the scheme.

**3 OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 The council has introduced other resident parking schemes in Elmbridge and throughout the county. The experiences from other schemes would indicate the provision of resident permit bays is sufficient. Work has been specifically undertaken to ensure the number of bays proposed is sufficient. The scheme if introduced would be kept under review (after 6-12 months) and if the additional capacity becomes necessary this could be introduced. **It is therefore recommended that the scheme be implemented unaltered.**
- 3.2 The proposed restrictions in the vicinity of the cemetery access road and Ashford Gardens are designed to keep the junctions free from obstruction and to maintain sightlines for safety. There have been requests to either increase the restrictions further on the Ashford Gardens/Tilt Road junction or to reduce or remove the restrictions. **Both junctions could be used at anytime by pedestrians, cyclists or vehicles so it is recommended that the scheme be implemented**

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

**unaltered.** If the restriction time was reduced to a daytime restriction (as suggested by some respondents) this would require additional signage which would impact the conservation area. Visitors to the cemetery may also visit outside daytime restricted hours. If the restrictions were removed from this area this would allow vehicles to park dangerously close to these junctions, and any possible displacement of commuter vehicles could also potentially move to this area.

- 3.3 There have been requests to increase or implement further restrictions. The proposals have been designed to eliminate the current difficulties with commuter parking in Tilt Road. Tilt Road and the surrounding area will be reviewed after 6-12 months and if further restrictions are required these will be brought to the attention of the Local Committee. **All other comments from respondents have also been considered (as outlined below) and it is recommended that the proposals be implemented unaltered.**



## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

Objection No.	Summary of Objection	Officer Response
1	Drivers might park on the soft verge opposite house numbers 98-90 Tilt Road. I would suggest no waiting at any time is introduced from the cemetery access road along the north curb up to Farm View Road.	In developing the proposals the extent of the restrictions was carefully considered to balance the needs of residents, visitors to Tilt Road and visitors to the cemetery against the problem of commuter parking. It is felt that ending the restrictions at the junction with Ashford Gardens is proportionate allowing for the displacement of commuter vehicles that may occur if the scheme is introduced. The assessment made by the Council is based on experiences elsewhere in the county when introducing parking schemes. The Council will keep the location under review and if further restrictions are necessary in the future they will be brought to the attention of the local committee.
2	Parking is not a problem in the vicinity of the cemetery access road and Ashford Gardens as it is too far for commuters to park and walk to the station. I have a wonderful view and would not like to see double yellow lines and no parking signs outside my house. Could you perhaps move the restricted area to the other side of the cemetery?	Please see response to objection 1 above.
3	Double yellow lines not necessary in cemetery access road. Permits should be obtainable for all residents regardless as to whether or not they have parking in their front gardens.	<p>Parking has been occurring within 10 metres of the cemetery access road and this affects sightlines for pedestrians and vehicles and may cause obstruction to vehicles to the cemetery. In addition, it would not be desirable to end the parking restrictions before the cemetery access road, as it may encourage a displacement of commuter vehicles to park in this area.</p> <p>Current county policy means permits are restricted to two per dwelling if there is no off-street parking. A resident with only one off-street space would be able to apply for one permit. The permits are only required during the restricted period 10-11am.</p>

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

4	No problem with parking beyond Korea Cottages. Proposals eliminate on-street parking for residents unless they are prepared to pay £35. The double yellow lines in the cemetery access road and Ashford Gardens junction are unnecessary. The conservation area should not be defaced and suburbanised with yellow lines and parking notices.	Please see response to objection 1 above. Residents applying for permits are asked to pay a contribution towards the costs of running the scheme. The proposals have been developed to carefully consider the impact on the conservation area. The parking controls are specifically a 'controlled parking zone' so that signage is kept to a minimum. The parking restrictions are necessary to avoid the negative impact caused by commuter parking on the conservation area.
5	I would suggest the CPZ is extended to the west of Farm View cul-de-sac. Parking around the entrance to the cemetery should be 9am-5pm when the cemetery may be in use.	Please see response to objection 1 and 3 above. Visitors to the cemetery may visit outside 9am-5pm.
6	There is a grass bank just beyond where the controlled proposed zone end with no restrictions on it. The restrictions should be extended further down the other end of Tilt Road as it is still only a ten minute walk to the station.	Please see response to objection 1 above.
7	The whole problem of parking will just be shifted further along Tilt Road. I would strongly advise wooden posts are put in from Korea Cottages to the bend to avoid cars parking on the verge.	Please see response to objection 1 above. The parking restrictions will apply to the verge also in the location described.
8	This is very welcome. Only concern will cars now park on those parts of Tilt Road not included to walk to the station.	Please see response to objection 1 above. The effects of any displacement of vehicles will be monitored and if further restrictions are necessary this will be included in future proposals.
9	Support restrictions in Tilt Road but concerned Winston Drive will become only unrestricted road in the area and we are nearest to the station as well.	Please see response to objection 8 above.
10	I would prefer a longer period say 9am-4pm.	The restriction period has been designed to eliminate the problem with all-day commuter parking without unnecessarily inconveniencing residents, the business near Stoke Road and visitors to Tilt Road.
11	Restrictions up to Ashford Gardens and cemetery	Please see response to objections 1, 3 and 4 above. Vehicles

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

	<p>access road are unnecessary and cause a major inconvenience to the residents of Tilt Road, Ashford Gardens and visitors to the cemetery. The Tilt is a conservation area and its appearance should not be blighted with unnecessary yellow lines and parking notices. No allowance has been made to provide residents parking for the owners of 100-112 Tilt Road who have to park on the road. It is proposed to include junction protection for Ashford Gardens and the western entrance to the Cemetery in the form of double yellow lines. Use of these junctions is minimal and will force parking further east. Currently there is no junction protection at any other junction between Tilt Road and Station Road so why is it proposed to protect these little used junctions at great inconvenience to residents?</p>	<p>parked within 10 metres of the Ashford Gardens and Tilt Road junction have been causing an obstruction and effect sightlines. Residents of 102-112 Tilt Road will be able to apply for resident permits and there is a parking area in the vicinity (see plan of the proposals) where they will be able to park during the restricted time. The residents of 100 Tilt Road are outside the controlled parking zone.</p>
12	<p>I should not like what follows to be taken as 'objecting' to the proposals which in general I wholeheartedly support. Residents from Tilt Road routinely park in the first 50m or so of Ashford Gardens northwards. Periodically they have blocked access from Tilt Road to the point where wheelie bins could not be collected. Moreover, vehicles are regularly parked too near the junction in Tilt Road itself so as to blank out the sight-lines for anyone trying to enter Tilt Road from Ashford Gardens. I would suggest that these issues would be much better met by 20m lengths than your 10m.</p>	<p>The location has been carefully assessed and it is believed the proposed restrictions on the junction of Ashford Gardens and Tilt Road is sufficient to ensure there is no obstruction and sightlines are maintained.</p>
13	<p>Support restrictions as proposed but the Cobham end of Tilt Road needs parking sorted out as well. It is sometimes near impossible to get through between Stoke Road and the Pub.</p>	<p>Please see response to objection 1 above.</p>
14	<p>This is much needed and a very good plan. I am not sure 10meters along Ashford Gardens/Tilt Road will be</p>	<p>Please see response to objection 12 above.</p>

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

	enough.	
15	The no waiting at any time should include the sharp right angle bend by Ashford Farm House.	The proposed scheme should eliminate the current parking difficulties, but the situation will continue to be monitored and if further controls are necessary this will be brought to the attention of the Local Committee.
16	Support introduction of proposals. The parking bays outside of Korea Cottages are not enough for the cars belonging to the residents, I feel this was not looked into enough at the planning.	The parking bay outside Korea Cottages should be sufficient for the properties without off-street parking. If it transpires that additional bays are necessary amendments could be made at a later date.
17	Support introduction of proposals. Could the area outside Tilt Meadow become a double yellow line for 10 metres to allow big lorries to get in and out successfully without going across the green at the end of our road.	Please see response to objection 15 above.
18	Support introduction of proposals. No waiting at any time needs to be extended opposite Tilt Meadow.	Please see response to objection 15 above.
19	Support introduction of proposals. Probably need to extend no parking zone in Tilt Road opposite entrance of Tilt Meadow at future date.	Please see response to objection 15 above.
20	Support introduction of proposals but would strongly suggest that No Waiting at Any Time should be extended right across the kerb opposite the entrance to Tilt Meadow as larger vehicles are forced to drive over the grass due to lack of space.	Please see response to objection 15 above.
21	Offer residents parking permits to park anywhere and have no waiting to prevent commuters parking but residents with permits avoid penalty. Also, provide some sort of solution to the overall problem of parking for the station.	It is necessary to mark out parking bays for permit holders. In order to reduce street clutter and unnecessary markings, formalised bays have been proposed along specific lengths of Tilt Road. The county and borough council does not own the car park at the station.
22	Support introduction of proposals. I would prefer the restriction time to be 9.30-10.30	The current restriction time of 10-11am has been chosen to minimise the inconvenience to residents and visitors to Tilt Road. This can be amended at a future date if there is the support.
23	I believe the number of bays allocated between Bray	There are three parking bays at this location described providing



## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

	Road and Stoke Road (past Peacock Cottages) are insufficient. The bay outside Peacock Cottages is not marked as a bay in your scheme. This should be. It is very well parking permitting the area to eliminate commuter parking but to reduce the number of parking bays for residents is ludicrous. Why restrict the number of bays? Tresco, 1 & 2 Peacock Cottages have 6 cars between them. This almost fills your quota and does not take into account New and Old Cottage and the flats above the shop.	space for approximately 10 vehicles that should be sufficient for the properties without off-street parking. The area where cars are currently parking outside Peacock Cottages is not part of the highway. If it transpires that additional bays are necessary amendments could be made at a later date.
24	The proposals are fine for us. However, we must support our neighbours in Tresco, the flat above Simpsons Interiors and Peacocks Cottages in pointing out that the provision for residents parking allocated in your plans is not sufficient. It is our belief that there will not be enough space for the occupants of these properties to all park their cars. We would suggest the residents parking allocation be extended at least past our property and “Cooper Cottage” to enable them to park.	Please see response to objection 23 above.
25	In the residents permit holders only schedule I object on the basis that the areas suggested are simply not big enough. Residents in 1 /2 Peacock Cottages and Tresco all have 2 cars, The tenant above the shop has 1 car a total of 7. You have only allowed space to park 3 cars. Likewise the residents of new and old Cottages. A sensible solution would be to provide resident-only parking between Tilt Close and Stoke road, providing ample space for the residents in properties with no off-street parking.	Please see responses to objection 23 and 21 above.
26	Anyone will still be able to park outside our house in the bay for 23 hrs of the day or 24 hours if they buy day	The county cannot provide a personal space for the benefit of an individual. Resident permit schemes have been introduced

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

	<p>parking permits. We will have to keep checking daily that our cars are in the bay at the relevant time – and if people only move out of the bay at the last minute we may find our cars are parked illegally and subject to a fine. It seems extremely unfair that those of us without drives are paying for the administration costs of the parking scheme which benefits the whole of Tilt Road and those with drives.</p>	<p>successfully throughout the county and across the country without the recurring problem described. The permit costs contribute towards the cost of the administration of the resident permit scheme.</p>
27	<p>I have enjoyed free parking outside my home since moving to Tilt Road in 1992 and find it difficult to understand why your intended resident permit charges cannot be absorbed within the Council Tax of those residents who DO NOT HAVE off-street parking facilities. We are in fact in the minority and without double are being penalized for this as opposed to those residents who HAVE off-street parking whereby it will cost them nothing other than if they wish to purchase a permit. It seems to me that myself, including the minority of other residents in my position, will be the only residents paying for the administration and operation of the scheme when it is implemented. There is also no guarantee that a parking place will be available should another resident who HAS off street parking plus a parking permit, decide to leave their vehicle in a parking bay for their own convenience. If this were to be the case, I would have no alternative but to park illegally, thus committing a parking offence incurring penalties.</p>	<p>Please see response to objection 26 above.</p>
28	<p>The latest proposal extends these parking restrictions further along Tilt Road, where there are no current parking issues, to the junction of Ashford Gardens. There is no parking issues here today and the local residents appear to be against the scheme. It will create</p>	<p>Please see response to objection 1 above. The proposals have been developed to protect and enhance the conservation area.</p>

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

	<p>parking issues where there are currently none and likely force the transition of attractive front gardens to parking places in due course. There is a legal obligation placed on the local authority to protect and enhance the Conservation Area. Introduction of double yellow lines and parking restriction signs around Ashford Gardens and the entrance to the cemetery where there is no need to do so is therefore neither required nor necessary and in my contravenes local Elmbridge planning policy guidelines.</p>	
29	<p>From Mr Gerry Archer, Chairman, Cobham Conservation and Heritage trust:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· This matter has now been going on for over two years and we feel really sorry for those who need these lines who are badly affected by commuter parking.</li> <li>· Thus, whatever happens when you meet the option of doing nothing or further delaying would not be one we would support</li> <li>· There is concern as to whether double yellow lines at the entrances to the cemetery and Ashford Gardens is overkill. We strongly believe it is and we would suggest you specifically review this at your meeting to consider whether objectors' points are valid. We suggest single lines as a sensible compromise covering those entrances.</li> <li>· We believe this modification can be accommodated without any delay or further consultation as it is a modification which is less stringent.</li> <li>· Above all please arrive at a decision which results in those badly affected finally getting some relief and quickly.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see the responses to objections 1, 3 and 5 above.</p>
30	<p>In summary:</p>	<p>1) Please see response to objections 16, 21 &amp; 23.</p>

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Inadequate number of residents only spaces</li> <li>2) Lack of consideration given to parking bay outside Peacock Cottages and the use of access to drives over commonland.</li> <li>3) Insufficient evidence to justify the proposed legislation</li> <li>4) Basis for granting permits may give rise to unfairness.</li> <li>5) Charging for permits is unfair and discriminatory</li> <li>6) Detrimental effect of yellow lines on the street scene and failure of consultation process to actually mention yellow lines at all.</li> <li>7) Legislation infringes Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) The area described by Peacock Cottages is not part of the highway, and neither are the accesses to drives over commonland so vehicles parked here will not be committing a contravention.</li> <li>3) There is evidence that parking by commuters has extended to Tilt Road and that residents and visitors to Tilt Road are being impacted. When new parking controls are introduced there can sometimes be a displacement of vehicles which had previously parked where it is now restricted. Therefore in order to control the effects of any such displacement it is sometimes appropriate to extend the controls beyond the location that initially suffered the problem. This is the situation in Tilt Road and is justification for extending the controls from Bray Road to Stoke Road.</li> <li>4) The proposed allocation of permits is in line with the allocation in other controlled parking zones in Elmbridge and elsewhere in Surrey, and has not proved to be unduly inconvenient to residents. We do not believe the situation should be any different in the CPZ proposed for Tilt Road, particularly given the relatively short period each day that the controls will operate. The discretion to issue permits is a necessary tool to control the issue of permits in cases where permits are being obtained contrary to the intention of the scheme, e.g. by a resident for a non-resident. It is the Council that has the discretion, and any decision made by a council officer could be referred back to council members by way of representation to a local councillor. It is therefore not the case that individual council officers can apply the discretion arbitrarily.</li> <li>5) With all permit schemes a charge is made to help finance the administration of the scheme. Where a scheme is</li> </ol>
--	--	---

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

		<p>introduced their will always be some people who need to buy permits in order to have the opportunity to be able to park in the residents' bay in the area during controlled hours. The decision to introduce a resident's permit parking scheme results from the majority of residents expressing a desire for it. Whenever any such democratic decision is taken, its effect may not necessarily be the same for all those affected.</p> <p>6) See response to objection 4 above. The consultation process has included an outline of the various restrictions proposed. A large number of people feel that commuter parking is serious enough to warrant some action being taken and have supported the introduction of the parking controls.</p> <p>7) We do not believe that the proposed measures interfere with any resident's rights in respect of their private life, family life or home.</p>
31	<p>1) Insufficient resident permit allowance to accommodate 4 residents in a 4 bedroom house.</p> <p>2) Does not take into account bigger issue of excessive traffic flow as 'cut through' to railway station – speeding, near miss accidents and 'road rage' have become commonplace. Need a traffic calming scheme.</p> <p>3) Notwithstanding point 2, this may add further congestion due to additional street parking at western end of Tilt Road (nr Running Mare Pub). This is both inconvenient for passing and potentially dangerous due to difficult access for emergency vehicles.</p>	<p>1) Countywide policy allows residents to apply for up to two permits per property where there is no off-street provision.</p> <p>2) The location has been assessed and it has not been evident that there is excessive traffic flow or speed through Tilt Road. Tilt Road has a very good road safety record and it is hoped that by clearing the junctions with parked vehicles this will maintain this good safety record.</p> <p>3) Please see response to objection 1 above.</p>
32	<p>1) I do not believe that a demonstrable safety problem currently exists and personal injury accident records will support this. There is not a safety issue to be addressed.</p>	<p>1) Tilt Road has a very good safety record, however, there has been parking close to the junctions, which reduces visibility and sightlines. In order to maintain this good safety record it is considered necessary to introduce the proposals. The</p>

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

	<p>2) There is also significant parking of vehicles by residents in the area of the proposed controlled parking area. It is proposed that the parking by residents will be permitted through the sale of permits. Therefore the issue relating to amenity will not be fully addressed.</p> <p>3) Also the introduction of double yellow lines will have a significant and permanent visual impact.</p> <p>4) Furthermore, in the current economic climate and resultant pressure on the public purse, the use of funds on this non-essential scheme do not provide good value for the residents of Elmbridge and Surrey.</p> <p>5) Finally as far as I am aware the area for the proposals is not adopted highway, and therefore a traffic order made can not be enforced by Surrey County Council the highway authority.</p>	<p>restrictions will also aid access to the junctions, which has been a problem.</p> <p>2) Please see response to objection 22. It is recognised that there will be a short-term impact (for one hour a day, Monday to Friday) but the scheme has been developed to minimise this.</p> <p>3) The double yellow lines are considered necessary as outlined in paragraph 1 above. The results from consultation exercise and site assessments indicate this restriction is necessary.</p> <p>4) The results of the initial consultation and site assessments suggest the scheme is essential.</p> <p>5) The council is able to make a traffic regulation order on the section of highway you refer to under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p>
33	<p>I am worried that with the proposed controlled parking on Tilt Road that it will just move it up the road to Farmview. It is difficult enough to see when cars are parked on Tilt Road to get out of Farmview. Is there some way of putting lines on the corner of Tilt Road and Farmview as well?</p>	<p>Please see the response to objection 1.</p>
34	<p>I am concerned your proposals will move the parking problem to the proposed non-regulated zone. This is the area of Tilt Road between Ashford Gardens and Farmview. Here residents have an average of two cars per property and off street parking for one vehicle. This can cause reduced visibility when accessing Tilt Road from a driveway. Also, I am concerned drivers will park on the grass verge opposite causing damage. I would be grateful if you could consider properly the impact of your proposals will have further down Tilt Road. Please consider introducing parking restrictions the entire length</p>	<p>Please see the response to objection 1. The results from the initial consultation indicated residents would not favour parking restrictions the entire length of Tilt Road. It is also not considered necessary to eliminate the difficulties caused by commuter parking. The county council and borough council do not own the station car park.</p>

ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

	<p>of Tilt Road, or better still, finally tackle the source of the problem and provide adequate and affordable parking at the station.</p>	
<p>35</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There is no current problem between the east entrance to cemetery and Ashford Gardens so proposal only serves to inconvenience local residents on this stretch.</li> <li>2) Insufficient 'Resident Parking' zones in current proposal (would require double space).</li> <li>3) No evidence that the root cause has been tackled. Is there a capacity/pricing issue at Cobham Rail Station Car Park.</li> <li>4) This is a conservation area. Planning permission needed from Elmbridge for the yellow lines.</li> <li>5) Agree with proposal from Stoke Road to East Cemetery entrance only.</li> <li>6) Proposals will increase risk of accidents by encouraging speed due to less need for care.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Please see the response to objections 1 and 3 above.</li> <li>2) Please see the response to objections 16 and 23 above.</li> <li>3) The county council and borough council do not own the station car park.</li> <li>4) Planning permission is not required to introduce yellow lines.</li> <li>5) Comment noted.</li> <li>6) The proposals have been developed to reduce the risk of accidents. It is not believed that there will be a problem of excess speed.</li> </ol>