

Summary of objections and comments received during objection period.			Annexe 1
Name	Address	Summary	
<b>No road name specified</b>			
Resident	Delaporte Close	<b>Support</b> but problem will be compounded into roads such as Delaporte Close. There is a lack of enforcement of waiting restrictions.	
<b>Bridge Road</b>			
Resident	Woodland Court, Bridge Road	<b>Object</b> to hours of restriction. Limit it to Mon – Fri.	
Resident	Woodland Court, Bridge Road	<b>Objects</b> only to the hours of restriction. Does not object to proposal in principle. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The residents of Woodlands Court have limited on-site parking and many park in Bridge Road. Saturday restriction will cause them problems.</li> <li>• Displaced parking will cause congestion further down the road.</li> <li>• Wants Mon – Fri for existing and new restrictions.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Woodland Court, Bridge Road	Does not object in principle but <b>Objects</b> to hours of restriction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saturday restrictions will cause problems to residents'</li> <li>• Will lead to further congestion down road.</li> <li>• Reconsider hours, Mon-Fri for existing and proposed.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Woodland Court, Bridge Road	<b>Objects</b> to hours of restrictions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited on-site parking, some residents park on-street outside restricted hours. Would be inconvenienced to be restricted on Saturdays.</li> <li>• Lead to further congestion down the road.</li> <li>• Reconsider the hours changing them to Mon – Fri only for the new and existing.</li> </ul>	
<b>Chalk Lane</b>			
2 Residents	Chalk Lane	<b>Objects</b> if no residents parking scheme is introduced. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'on-street' parking for those residents with no 'off-street' parking.</li> </ul> Only satisfactory solution would be Residents parking scheme. What are the reasons for not introducing such? Any possibility in the future? If not, leave it as it is.	

Resident	Chalk Lane	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'on-street' parking. Proposal would put pressure on remaining 'on-street' parking. Many properties have no or inadequate off-street parking. Hospital staff and Atkins employees park in the lane daily.</li> <li>• Only solution is residents parking scheme. What is the reason for not introducing this?</li> <li>• If above mentioned scheme is not introduced, then leave it as it is.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Chalk Lane	<p><b>Supports</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 3? of the Traffic Order.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Chalk Lane	<p><b>Supports</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants AAT restrictions both sides as suggested in C Frost's plan</li> </ul>	
Resident	Chalk Paddock	<p>Not contacted by SCC but did not expect to be as is not directly affected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests restrictions are extended to include the narrowest part of the lane between the electric sub station and the hotel wall (at end of car park). It is the parking on the opposite side to the hotel which is the 'killer'. This would enable traffic to pass. In addition the line should be extended to prevent parking in front of the 'World's End' sign at hotel front.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Chalk Paddock	<p><b>Support</b> Option 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mon-Fri 8.30-18.30 shown on drawing 6499/025 Rev A. This is consistent with existing Traffic Order n16 Mar 1995 (closing Chalk Lane) since it will facilitate heavy vehicles access to The Amato and Chalk Lane Hotel from the north end j/w Worple Road.</li> <li>• Option 1 is unacceptable due to having to squeeze past parked cars to reach Chalk Paddock.</li> </ul>	
	'Punch Taverns', Second Avenue, Staffs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understand safety and access is important but proposals would be detrimental to business at 'Amato' PH.</li> <li>• Consider instead, 9.30 –11.30. Main problem is hospital staff parking in Chalk Lane between 7.00-16.00.</li> <li>• The barrier has caused problems too for day deliveries.</li> <li>• Would like concerns raised to Committee on behalf of Punch Taverns and the current leaseholder.</li> </ul>	

<b>Chartwell Place</b>			
Resident	Chartwell Place	<b>Objects</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To any restrictions that will affect the residents of the road.</li> <li>• Would like Residents permits</li> <li>• Consider full restrictions on one side only, ie school side making road safer and allow emergency services access.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Chartwell Place	<b>Objects.</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently there is no serious commuter parking problem but there may be if SCC introduce restrictions elsewhere.</li> <li>• Would create too much inconvenience to residents.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Downs Road	<b>Supports</b>	item 3 of TRO Mon – Fri 9.30-12.30
2 x Residents	Chartwell Place	<b>Objects</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'On-Street' parking will prevent relative from staying overnight.</li> <li>• Suggests reduction of lining so restrictions do not apply on east side of Chartwell Place but do apply on 'west' side (see map).</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Chartwell Place	<b>Objects</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed restrictions are unacceptable in this residential road. Will inconvenience residents and trade people will not be able to make morning calls.</li> <li>• Any new restriction should include provision for residents.</li> <li>• If forced to choose would prefer to leave it with no restriction or 2<sup>nd</sup> choice to reduce restrictions to St Christopher's School side only)</li> </ul>	
Resident	Chartwell Place	<b>Objects</b>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconvenience to self as currently parks o/s house. The period of restriction makes little difference.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Chartwell Place	Does not object to the restrictions, only aesthetics.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not like yellow lines and associated signs</li> <li>• Would like to know what proposals are for signing it. Would be disappointed to see more than 4 signs installed.</li> </ul>	

2 x Residents	Chartwell Place	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No commuter problem. Only parents delivering children to school.</li> <li>Loss of 'on-street' parking for visitors. Tradespeople usually call in mornings.</li> <li>Own 2 cars. Insufficient off road parking.</li> <li>Consider waiting restrictions on one side all day.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Chartwell Place	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not currently experience problems such as commuter parking. Not experienced problems in 12 years.</li> <li>Loss of 'on-street' parking. Proposed restrictions would prevent all residents in Chartwell Place from parking their cars every morning.</li> <li>Will prevent trades people from calling in the mornings.</li> <li>Please check how many residents are actually asking for this proposal.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Chartwell Place	<b>Object</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No parking problem in our road, hence no problem to solve.</li> <li>Proposals are impractical to us for visitors, 2<sup>nd</sup> cars and when we have our drive resurfaced.</li> <li>Objected in 2003. 80% of residents signed petition. The predicted problems then did not materialise.</li> <li>Please advise how many residents in this road have requested the proposal.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Chartwell Place	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mon-Fri 9.30-12.30 which is the least worst solution.</li> <li>Can we have a narrower line for aesthetic value?</li> </ul>	
	St Christopher's School, Downs Road	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Catchment area for this nursery and infant school includes Bookham and Kingswood. These children need to be driven to school and parents need to park in Chartwell Place between 8.00-9.00, 11.50-12.50 and 14.50 and 16.20.</li> <li>Noticed increase in parking in the close. Could be overflow from the new development but some is certainly commuter parking displaced from Downs Hill Road.</li> </ul>	
<b>Church Road</b>			
Resident	College Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If Waiting Restrictions are installed as advertised, it is essential that they are also installed on SE side of Andrews Close from College Road as far as No. 39 Andrews Close and possibly further.</li> </ul>	

Resident	Grove Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrictions do not go far enough. Cars are often parked on white hatching at end of Grove Avenue causing sightline problems. AAT restrictions needed instead.</li> <li>Cars parked for long periods and customers to the mini store in Church Road disregard the white hatching. AAT restrictions needed.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Church Road	<p><b>Object</b> to extend restrictions o/s Nos 8-12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of 'on-street' parking for residents</li> <li>Devalue their homes. 'On-street' parking was one of the reasons residents bought their home.</li> <li>Displacement of parking to other roads</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Church Road	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of 'on-street' parking o/s home.</li> <li>Parking is already an issue. Proposals will have detrimental effect.</li> <li>Restriction of articulated lorries would be a more purposeful change.</li> </ul>	
<b>Church Road/Albert Road</b>			
2 x Residents	Grove Avenue	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will greatly improve visibility.</li> <li>Would also like a proposal for similar restrictions opposite Grove Avenue /Church Road junction. It is very difficult to emerge from and also to cross the road on foot while cars are parked on hatching and yellow lines.</li> </ul>	
<b>Church Road/Wyeths Road</b>			
Resident	Wyeths Road	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of 'on-street' parking</li> <li>AAT restrictions not necessary</li> <li>People start arriving at 7.30 to park and don't leave until 6pm</li> <li>Suggest double length of restriction on left etc (as No.13's letter).</li> </ul>	
Resident	Church Road	<p><b>Objects.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of 6-7 'on-street' parking spaces to residents, shop and 2 public houses.</li> <li>Residents may need to continue paving over front gardens thus blighting this conservation area.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Church Road	<p><b>Objects.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why 'AAT' restriction on corners?</li> <li>Loss of 5 'on-street' parking spaces putting pressure on surrounding area where local residents already have parking problems.</li> <li>Will also impact on the pub and corner shop.</li> </ul>	

2 x Residents	Wyeths Road	<p><b>Supports</b> proposal to install AAT restriction on Church Road. It should improve sightlines.</p> <p><b>Objects</b> to extent of proposed restriction in Wyeths Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of approx 6 spaces. Does not feel this will improve safety but it will put further pressure on neighbouring roads.</li> <li>• Suggests the only change to make is replace single yellow line at end of Wyeths Road to double (AAT) both sides but not extending further into road.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Wyeths Road	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need to make changes except install single yellow line at entrance to Wyeths Road to match opposite side.</li> <li>• Residents already have parking difficulties. The proposals will make the situation worse.</li> <li>• Have requested Residents Parking in the past but not been offered this.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Wyeths Road	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of restriction exceeds what is needed.</li> <li>• Loss of 10-12 'on-street' spaces.</li> <li>• Suggest yellow lines on left side (odd nos.) is doubled in length and proposed restrictions on right deleted.</li> <li>• This community would benefit from Residents Parking half residents and half non-residents for 2 hours</li> </ul>	
Resident	Church Road	<p><b>Objects</b> AAT restriction o/s Nos 7-11 is OK.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'on-street' parking for local residents' which is scarce anyway due to pub clientele and commuters to station.</li> <li>• The AAT proposal o/s Nos 13-17 is where the road is widest, so seems illogical.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Church Road	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sees no reason to install AAT restriction at corners and along Wyeths Road from nos. 2–6 and Church Road from nos.13-17 and up to No.19.</li> <li>• Loss of precious 'on-street' parking. Think of the residents with small children. They need all the parking they can get.</li> <li>• Displaced parking to surrounding roads.</li> <li>• The parking in Church Road helps to calm speeding traffic making it a little safer.</li> <li>• Council could spend the money on residents parking permits rather than yellow lines which does not benefit anyone other than the Council.</li> </ul>	

Resident	Wyeths Road	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 6 'on-street' spaces but can see that it will improve sightlines.</li> <li>• Removal of parked vehicles will increase speed in Church Road.</li> <li>• No recollection of an accident at this junction in 10 years.</li> <li>• If reason is for access for emergency services, suggest AAT restrictions on one side of road.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Wyeths Road	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 5-6 'on-street' spaces.</li> <li>• Wyeths Road already has parking problems caused by local workers, commuters and shoppers at weekends.</li> <li>• Problems increased by displacement of parking from Church Road proposals too.</li> <li>• In favour of Residents' only.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Wyeths Road	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'on-street' parking for residents. 'AAT' restrictions on corners exceeds what is necessary affecting all residents and tradespeople and directly affecting Nos. 2, 4 and 6. Total loss of 11-12 spaces.</li> <li>• Requests Residents parking scheme.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Wyeths Road	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of proposed restriction exceeds what is necessary.</li> <li>• Loss of 10-12 'on-street' parking spaces used by local workers, cinema visitors and Pikes Hill and Church Road residents from 7.30-18.30.</li> <li>• AAT restrictions unnecessary. Suggest double the length on even nos. side with current restriction times and enforce more frequently. Proposed restriction on the right should not apply.</li> <li>• Resident has lobbied for Residents Parking, in the past.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Wyeths Road	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why AAT restriction both sides? Unnecessary.</li> <li>• Where can residents' park? No other turnings off Church Road marked like this.</li> <li>• Loss of almost 40m of 'on-street' parking.</li> <li>• The issue is that the road is used as a free car park for workers and shoppers. This is ignored by Council. The proposal makes it worse for residents.</li> <li>• Displacement of vehicles to elsewhere.</li> <li>• Why has proposal been based on one request?</li> </ul>	

<b>Church Road/Pitt Road</b>			
Resident	Andrews Close	<b>Supports</b> in principle but <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with impact it may have on Andrews Close by displaced parking by commuters and local workforce.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Wimborne Close	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wimborne Close, St Martin's Close and Andrew's Close will be worse off.</li> <li>Requests Residents' Parking permits.</li> </ul>	
<b>Church Street</b>			
Resident	Church Street	Does not mention whether he objects or supports proposal. Concerned about getting the 'Keep Clear' marking reinstated.	
	St. Martin of Tours, Church Street	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under schedule 1. Currently users of the church can park on Sundays. Proposals would inconvenience parishioners. Leave it as it is.</li> </ul>	
<b>Dorking Road</b>			
Resident	Yew Tree Gardens	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Displacement to other residential roads</li> <li>Parked cars on A24 effectively narrow it and therefore slows down traffic.</li> <li>West end of extension is already covered by pelican crossing zig-zags.</li> <li>Parking at bus stop is prevented by traffic island.</li> <li>Cost would be better directed to other safety initiatives in the County.</li> <li>There may have been a number of accidents including parked cars but thinks there will be even more involving pedestrians and cyclists due to the increased average road speed and motorised users.</li> </ul>	
<b>First Avenue/Green Lanes</b>			
2 x Residents	Green Lanes	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of on-street parking for residents</li> <li>Not convinced emergency services cannot gain access.</li> <li>Refuse collectors should use smaller vehicle.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Green Lanes	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of on-street parking for residents</li> <li>Road wide enough for emergency services.</li> <li>Residents have not requested this proposal.</li> </ul>	



26 x signature petition from residents	First Avenue	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking made difficult by commuters using West Ewell Station from 6.30. Often contravenes the Highway Code 243 opp or within 10m junctions. This is not enforced nor are the existing restrictions at Chessington Road end of Green Lanes.</li> <li>• Displaced parking. If proposals goes ahead, commuters will park further into First Avenue causing difficulties for refuse truck access etc.</li> </ul>	
<b>Grove Road/Church Street</b>			
Resident	Grove Road	<p><b>Supports</b> but</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• asks for consideration of allowing one extra car space at end of row on post box side of Grove Road nearest The Grove.</li> <li>• Please refresh white parking bays.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Grove Road		
2 x Residents	Grove Road	<p><b>Objects</b> to proposal in its current form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'on-street' parking.</li> <li>• AAT restriction extends too far</li> <li>• AAT restriction will lose 'on-street' parking in Pitt Road.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supports</b> AAT at junction of Albert Road and Church Road as school children cross here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the same as above at Church Road j/w Grove Avenue.</li> <li>• What is the situation with regard to Residents Parking Permits?</li> <li>• What is the position with traffic calming?</li> </ul>	
<b>Hylands Mews</b>			
2 x Residents	Dorking Road	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal encroaches onto private land.</li> <li>• Loss of on-street parking</li> <li>• What provision for residents is there?</li> </ul>	
<b>Longmead Road</b>			
	Resident from Surbiton	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate parking for employees of Business Estate. Main causes parents of schoolchildren of Blenheim School and queuing traffic to Waste Transfer station. Suggest possible permit system for estate employees or create parking by removing some of the verges.</li> </ul>	
31 x signature petition from employees	'Epsom Motor Company Ltd'.	<p><b>Objects</b> to Longmead Road and surrounding roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'on-street' parking for employees of Epsom Motor Co Ltd. If they had to use public transport they would seek employment elsewhere.</li> </ul>	

26 x Signature petition from employees	'Epsom Car Care Centre' and 'Allams', Blenheim Road	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is it all parking is being taken away from us?</li> </ul> Affects employees and the business and its customers	
<b>Lyncroft Gardens/ Garbrand Walk</b>			
	Ewell Grove Infant & Nursery 29 West Street, Ewell	<b>Objects</b> to a proposal for full <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11.00 –12.00 restriction would cause difficulties for nursery collections.</li> <li>No issue with 13.00-14.00 restriction.</li> <li>What is the actual proposal?</li> </ul>	
Resident	Garbrand Walk	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents of Garbrand Walk now agree with Ewell Grove Infant and nursery school that restricted hour should operate between 13.00 and 14.00.</li> </ul>	
<b>Mathias Close</b>			
Resident	Mathias Close	<b>Support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wonderful that thus is going to happen after such a long struggle.</li> </ul>	
<b>Meadway</b>			
Resident	West Hill	Fully <b>supports</b> proposal, possibly even further along Meadway.	
2 x Residents	West Hill	<b>Supports</b> proposal	
2 x Residents	Meadway	<b>Supports</b> excellent proposal.	
Resident	Ridgeway	<b>Supports</b> Meadway/West Hill <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Also suggests adding 'No Entry' to Ridgeway from Christ Church Mount.</li> </ul>	
Resident	West Hill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal would ease congestion at the road junction</li> <li>Existing restrictions on west side of Meadway serve no useful purpose as cars parked here would block the road.</li> <li>More logical to install AAT restrictions continuously along the west side of the road.</li> </ul>	

Nightingale Drive			
	'Edward Thomas and son' Chessington Road	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of space for Edward Thomas &amp; Son employees to park. Area is not outside anyone's house and if proposals were implemented it would impact on other roads such as Larch Crescent or Poplar Drive.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Larch Crescent	<b>Objects.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal is excessive. Will have a 'knock-on' effect in surrounding roads.</li> <li>Larch Crescent already has a problem with verge and pavement parking occurring (see photos)</li> <li>Suggests 'AAT' restrictions at Chessington Road j/w Nightingale Drive and Poplar Crescent j/w Nightingale Drive to improve sightlines.</li> </ul>	
Providence Place			
Resident	Providence Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of on-street parking for residents.</li> <li>Requests consideration of parking permits to limit numbers parking in this location.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Providence Place	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals will not solve any issues, may create more. Commuters, shoppers etc use the road as a free car park.</li> <li>Only solution is Residents Permit system. This should cut numbers of vehicles parked by 60% Mon-Fri 8am-6pm.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Providence Place	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals would probably increase volume and speed of traffic.</li> <li>Loss of 'on-street' parking to residents.</li> <li>Has SCC considered residents parking permits?</li> </ul>	
Resident	Providence Place	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to deter parking at East Street end.</li> <li>Proposals will not address additional problem of pavement parking by reducing residents parking spaces.</li> <li>Wants combination of yellow lines and residents parking permits.</li> </ul>	

Resident	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impossible to see how the proposal will address the commuter parking problem here,</li> <li>• The proposal is to address obstructive parking, there will still be 2 places to park from No 11 onwards and in front of Nos.12-14 as well as at the end which is particularly narrow thus obstruction still takes place.</li> <li>• Proposals penalises residents at the beginning of Providence Place who suffer most from commuter parking. It will be difficult, if not impossible to find a space during the day.</li> <li>• Opposed to any restriction in front of house, which makes life, even more complicated as resident is suffering from illness.</li> <li>• Opposed to parking permits arrangement which are complicated and costly.</li> <li>• Many over 60's who need parking outside.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'On-Street' parking for residents. Only 25% of houses in Providence Place have off-road parking.</li> <li>• Proposals do not address the residents issues – commuter parking.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Providence Place	<p><b>Object</b> to any proposal that limits or stops residents parking in Providence Place. Parking partly on the kerb is a necessary inconvenience but enables 'on-street' parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'On-Street' parking for residents.</li> <li>• Would be in favour of Residents Parking Scheme.</li> <li>• Wants answer as to why SCC has not put forward allocated Residents Parking in Providence Place.</li> <li>• Wants to know where does SCC suggest residents park their cars within a reasonable distance from their homes, should the proposals go ahead.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b> The parking problem is recognised by this resident who says it is due to office workers nearby. The current proposals do not address the problem in an appropriate way. (see details in letter as to why proposals will not achieve the objectives).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal lacks consistency</li> <li>• It penalises residents.</li> <li>• Suggests less restrictive limitations as an alternative eg 8.30-16.30 weekdays</li> <li>• Same as above with Residents parking permits in addition.</li> </ul>	

Resident	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'on-street' parking. Resident finds it difficult to find somewhere to park. The proposal will make it worse.</li> <li>• It will not mean less commuter parking. It will mean less space for residents.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Dirdene Gardens	<p><b>Objects</b> Understands that action is needed to address problem but does not see how the proposal will do this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the reasoning behind the gaps?</li> <li>• What provision is made for car owners in Providence Place?</li> <li>• What guarantee is given that there will not be displaced parking to surrounding roads?</li> <li>• Would <b>Support</b> restrictions 8am – 6pm Mon – Fri with provision to allow residents to park during this period.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b> Problem is 2 fold, Commuters and too many residents' cars in narrow road, 2 wheels on pavement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simply address with Residents Only parking between 10 and 11am.</li> <li>• Car parking one side only through its length.</li> <li>• AAT restriction on even side would leave a clear road and footway both sides.</li> </ul> <p>If SCC insists on AAT, then cover the whole road. The proposals will make problems worse.</p>	
Resident	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introducing waiting restrictions will lead to a greater problem. All residents will not be able to park close to their homes. Loss of 'on-street' parking.</li> <li>• Will push congestion into surrounding roads potentially affecting property values.</li> <li>• Will not stop commuters' use, just lead to competition between them and residents.</li> <li>• Introduce CPZ for a better solution to ensure all those living in the street are able to park there. Has this been discussed?</li> <li>• Or yellow lines with limited waiting eg 9.00-16.00 weekdays</li> <li>• If neither of above is possible, would prefer to stay with current situation than have 24 hr restrictions imposed.</li> </ul>	

Resident	Providence Place	<p>Recognises this road has a problem. Inspected plans and thinks zig-zag proposal is a good idea. Will enable emergency vehicles access, keep down speeds and eliminate pavement parking. However, <b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals to reduce parking by 50% will not prevent commuter parking. From 8.15 – 17.45 space is dominated by ‘Teddies Nurseries’ and ‘Premium Credit’ staff Mon – Fri.</li> <li>Could support a proposal that was addressing Commuter Parking issue ie permits for residents, single line restrictions 8am – 6pm would suffice. Is familiar with problems permit holders encounter in KT1 and KT2 areas. Not enough visitors permits.</li> <li>Suggests Commuter parking restrictions with residents’ exemptions.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of ‘on-street’ parking will not deter commuters from parking or stop kerb parking.</li> <li>Has thought been given to how many residents cars are currently parked in the road? Proposals do not give sufficient space for existing residents.</li> <li>AAT will make a bad situation worse.</li> <li>Residents’ permit scheme is a more appropriate solution.</li> <li>Or a single yellow line for peak hour only 8am – 6pm Mon-Sat one side.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b> to hours of restrictions. Concerned that these measures are not addressing the actual problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient ‘on-street’ parking. Some type of residents’ parking scheme may address this.</li> <li>Restrictions not necessary o/s 8.00-18.00 Mon- Fri. Once commuters have left, there is no problem parking in road.</li> <li>Resident is concerned she won’t find a legal space on return home from work.</li> <li>If the hours were reduced , resident would be in favour of restriction and it would make the road more pleasant.</li> </ul>	

Resident	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b> not in favour of AAT restrictions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 'on-street' parking. Inconvenient to residents carrying shopping and with young children, unable to park close by.</li> <li>• Main problem is commuter parking and vehicles 'cutting-through' Dirdene Gardens and Prvoidence Place when East Street traffic builds up.</li> <li>• Would prefer restricted parking between 8.00 and 17.00 Mon-Fri. offer permits to residents and stop lorries cutting through by installing a width restriction.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Dirdene Gardens	<p><b>Objects</b> Understands that concern regarding East Street office workers parking in side roads during the day. However pleased to see a solution is being sought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is only part of the problem. Providence Place and Dirdene Gardens are used as an easy route to reach Kiln Lane and Sainsburys, rather than uncontrolled right turn from Church Road.</li> <li>• Proposed restrictions are likely to displace parking problem into Dirdene Gardens.</li> <li>• Existing parking functions as traffic calming and if removed wopuld encourage further use as a short cut.</li> <li>• Current proposals do nothing to restrict the hazardous parking at the junction of Providence Place and Dirdene Gardens. (on verge and on Bend)</li> </ul>	
Resident	Dirdene Gardens	<p><b>Objects</b> Virtually Impossible to walk with children due to obstructive parking on footways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staggered restrictions are not appropriate. Would be better to keep parking restricted to one side AAT.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b> – Realises that a compromise will have to be found to satisfy all parties needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest painting a white line along pavement to keep cars parked outside it, allowing enough room for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Traffic Calming measures should be considered at junction of Providence Place and Dirdene Gardens.</li> <li>• Most residents are considerate but wonder if local workers have the same attitude.</li> </ul>	

2 x Residents	Providence Place	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot understand how the proposals are intended to work. As there will be less space for residents' vehicles.</li> <li>• AAT penalises the residents who mostly park outside commuter hours.</li> <li>• Horrified at the detrimental effect it will have on capital and rental values of Now 16-22 as no parking will be available directly o/s their properties.</li> <li>• Displacement to more dangerous places eg on the dangerous bend.</li> <li>• Suggest AAT on bend and corner of Church Road and Providence Place. Introduce parking bays along whole length incorporating one third of footway and introduce some form of residents parking permits between 9.00-10.30 and 13.00 and 14.30 such as Wandsworth and Putney.</li> </ul>	
<b>Sheraton Drive</b>			
Resident	Sheraton Drive	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In full agreement</li> </ul>	
Resident	Sheraton Drive	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like times increased to 'At Any Time' on bend and 8.30am to 5.3pm</li> </ul>	
Resident	Sheraton Drive	<b>Supports</b> but wants total yellow banding of Sheraton Drive.	
2 Residents	Sheraton Drive	<b>Supports</b> but should be 'At Any Time' restrictions.	
Resident	Sheraton Drive	<b>Supports</b> fully	
2 x Residents	Sheraton Close	<p><b>Support</b> – should be the whole day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can some restrictions be considered for the rest of Sheraton Drive? Expecting increase of parking causing obstruction to private driveways. Increased parking is also expected due to less available parking in Burnet Grove when housing development replaces existing parking places.</li> </ul>	
<b>Squirrels Way</b>			
Resident	Squirrels Way	<p><b>Supports</b> proposal up to 14.30 but</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• also wants 12' of AAT restriction opposite his garage.</li> <li>• Further letter to C Frost supports his double yellow line proposal.</li> </ul>	



Resident	Squirrels Way	<b>Objects</b> to changing the restriction times unless it could be earlier. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like the yellow line in question to be extended to restrict parking in the entire area of Squirrels Way. By 8am every weekday it is completely full of commuters employed locally who stay for 8 to 10 hours.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Squirrels Way	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot give an informed opinion as out all day</li> <li>• In favour of leaving things unchanged.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Squirrels Way	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Want restrictions unchanged. No mass exodus from WS Atkins or hospital rushing out to move their cars into Squirrels Way at 12.30. Can provide photographic evidence of this.</li> <li>• Inconvenient to residents.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Squirrels Way	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants restriction to extend to 15.30 each day because parents block drives while collecting children from school.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Squirrels Way	<b>Supports</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants AAT restrictions o/s 11,12,13,14 and side of 15 to cure obstruction to drives but realises this is not offered.</li> <li>• Therefore prefers restrictions to be extended to 14.30 rather than unchanged.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Squirrels Way	<b>Objects</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not extend restrictions. No evidence to suggest WS Atkins staff are moving their cars lunchtimes.</li> <li>• Would prefer restrictions be reduced</li> </ul>	
Resident	Squirrels Way	<b>Supports</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In favour of extending times to 14.30.</li> <li>• And also to extend restrictions in Worple Road (see letter)</li> </ul>	
<b>Stevens Close</b>			
Resident	Stevens Close	<b>Object (in part only)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restrictions are required on one side only ie o/s nos.1-10</li> <li>• They should apply Mon-Fri 8.30-18.30</li> <li>• Restriction not required alongside wall by railway line</li> <li>• Lines required on curves o/s 9/10 and 11/12</li> </ul>	

Visitor to resident	Sutton	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restrictions should be one side only</li> <li>• Proposed 8.30 restriction start will not solve 7.30 Refuse Collection problem.</li> <li>• Why propose restrictions along by railway line? This will cause difficulties for visitors.</li> <li>• Suggests AAT restrictions on one side, leave railway line end clear.</li> <li>• Ban pavement parking as Sutton do.</li> <li>• Enforce restriction 6.00-18.30 daily.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Stevens Close	<b>Objects</b> to current proposals but wishes to see it done as his enclosed sketch.	
Resident	Stevens Close	<b>Agrees</b> with Mr Swan's suggestion. See above.	
Resident	Stevens Close	<p><b>Objects</b> The problem is mainly obstructed access for deliveries and refuse collection by vehicles parked partly on the footway o/s Nos 1-12. Refuse is collected at 7.30 on Mondays.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restrictions are only needed o/s Nos 1-12.</li> <li>• 8.30 start would not solve refuse collection problem. Hours should be 6.00-18.30 every day.</li> <li>• What is the point of proposing restrictions by the railway? Valuable visitor parking will be lost.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Upper High Street	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of on-street parking for residents.</li> <li>• Introduce parking zones for residents or a combination of restrictions on one side and parking for residents the other.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Stevens Close	Does not express an objection as such. See his proposal on enclosed map (the same proposal as Mr Swan's and Mrs Grover)	
Resident	Stevens Close	<p>This resident's proposal is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend AAT from existing to cover Nos. 1-10.</li> <li>• Install 10m AAT restriction on corner o/s Nos.11 and 12</li> <li>• AAT in space between drain and lamp column by railway line for 7m. See enclosed sketch (same as Mr Swan's, Mrs Grover's and Mr Cousin's)</li> </ul>	
Resident	Stevens Close	See resident's current letter and enclosed letter dated 5-6-2000 to A Flaherty who installed some hatching. It is not clear if the resident objects or supports the proposal. It appears they want AAT restrictions.	

Resident	Stevens Close	<p><b>Objects</b> – This proposals is inadequate to prevent obstruction for Refuse Collection and Emergency Services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move proposal to Schedule 1. 'At Any Time' (AAT)</li> <li>• Area covered is excessive. Just restrict western side of Close and replace white hatched area in NE with AAT restriction.</li> <li>• Allow parking on eastern side and by railway as at present.</li> <li>• If restrictions are unnecessary, it may lead to parking in private spaces. See map.</li> </ul>	
Visitor	Watford	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is unreasonable. Inconvenience to visitors and residents.</li> </ul> <p>Solution is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ban pavement parking</li> <li>○ Mark out visitors and residents bays</li> <li>○ Enforce restrictions between 6.00-18.30 every day.</li> </ul>	
<b>West Hill Avenue</b>			
2 x Residents	West Hill Avenue	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal will unbalance original scheme and inconvenience themselves and other residents.</li> <li>• Will set a precedent to encourage other residents to apply for more restrictions.</li> <li>• Will encourage residents to pave over driveways which is not in the best interest of the environment.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	West Hill Avenue	<p><b>Supports</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will make it easier to manoeuvre in and out of drive to No 45.</li> </ul>	
<b>Wheelers Lane</b>			
Resident	Wheelers Lane	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like times 9.30-12.30 Mon-Fri.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Wheelers Lane	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9.30-16.30 restriction will not resolve problem</li> <li>• Suggests changing 'Keep Clear' areas to 'AAT' restriction, within the yellow lined areas.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Wheelers Lane	<p><b>Object</b> – The problem is vehicles meeting oncoming traffic with no room to pass. Keep Clears ignored. Has been better since yellow lines installed last year but only during mornings, still ignored in afternoons as entitled. It's worse than when the Keep Clears were in use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change the timeplates to match the existing TRO rather than revoke the existing TRO to match the timeplates.</li> </ul>	

<b>Worple Road</b>			
Resident	Woodcote End	<p><b>Objects</b> to proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals do not go far enough. Extend restrictions on both sides of Worple Road where there is absence of footway.</li> <li>Extend restrictions in Chalk Lane southwards both sides into Woodcote End for approx.50 yards just past the Hotel's garage entrance.</li> </ul>	
Resident	Worple Road	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leave it as it is</li> <li>Hospital staff parking is prevalent but not inconsiderate as school pick up/set down parking is.</li> </ul>	
2 x Residents	Ashley Road	<p><b>Objects</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of 'on-street' parking for residents</li> <li>Has Residents parking been considered? Residents rather than visitors lose out.</li> </ul>	