

ANNEX A (Revision A)

**Recommendations following advertising of
Phase 6 Epsom and Ewell**

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Drawing 1 – Suffolk Road / The Avenue / Badgers Copse | No Objections received – however there has been a suggestion to implement further restrictions which will be looked at as part of the Phase 7 review. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 2 – Edenfield Gardens / Woodlands Avenue | One correspondence received, requesting that one side of Woodlands Avenue be restricted all day – this will be looked at as part of Phase 7 | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 3 – Worcester Park Road / Parkdale Crescent | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 4 – Cromwell Road / Grafton Road | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 5 – Delta Road / Salisbury Road / Cuddington Avenue | One correspondence in agreement with the extension of Double yellow lines in Delta Road, but thinks that restrictions in Salisbury Road should allow drop off and pick up of children from the school. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 6 – Vale Road Roundabout / Cuddington Avenue | One letter in favour of the double yellow lines at Vale Road Roundabout. It should be noted that splitter island has been installed on Vale Road adjacent to The Parade – this will potentially conflict with the parking bay proposals outside of The Game Cock public house and The Parade. | Proceed with installation of double yellow lines, but defer installation of parking bays to Phase 7. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Drawing 7 – Thorndon Gardens / Newbury Gardens | One objection to double yellow line proposals – suggests that the proposals should be the same as Newbury Gardens (School pick up and drop off times). | Consider the implementation of the extension of double yellow lines in Newbury Gardens, but to amend the restrictions in Thorndon Gardens to school pick up and drop off times. |
| Drawing 8 – Fir Tree Close / Newbury Gardens | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 09 – Francis Close / Kingston Road | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 10 – Tealing Drive / Riverview Road | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 11 – Ruxley Lane / Scott Close / Scotts Farm Road / Always Avenue | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 12 – Elm Way / Pams Way | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 13 – Fairfield Way / Ewell Court Avenue / Elmstead Close / Kingston Road | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 14 – Preston Drive / Bradford Drive / | One objection agreeing in principle, but recommends that the double yellow line should only extend 2.5m south-west of no.2 Bradford Drives driveway. This will allow for one vehicle to park in this location. | Recommend that this proceeds as per the objection – however dimensions would need to be confirmed on site. |

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Kingston Road | | |
| Drawing 15 – Derek Avenue / Chessington Road | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 16 – Chessington Road / Hartford Road / Collier Close | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 17 –Jasmin Road / Lavender Road | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 18 – Oakhurst Road / Danetree Road | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 19 – Chessington Road | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 20 – Chessington Road / Belfield Road / Riverholme Drive | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 21 – Gibraltar Crescent / Brook Close / Station Avenue | General objection from a commuter to proposals in Station Avenue, who has objected to proposals on Green lanes, believing that commuter parking will be greatly reduced. This would not be the case in this area and is to help alleviate problems with entry and exit from private driveways. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 22 – Kingston Road / London Road | No objections received during advertising period. However during the preliminary consultation period there was an objection to the proposals from The Wheatsheaf public house. These proposals should not directly affect the PH as the intention is not to extend the residents parking bay as far as that point. | Proceed as Advertised |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Drawing 23 – Glyn Close / Portway Crescent</p> | <p>Portway:- Two correspondents received: Two in agreement with the proposals, but asks for an additional restriction of 11-12 and 2-3 along the entire length. The second believes that there should be a restriction along the entire length of 7.30-10am. They fear that the current proposals will force motorists to park on verges which are maintained by the residents.</p> <p>Glyn Close: 10 residents of Church Street are opposed to the proposals. 4 Residents of Glyn Close are against the proposals 1 Resident of Glynn Close is for the proposals 1 objectee thinks that this should be left for shoppers to park, so that the village doesn't get clogged up.</p> | <p>Portway: Proceed as advertised</p> <p>Glyn Close: Do not proceed.</p> |
| <p>Drawing 24 – Queensmead Avenue</p> | <p>One objection received from a disabled resident who lives on Cheam Road, who feels that this extension would cause considerable problems for them as they have no off-street parking.</p> | <p>Proceed as Advertised</p> |
| <p>Drawing 25 – Arundel Avenue</p> | <p>One general objection to proposals around Ewell East train station from a commuter.</p> | <p>Proceed as Advertised</p> |
| <p>Drawing 26 – St Normans Way / Chatsfield</p> | <p>St Normans Way: 5 agree that there should be restrictions of 1hr in the morning and 1 hour in the afternoon 1 agrees that times should be restricted to 1hr in the morning 1 agrees that times should be 11am – 1pm</p> <p>Chatsfield: 4 residents oppose the entire scheme</p> <p>General:</p> | <p>Proceed with St Normans Way with a 1hr restriction of 11am – 12 noon</p> <p>Proceed with similar proposals (as above) for Conaways Close</p> <p>Chatsfield: Do not proceed</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | 2 against any scheme near the station (it will reduce commuter parking) | |
| Drawing 27 – Ewell House Parade / Ewell House Grove | No Objections received. | Proceed as Advertised |
| Drawing 28 – Hurst Road / Lower Court Road / Pound Lane / Almond Road / Andover Close | Pound Lane:- Two Objections received: One objection requests that only the bays opposite nos.13-29 Pound Lane should be restricted and the rest left as unlimited. Second Objection is against any proposals to restrict the area as they believe that the residents will have nowhere to park. | Proceed as advertised with bays adjacent to 1-29 Pound Lane and 179 Hook Road. Bays adjacent to 31 and 33 Pound Lane and 81 Temple Road to be unlimited. |
| Drawing 29 – Pound Lane / Hurst Road / Lower Court Road | See above | See above |
| Drawing 30 – Kendor Avenue / Manor Green Road / Hamilton Close | 6 correspondence received: All 6 object to the proposals, but further junction protection has been suggested. | Do not proceed with Kendor Avenue Proposals. Proceed with Hamilton Close proposals. |
| Drawing 31 – Manor Green Road / Meadway | One objection to the proposals which relates to not being able to park outside their property. | Proceed as Advertised as these proposals are to keep the junction clear. |
| Drawing 32 – Hook Road / Chase Road / Adelphi Road | Hook Road: 3 objections by residents of Hook Road against the extension of restrictions – they do not believe that there are any problems with parked vehicles on Sundays along this stretch of Hook Road – they do however recommend allowing more parking in Woodstock Court, this can be looked at as part of Phase 7. Adelphi Road: 2 letters in agreement, but feel that times should be extended. | Hook Road: Do not proceed with proposals between East Street and Hook Road car park. Leave Woodstock Court as existing. Proceed with proposals between Hook Road car park entrance and up to and including proposals in Chase Road and up to crossing in Hook Road. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | Adelphi Road: Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 33 – Windmill Lane / East Street / Chuters Grove / Dirdene Gardens / Dirdene Close / Chelwood Road / Bridge Road | <p>Chuters Grove: One resident supporting proposals. Owner of Car Sounds objecting to proposals and also making comments about the vehicles from ‘Wilson’s’ which he believes are causing most of the problems and that there is no enforcement in the area. Also wishes to have a section of yellow line revoked to accommodate some cars so that he can continue with his business. One resident believes that enforcement is not happening currently and wonders if the new restrictions would be. One resident requires the entire length of Chuters Grove to be restricted. One resident in agreement as long as it prevents pavement parking. Two residents think that DYL should be reduced along East Street to boundary of nos.178 & 180</p> <p>Windmill Lane (northern section): Propose 9am-3.30pm and 4-6.30pm, or to ensure an area of free parking for school drop off at Downsend School. One in agreement to proposals, but against proposals in southern section. 1 against proposals, unless dropped kerbs can be provided. Allow school pick up and drop off.</p> <p>Windmill Lane (southern section): Reduce restriction to 7-9am Parent objects as school drop off and pick up will be made difficult. 3 would like to restrict parking on one side only 11 against entire proposal including objecting to measures to stop parking for park users. One person suggests allowing passing points.</p> | <p>Chuters Grove: Proceed as advertised</p> <p>Windmill Lane (northern section): Proceed as advertised</p> <p>Windmill Lane (southern section): Do not proceed</p> <p>Proceed with all other proposals</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>1 in agreement if the extension up to Park End is included. 3 generally in support of restrictions, but worried about offset into Windmill Close.</p> <p>Windmill Lane (southern section – additional advert) 1 letter in agreement, but would like restrictions reduced to school times and mon-fri.</p> | |
| Drawing 34 – Bridge Road / Denham Road | <p>Apply markings to in front of 1-5 Bridge Road Objection from Cllr Julie Morris to proposals. One proposal that restrictions should be 10-11am. One in support of no parking at any time along the even side up to Woodland Court. One in support to proposals for Bridge Road and Windmill Lane 1 total objection 2 objections with an alternative of proposals only outside no.1 Bridge Road (if necessary)</p> | Only apply restrictions outside of no.1 Bridge Road up to the end of the road table and as advertised outside of 18 Mill Road and Denham Road. |
| Drawing 35 – Windmill Close / Wallace Fields | No objections to Wallace Fields or Windmill Close specifically. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 36 – Wallace Fields / Higher Green | <p>3 objections to DYL outside nos.4-6 Higher Green and nose of triangular island and one objection to DYLS on junction of Wallace Fields and Higher Green. 1 in favour of restrictions on corners, but extending further (not achievable as part of Phase 6) 1 in agreement to restrictions at junction of Wallace Fields and Higher Green.</p> | <p>Do not proceed with proposals outside nos.6-8 Higher Green or opposite on the nose of the green. Progress as advertised with all other proposals.</p> |
| Drawing 37 – Wyeths Road / Pikes Hill / Wyeths Mews | 1 correspondence received in agreement to the proposals, however they would like us to look at further restricting the rest of Pikes Hill. | Proceed as advertised. |
| Drawing 38 – Grove Road | One correspondence in agreement with proposals, but would like further restrictions outside no.20 Grove Road – this could be resolved using an Access | Proceed as advertised. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | Protection Marking. | |
| Drawing 39 – Church Road / College Road / Tintagel Close | No Objections received. | Proceed as advertised. |
| Drawing 40 – St Martins Avenue | No Objections received. | Proceed as advertised. |
| Drawing 41 – Ladbroke Road | 6 for the proposals – 1 would like them to operate 24hrs, one would like mon-fri 8am-5pm 1 in favour, but would like pavement parking removed. Cllr Frost requires residents who live between Ladbroke Road and Worple Road be included in the Ladbroke Road scheme. 5 objections to proposals 2 objections based on not understanding the scheme and requiring clarification. | Proceed as advertised. Restriction times Mon – Fri 8.30am – 6.30pm Previous consultation was in favour of the residents schemes – hence the progression to this stage. |
| Drawing 42 – West Hill / Burnet Grove / Langlands Rise / West Street / Wheelers Lane / Sharon Close / Marshalls Close / Sheraton Drive / Horsley Close | Burnet Grove / West Hill / Langlands Rise: One in agreement in general, but concerned that there is not enough bays to cope with the number of vehicles and there are further developments proposed on the site of some old garages which would make parking even more difficult. Marshalls Close / Sharon Close / Sheraton Drive: 7 Objections to Marshalls Close 5 for Marshalls Close 1 Objection to Sharon Close 2 for Sharon Close 1 Objection to Sheraton Drive 3 for Sheraton drive Epsom Christian Fellowship: List forwarded with 53 names who would be affected by the proposals (not | Burnet Grove / West Hill / Langlands Rise: Recommend not to proceed and remove the CPZ restrictions – possibly to increase spacing and introduce resident permit bays only as part of Phase 7. Marshalls Close / Sharon Close / Sheraton Drive; There seems to be more against the proposals than for them. Would recommend removing this as a CPZ and implementing a single yellow line restriction with more bays. This would |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>petition).</p> <p>The Cornerstone School: List forwarded with 24 names who would be affected by the proposals (not petition) – requesting mon-sat 9.30am – 3pm and 4pm – 6pm.</p> | need to be carried out as part of Phase 7. |
| Drawing 43 – Rosebank | <p>A petition received with 125 signatures asking for the proposals to be amended so that parents can drop off and pick up children (8.45-9am and 2.45-3pm) – this was subsequently followed up by a site meeting between Epsom and Ewell Parking Manager and Senior Engineer from SCC Parking Team. The instigators of the Petition then requested a variation on the original request, which has been forwarded by way of 104 emails requesting that the residents bays only operate between 9.30am and 2pm.</p> <p>Over and above this: 1 document signed by 5 residents against the permit scheme 1 resident of Rosebank against the permit scheme 1 resident of West Street who is in favour and thinks that residents of Rosebank should be given priority over those in West Street, because of lack of parking. 1 resident of Rosebank who is worried that there will not be enough spaces. 1 resident of Rosebery Heights who would like to be included within permit scheme as they feel they do not have enough parking available to them.</p> | Amend the times of operation in the proposed residents parking bays to 9.30am-2.30pm and 4.30pm-6.30pm. Proceed with the rest of the proposals as advertised. |
| Drawing 44 – Wheelers Lane | <p>Three correspondents: Two, we believe have misinterpreted the proposals as the lines will not be extending any further than already exists and the resident zone proposal is not to be progressed. The second believes that there is no change and is asking for restrictions to include Sundays – which the proposals do.</p> | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 45 – Woodlands Road | 16 Objections received against the entire proposal as it is believed this will cause more parking issues along Woodlands Road into Wells Road. | Do not proceed |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Drawing 46 – Castle Road / Woodcote Side | No objections received, we do however have to seek legal advice about the placing of a TRO on part of the common. | Proceed as advertised following advice from legal, on Castle Road. Proceed as advertised on Woodcote Side. |
| Drawing 47 – Woodcote Side / Woodcote Park Road | No objections received. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 48 – Chalk Lane / Squirrels Way | One objection received, however this is due to misinterpretation of the key. It was believed that the bays were to be restricted to 30mins, this however is not the case as the bays are to be for residents. One letter for the proposals in Squirrels Way. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 49 – The Ridings / Highridge Close | No objections received. Two correspondence in favour, however it looks as though it is believed that the restrictions will be more onerous than they are. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 50 – Treadwell Road | No objections received. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 51 – Grosvenor Road | One objection that seems to believe we are introducing permits in the area. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 52 & 53 – West Gardens Permit Zone | Four objections from residents to the proposals – most of these live in the vicinity of the DYL proposals. Two residents who do not give definitive answers as to whether they object to the scheme or not. 1 resident (again in the vicinity of the proposals) believes that a 1hour afternoon restriction would be ample. 2 against a permit scheme (which was no advertised) | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 54 – Middle Lane / Lintons Lane Permit Zone | One correspondence enquiring as to why we are not proceeding with residents permits. | Proceed as advertised |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Drawing 55 – Hawthorne Place / Beaconsfield Place / Clayton Road Permit Zone & Church Road</p> | <p>Church Road: 2 residents of Church specifically object to being included in the residents permit zone. However one resident was in favour if they were to be included in a residents zone (this came to light following the earlier consultation). 2 residents of Dirdene Gds believe that parking should be left unrestricted along Church Road. 1 resident for the scheme, but feels that SYL on the corner of Providence Place / Church Road should be made into residents parking.</p> <p>Hawthorne Place: 4 residents of Hawthorne Place and 1 resident of Delaporte Close are against the scheme. 2 residents of Dirdene Gds believe that parking on the northern side should be unrestricted. Also that the area set aside for the vehicles for the funeral parlour should be shortened.</p> <p>Delaporte Close: 2 residents of Dirdene Gds believe that parking should be unrestricted in Delaporte Close.</p> <p>Beaconsfield Place: 2 residents of Dirdene Gds believe that parking should be unrestricted in the section of Beaconsfield Place that runs parallel to Church Road.</p> <p>Providence Place: 2 residents against scheme. 1 resident for the scheme, but not the charges.</p> <p>General: 1 resident of Dirdene Gds against entire scheme.</p> | <p>Proceed as advertised.</p> <p>Previous consultation was in favour of the residents schemes – hence the progression to this stage.</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | 2 commuters who are against the schem as they use Teddies Nursery and like to park their cars nearby. | |
| Drawing 56 – The Parade / Laburnum Road / Heathcote Road / Hereford Close Permit Zone | <p>In total there have been 28 correspondence, 5 of which are objections. The general consensus is: That the hours of restriction need to be extended to 8pm. Laburnum Road needs 24hr restrictions on the western side. The parking bays opposite The Gresshingshams should be removed The zone should start at the Town Hall so that it does not include the new developments or possible development of the hotel. Create some free / unlimited parking bays near The Rising Sun public House. Two residents would like days of operation from mon-fri. To allow an area for deliveries to Argos, by removing part of proposed loading restriction. Prevent disabled drivers from blocking access along The Parade.</p> <p>The Objections: To the whole scheme in support of enabling shoppers to park free in this location and staff from a business in east Street. 1 resident objects to the entire scheme.</p> | Proceed as advertised, allowing a loading area for Argos. |
| Drawing 57 – Elm Road / Kingston Road | No objections received. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 58 – Stoneleigh Park Road / Cunliffe Road | One objection to the proposals and one in favour, who thinks that proposals should be introduced in Cunliffe Road. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 59 – Derek Close / Derek Avenue | One objection requesting that double yellow lines not be extended across driveway. | Proceed as advertised |

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| Drawing 60 – Cox Lane / Larkspur Way | No objections received. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 61 – Riverholme Drive / Green Lanes | Two objections to Green Lane proposals from commuters who believe that this will reduce commuter parking – this however is not the case as the restriction is proposed on only one side which is not parked on at the moment. There are only three cars that cause problems at the southern end and this restriction will remove that pinch point and potential hazard. One objection to double yellow lines on the corner of Riverholme and Green Lanes, saying that this will cause problems for residential parking – however this is a very tight bend with a continued problem of parking on the corner which greatly reduces forward visibility and leaves half of the vehicle extending in to Green Lanes. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 62 – Sefton Road | No objections received. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 63 – Briane Road / Hook Road | No objections received. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 64 – Hazon Way / Horsley Close / Maidenshaw Road / Gosfield Road Permit Zone | One correspondence relating to Waterloo Road, agreeing in principle, but would like hours of operation extended from 7am-6pm. Comments from Cllr Taylor regarding the hours of operation in Hazon Way and Horsley Close. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 65 – Manor Green Road / West Hill | No objections received. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 66 – Worple Road | One letter from concerned parent who believes that restrictions will make dropping off and picking up of school children more difficult. This is not the case as the restrictions have purposely been amended to accommodate this. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 67 – Castle | No objections received, we do however have to seek legal advice about the | Having seeked legal advice, we have |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| Road | placing of a TRO on part of the common. | been advised that we cannot progress with this proposal as it is not and cannot be considered as part of the highway. A parking ban would have to be introduced by way of a bylaw through Epsom and Ewell Borough Council. |
| Drawing 68 – Sandy Mead | One objection received that has since been withdrawn. One asking for additional protection at the junction of Medina Square and Sandy Mead. One total objection as it is believed that the problem is the cause of one driver. One request to extend restrictions onto the raised section of Sandy Mead. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 69 – Blenheim Road | No objections received. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 70 – Church Road | This has already been advertised and implemented. | |
| Drawing 71 – West Street | No objections received. | Proceed as advertised |
| Drawing 72 – Windmill Lane | No objections received – refer to drawing 33 | Proceed as advertised |
| Hookfield | This area was not intentionally advertised with any changes, except to bring it in line with current County policy on permit issuance. Unfortunately the notice was advertised with a change to the hours of operation. Following on from this SCC letter dropped all residents to inform them that there was no change proposed to the hours of operation. Over and above this the feedback suggested that residents did not want to pay for a permit zone and thought that the current restrictions worked perfectly well. 20 residents against any changes or charges for permits and only 2 in favour. | Propose to remove the current CPZ restrictions from this area as part of Phase 7 and to implement restrictions with the same hours of operation throughout Hookfield and Lindsay Close – this can then be enforced as a simple yellow line restriction, and no permits would need to be issued. |