

ANNEXE 1**OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES****Bypass Road****Objections and response:**

Objection from: No objections received	Officers Response: No response required Recommendation: Proceed with the Bypass Road proposals as advertised.
--	--

Epsom Road**Objection and response:**

Objection from: Mr Peter Browne of no.14 Homelands. Mr Browne feels that there was inadequate consultation on the proposals for Epsom Road and feels that the proposed restriction will offset parking into Homelands, thus making access for residents very difficult. Mr Browne suggests that the proposals be withdrawn and should be consulted on again to include all roads joining Epsom Road	Officers Response: It was felt by the Local Leatherhead Parking Task Group that only roads that are predominantly residential would be consulted on. Epsom Road (B2122) is the main thoroughfare into Leatherhead Town Centre, it is obstructed on a daily basis and causes major congestion for traffic entering and leaving Leatherhead town centre. The roads joining Epsom Road at the western end were consulted on because it was deemed that only these roads would be affected by any offset of parking. Officers did not consider that Homelands would be affected because of its distance from the town centre. Include Homelands in the next Leatherhead Parking Review if parking becomes a major problem due to the effects of the Epsom Road restrictions. Recommendation: Proceed with the Epsom Road proposals as advertised.
---	--

High Street:

Objections and Responses:

<p>Objections from:</p> <p>No objections received</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>No response required</p> <p>Recommendation: Proceed with the High Street proposals as advertised.</p>
--	--

Kingston Avenue:**Objections and Responses:**

<p>Objections from:</p> <p>Councillors Bob and Penny Hedgeland, restriction on bend is not extensive enough. Two objections from non-residents who live in Upper Fairfield Road who have to park in Kingston Road due to lack of parking in Upper Fairfield Road.</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>To continue as proposed and to review the extension to double yellow lines required and the lack of parking in Upper Fairfield Road in the next annual Mole Valley parking review.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Proceed with the Kingston Avenue proposals as advertised, and review again during 2010.</p>
--	---

Leret Way:**Objections and Responses:**

<p>Objections from:</p> <p>No objections received</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>No response required</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Proceed with the Leret Way proposals as advertised.</p>
--	---

Linden Road:**Objection and Response:**

<p>Objections from:</p> <p>Mr D. Potter of no.29 Linden Road Mr Gareth Slater of no.27 Linden Road</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>The Local Leatherhead Parking Task Group considered that residents of Linden</p>
---	--

<p>Both residents are concerned that the removal of restrictions from outside of their properties will allow shoppers or commuters to park there all day, thus making it difficult for residents to park here. Both require residents permit zones.</p>	<p>Road wanted the restriction removed to allow them to park vehicles outside of their own properties.</p> <p>Resident permit zones are not to be considered at present until the proposals for Minchin Close are considered to be a success.</p> <p>S.C.C only received two responses from residents of Linden Road – this is out of eight properties on the side of the road affected and does not represent a high enough majority to consider abolishing the proposal.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Would recommend to continue with the Linden Road proposals as advertised.</p>
---	---

Minchin Close:**Objections and Responses:**

<p>Objections from:</p> <p>No objections, but one requirement to extend the hours of the Controlled Parking Zone</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>To implement the advertised proposals and to review the times following implementation.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Proceed with the Minchin Close proposals as advertised.</p>
---	--

Oak Road:**Objections and Responses:**

<p>Objections from:</p> <p>No objections received</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>No response required</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Proceed with the Oak Road proposals as advertised.</p>
--	--

Oaks Close:**Objection and Response:**

<p>Objections from residents of:</p> <p>Nos.1, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16 and 17 Including an objection report from the Oaks Close Residents Association which states that 65.22% of residents object to yellow line proposals in Oaks Close.</p> <p>A series of four letters challenging the advertising each with a different request on how to deal with the parking issues in Oaks Close. The fourth letter requesting an 'Access Only' option which it seems is the preferred option.</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>The 'Access Only' option was mentioned as a possible option that could be used to restrict traffic within a road - however it was not recommended and seems to have been taken out of Context, as it really only applies to through routes. Chapter 3 of the Traffic Signs Manual, 2008 para 5.10 states that 'Where there is a need to reduce the level of unnecessary traffic in a residential street, a prohibition of motor vehicles except for access might sometimes be preferable to stopping up the road and creating a cul-de-sac.' Oaks Close is already a cul-de-sac and therefore is not appropriate for this type of scheme. SCC has been in contact with Surrey Police their response to an 'Access Only' restriction is :</p> <p><i>Surrey Police following DPE (now CPE) do not wish to return to parking enforcement as a Police role. The issues that have been raised in Oaks Close Leatherhead are parking issues and one that SCC and Mole Valley DC as the agents for SCC need to address. We would not be happy for legislation meant for different issues to be used to try to solve a parking problem.</i></p> <p><i>The Police do not think Access only is relevant in this situation at the end of the day the road is a public highway that an access only restriction would be turning into a private road in all but name. A public road is a public road and as such we would not be happy to enforce an Access only restriction in these circumstances.</i></p> <p><i>An 'Access Only' type restriction was trialled in Tandridge on Salmons Lane and after 18 months the order ran out</i></p>
--	---

	<p><i>and the restriction was removed. It just didn't work and enforcement became a massive issue that was impossible to deal with.</i></p> <p><i>The other problem with residents enforcing matters is that it effectively raises the levels of expectation that Surrey Police will deal with everyone that is reported to us when in essence we do not have the time and thus CPE should deal with it.</i></p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Not to proceed - Oaks Close be reviewed again during 2010.</p>
--	--

Park Rise**Objections and Response:**

<p>Petition against proposals:</p> <p>We the undersigned residents of Park Rise, Leatherhead are writing to formally object to your proposed order to restrict the parking on Park Rise, Leatherhead as stated in paragraph 2(d) of the notice recently displayed at either end of Park Rise.</p> <p>The grounds for the objection are as follows:</p> <p>Most properties on Park Rise have limited off street parking, and any day time restrictions would make parking arrangements unnecessarily difficult for residents. Finding alternative parking near our residencies during the day would simply be impractical due to your other proposed restrictions in Leatherhead. We would favour the introduction of a free residents parking scheme as part of your proposal or else delete Park Rise from your proposal</p> <p>The petition includes 12 signatures.</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>Resident permit zones are not to be considered at present until the proposals for Minchin Close are considered to be a success.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Not to proceed - Park Rise be reviewed again during 2010.</p>
--	--

Poplar Road**Objections and Response:**

<p>Objections from:</p> <p>Mrs Fowler of no.17 Poplar Road Mrs Fisher-Greene of no.21 Poplar Road Mr Oakley of no.31 Poplar Road Mr Palmer of no.33 Poplar Road</p> <p>All objections above relate to the parking restriction on the south west side and believe that this will increase speed and traffic flow on the road and make it awkward for residents to park.</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>The proposals for this road were put forward on safety grounds – it was deemed that the road is too narrow to allow emergency vehicles to travel along it if there were vehicles parked on both sides.</p> <p>However to accommodate residents the proposal is only a daytime restriction to allow parking after 6pm.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Proceed with the Poplar Road proposals as advertised.</p>
---	--

Randalls Road**Objections and Response:**

<p>Objection from:</p> <p>Mr Guttridge of Flat 6 Austen Court, Highbury Drive. Would like residents permit scheme.</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>The proposal for Randalls Road was based on a petition and recommendation by all residents of Randalls Road following the consultation in March 2009.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Proceed with the Randalls Road proposals as advertised.</p>
---	--

Windfield**Response:**

<p>Objections from:</p> <p>Mr O'Brien of no.77 Windfield Mr Stanbridge of no.13 Windfield Mr McLleigh of no.4 Windfield</p> <p>Two of the residents concerned work</p>	<p>Officers Response:</p> <p>The proposals for this road were put forward on safety grounds – it was deemed that the road is too narrow to allow emergency vehicles to travel along it if there were vehicles parked on both</p>
---	---

<p>shift patterns and are concerned that they will not be able to park.</p>	<p>sides. However to accommodate residents and to prevent commuter parking the proposal is only a one hour morning and one hour afternoon restriction.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Proceed with the Windfield proposals as advertised.</p>
---	---