

PART ONE – OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

Plan No.	Location	Letters Delivered	Responses Received	Percentage return in relation to letters delivered	Objections Received	Percentage of objections in relation to responses received	Recommendations
01	Linkfield Street and Oakdene Road	65	5	7.69%	2	40%	<p>The proposed restrictions were intended to address sightline problems at the side road junctions with Grovehill Road, Elm Road, Fengates Road and Oakdene Road. It is requested that the proposed double yellow lines be kept to a minimum so as to maximise road space for residents. It is therefore recommended that the TRO be progressed with reductions in lengths of the proposed double yellow lines having due regard to road safety requirements.</p> <p>There is also concern that the times of operation of the proposed single yellow line restriction in Oakdene Road are excessive.</p> <p>A petition signed by 35 households in Linkfield Street and one in Whitepost Hill object to the proposals on the basis that (a) they were not consulted, and (b) the expected displacement from proposed restrictions in adjacent road will adversely affect Linkfield Street.</p> <p>The petition also requests that consideration be given to introducing a permit parking scheme.</p>

3A	Upper Bridge Road and Ridgeway Road	99	2	2.02%	1	50%	<p>Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.</p> <p>It should be noted that the times and dates of operation of the proposed restrictions were discussed and agreed with Redehele Residents Association.</p>
04	Mill Street and Garibaldi Street	25	4	16%	4	100%	<p>It is requested that the proposed No Waiting 8am-6.30pm Mon-Sat restriction be replaced with a 1 hour limited waiting facility for the benefit of adjacent business premises.</p> <p>It is recommended that the length in question is reduced to Waiting limited to 1 hour No return within 1 hour 8am-6.30pm Mon-Sat as requested and that an H-bar marking is provided across the front of the access to No.1.</p>
05	Linkfield Lane (east)	75	1	1.33%	0	0	Progress as advertised.
06	Gatton Park Road (east)	65	1	1.54%	1	100%	Progress TRO but reduce the proposed double yellow line to the front of Nos.11-24 to the minimum required preserve sightlines.
07	Gatton Park Road, Colesmead Road and Monson Road	25	1	4%	1	100%	Progress TRO but reduce the proposed double yellow lines on the east side of Monson Road to the minimum required to preserve sightlines.
08	Carlton Road (St. Bede's School)	20	1	5%	1	100%	Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.

09	Carlton Road and Vandyke Close	71	21	29.58%	3	14.29%	Progress as advertised, as the majority of responses are in favour.
10	Carlton Road and Carlton Green	56	10	17.86%	2	20%	Progress as advertised, as the majority of responses are in favour.
11	Carlton Road/ London Road	2	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
12	Colesmead Road/ Mead Close	25	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
13	Monson Road/ Lyndale Road	10	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
14	North Street	2	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
15	Garlands Road	212	4	1.89%	4	100%	<p>Consideration has been given to a 'do nothing' recommendation but as the very low response rate would appear to suggest that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed 'curfew' waiting restrictions that course of action has been discounted.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the TRO is progressed as advertised.</p> <p>It is however accepted that some residents will be inconvenienced by the proposal and to that end it is further recommended that the road be considered for permit parking in the future.</p>

16	Elm Road/ Ranelagh Road	54	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
17	Huntingdon Road	31	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
18	Dome Way (Carrington Close)	46	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
19	Frenches Road/ Elmwood Road	5	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
20	Green Lane, Woodcrest Walk, Windmill Drive	35	1	2.86%	1	100%	Progress as advertised.
21	Park Road	30	2	6.67%	1	50%	Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.
23	Frenches Road and The Frenches	27	1	3.7%	0	0	Progress as advertised and provide an H-bar marking to the front of No.22. See responses summary.
24	Frenches Road and Kingfisher Drive	30	4	13.33%	4	100%	Consider reviewing the proposed length of the double yellow lines with a view to retaining unrestricted on-street parking for residents. N.B. - Three of the responses were received from residents of Robin Close.
25	Frenches Road/Gordon Road/Osborne Road/Alpine Road and College Road	107	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.

26	Daneshill	45	5	11.11%	1	20%	Four of the responses received requested that consideration be given to amending the proposals – see responses summary for details. Progress as advertised.
27	Redstone Hill and Redstone Hollow	23	4	17.39%	3	75%	<p>Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.</p> <p>There were 13 responses from residents of Oakwood Close who feel that they will suffer displaced parking if the proposed measures are introduced on Redstone Hill Service Road. The situation should be monitored and action taken to address any issues that arise as a consequence of the proposed TRO.</p>
28	Fenton Close	20	2	10%	1	50%	Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.
29	Cavendish Gardens	28	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
30	Redhill Bus Station	2	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
32	Dome Way and Carrington Close	55	1	1.82%	1	100%	Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions. It should also be noted that residents requested the removal of the existing 2hr limited waiting facility.

33	Ladbroke Road	58	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
34	Linkfield Lane and Ravens Close	15	4	26.67%	2	50%	Progress as advertised and implement an H-bar marking across the entrance to the garage block.
35	Subrosa Drive	60	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
36	Hurstleigh Drive	40	4	10%	2	50%	Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.
37	Grovehill Road (Linkfield Street - Upper Bridge Rd)	44	2	4.55%	2	100%	<p>Consideration has been given to a 'do nothing' recommendation but as the very low response rate would appear to suggest that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed 'curfew' waiting restrictions that course of action has been discounted.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the TRO is progressed as advertised.</p> <p>It is however accepted that some residents will be inconvenienced by the proposal and to that end it is further recommended that the road be considered for permit parking in the future.</p>
38	Grovehill Road (Upper Bridge Rd - Garlands Rd)	40	2	5%	2	100%	<p>Consideration has been given to a 'do nothing' recommendation but as the very low response rate would appear to suggest that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed 'curfew' waiting restrictions that course of action has been discounted.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the TRO is</p>

							<p>progressed as advertised.</p> <p>It is however accepted that some residents will be inconvenienced by the proposal and to that end it is further recommended that the road be considered for permit parking in the future.</p>
39	Batts Hill and Kendal Close	40	1	2.5%	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
40	Brooklands Way/ Woodfield Way	7	1	14.29%	1	100%	Progress TRO as advertised, as the restrictions are proposed for road safety reasons.
41	Brighton Road	5	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
42	Holland Close	26	3	11.54%	3	100%	The responses are all from residents who live adjacent to the proposed restricted lengths and who do not benefit from off-street parking. It is therefore recommended that the two lengths identified be left as unrestricted.

43	Ranmore Close/ Claremont Road	15	0	0	0	0	<p>The only response received was from Claremont Road Resident's Association who were not directly consulted in this instance. The response highlights issues of parking in Claremont Road caused by persons attending East Surrey College and requests consideration of h-bar markings across private accesses in the interim.</p> <p>Progress TRO as advertised and provide H-bar markings where requested.</p>
44	Nash Drive and Nash Gardens	40	2	5%	1	50%	<p>The objection relates to the proposed double yellow lines in front of Nos.9-11 which, if implemented will inconvenience residents.</p> <p>It is recommended that the length in question is deleted from the TRO which should be otherwise progressed.</p>
45	Woodlands Road	18	2	11.11%	1	50%	<p>The objection is from a resident whose house is opposite the proposed disabled parking spaces on the basis that parking on the existing double yellow lines is not addressed and is obstructive. As blue badge holders can wait for up to 3 hours on double yellow lines it is considered appropriate to designate spaces in the hope that badge holders will park appropriately.</p> <p>Progress TRO as advertised.</p>
46	Brighton Road	15	0	0	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.
48	London Road,	17	1	5.88%	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.

	Ringwood Road, Holcon Court						
49	Blackborough Road/ Ringley Park Road	7	1	14.29%	1		Proceed as advertised as the restrictions are proposed for road safety reasons.