

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

### RECOMMENDATIONS OF WORKING GROUP AND OFFICERS

*(N.B. – Figures in brackets relate only to responses received prior to the 7 December 2009 meeting)*

PLAN No.	LOCATION	LETTERS DELIVERED	RESPONSES RECEIVED	OBJECTIONS RECEIVED	ORIGINAL OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS TO MEETING 7 DECEMBER 2009	RECOMMENDATIONS BY WORKING GROUP 15 JANUARY 2010 AND OFFICER RECOMMENDATION TO THIS COMMITTEE
01	Linkfield Street and Oakdene Road	65	(5) 9	(2) 6	<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 recommend-ed 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. The petition also requests that consideration be given to introducing a permit parking scheme.</p>	<p>(i) Reduce proposed double yellow lines to 10m as follows:  Charman Road – south side Oakdene Road – both sides. For southern section only replace removed double yellow section with single (0800-1830 Mon-Sat) to ensure continuous restriction (approx 5m in total) Grovehill Road – both sides</p> <p><u>Linkfield Street at its junctions with:</u> Elm Road – west side - south of the junction. Oakdene Road – east side - both sides of the junction. Grovehill Road – east side - both sides of junction.</p> <p>(ii) Reduce proposed 10m of double yellow line to the front of No.28 to 5m.</p> <p>(iii) Remove proposed single yellow line from slip road leading from Oakdene Road to Morriss Court.</p> <p>Otherwise, progress as advertised.</p>
02/03	Upper Bridge Road and Ridgeway Road	99	2	1		Progress as advertised.

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

04	Mill Street junction with Garibaldi Street	25	4	4	<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>	Progress as advertised.
05	Linkfield Lane (east)	75	1	0	Progress as advertised.	Progress as advertised
06	Gatton Park Road (east)	65	(1) 2	(0) 2	Progress TRO but reduce the proposed double yellow line to the front of Nos.11-24 to the minimum required preserve sightlines.	Progress as consulted and advertised.
07	Gatton Park Road junctions with Colesmead Road and Monson Road	25	1	1	Progress TRO but reduce the proposed double yellow lines on the east side of Monson Road to the minimum required to preserve sightlines.	Reduce proposed double yellow lines on both sides of Monson Road to 10m.
08	Carlton Road (St. Bede's School)	20	1	1	Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.	Progress as consulted and advertised.
09	Carlton Road and Vandyke Close	71	(21) 23	(3) 4	Progress as advertised, as the majority of responses are in favour.	Progress as advertised.
10	Carlton Road and Carlton Green	56	(10) 15	2	Progress as advertised, as the majority of responses are in favour.	Progress as advertised.
11	London Road junction with Carlton Road	2	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
12	Colesmead Road junction with Mead Close	25	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
13	Lyndale Road junction with Monson Road	10	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
14	North Street	2	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

15	Garlands Road	212	(4) 5	(4) 5	<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>	Progress as advertised.
16	Elm Road	54	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	<p>(i) Reduce double yellow lines northwards from Elm Road to 10m.</p> <p>(ii) Leave next 10m northwards unrestricted.</p> <p>(iii) Leave next 5m northwards as double yellow lines to protect dropped kerb crossing point for pedestrians.</p> <p>(iv) Otherwise progress as advertised.</p>
17	Huntingdon Road	31	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
18	Dome Way	46	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
19	Frenches Road and Elmwood Road	5	(0) 1	(0) 1	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
20	Green Lane, Woodcrest Walk and Windmill Drive	35	(1) 2	(1) 2	Progress as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
21	Park Road	30	2	1	Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.	Progress as advertised.

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

22	No Item					
23	Frenches Road and The Frenches	27	1	0	Progress as advertised and provide an H-bar marking to the front of No.22. See responses summary.	Progress as advertised.
24	Frenches Road and Kingfisher Drive	30	4	4	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.	<u>Kingfisher Drive – east side</u> (i) Reduce proposed double yellow lines northwards from Frenches Road to approximately 20m.  (ii) Remove approximately 40m of proposed double yellow lines between (i) above and the bend.
25	Frenches Road/ Gordon Road & Osborne Road	107	0	(0) 1	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
26	Daneshill	45	(5) 6	(1) 2	Four of the responses received requested that consideration be given to amending the proposals – see responses summary for details. Progress as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
27	Redstone Hollow and Redstone Hill Service Road	23	(4) 9	(3) 7	Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.  There were (13) 16 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.	Progress as advertised.
28	Fenton Close	20	2	1	Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.	Progress as advertised.
29	Cavendish Gardens	28	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.

### ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

30	Redhill Bus Station	2	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
31	No Item					
32	Dome Way and Carrington Close	46	0	(0) 1	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.	Progress as advertised.
33	Ladbroke Road	58	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
34	Linkfield Lane and Ravens Close	15	4	2	Progress as advertised and implement an H-bar marking across the entrance to the garage block.	Progress as advertised.
35	Subrosa Drive	60	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
36	Hurstleigh Drive	40	4	2	Progress as advertised. The low response rate suggests that the majority of residents have no objection to the proposed restrictions.	Progress as advertised.
37	Grovehill Road (Linkfield Street to Upper Bridge Road)	44	(2) 4	(2) 4	<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>	<p>(i) Remove proposed single yellow line restriction on south side.</p> <p>(ii) Reduce proposed double yellow lines on both sides at its junction with Linkfield Street to 10m.</p>

## ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

38	Grovehill Road (Upper Bridge Road to Garlands Road)	40	2	2	<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>	Progress as advertised.
39	Batts Hill and Kendal Close	40	(0) 1	(0) 1	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
40	Brooklands Way junction with Woodfield Way	7	1	1	Progress TRO as advertised, as the restrictions are proposed for road safety reasons.	Progress as advertised.
41	Brighton Road (extension of parking bay)	5	0	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
42	Holland Close	26	3	3	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.	Leave the proposed lengths (2) of 2hr limited waiting as unrestricted for the benefit of local residents.
43	Ranmore Close/ Claremont Road	15	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>	Progress as advertised.

### ANNEX A – CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

44	Nash Drive and Nash Gardens	40	(2) 3	1	<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>	<p>(i) Remove proposed double yellow lines to the front of Nos.9-11 Nash Drive.</p> <p>(ii) Remove the proposed double yellow lines at the western end of Nash Gardens to the front of No.28.</p>
45	Woodlands Road	18	2	1	<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>	Do not progress but consider as part of the southern villages review.
46	Brighton Road (Disabled Bay)	15	(0) 1	(0) 1	Progress TRO as advertised.	Do not progress.
47	No item.					
48	London Road/Ringwood Avenue/Holcon Court	17	1	0	Progress TRO as advertised.	Progress as advertised.
49	Blackborough Road and Ringley Park Road	7	(1) 2	(1) 2	Proceed as advertised as the restrictions are proposed for road safety reasons.	Reduce the proposed double yellow lines on the north side of Blackborough Road to the east of Ringley Park Road to a point in line with the prolongation of the eastern kerbline of Ringley Park Avenue.