



**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE  
SPELTHORNE**

**4TH AMENDMENT TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS –  
CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS**

**9th SEPTEMBER 2009**

**KEY ISSUE**

To acknowledge the result of the formal consultation, which took place during December 2008 and January 2009, and to resolve the objections received to the proposed amendments to waiting restrictions.

**SUMMARY**

Following the formal consultation, officers have identified solutions to the issues raised and propose adjustments to the proposed amendments to waiting restrictions as outlined in this report.

**OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS**

**The Local Committee (Spelthorne) is asked to agree:**

- (i) to consider the results of the formal consultation and door to door surveys;
- (ii) that where there has been no objection, the restrictions are introduced;
- (iii) that where an objection has been made, the resolution recommended in this report is agreed;
- (iv) that, subject to the agreement of items (ii) and (iii) above, the amended Traffic Regulation Order is made and the proposed on-street parking restrictions are implemented.

## **1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 A prioritised list of requests for amendments to waiting restrictions was reported to the March 2007 meeting of the Local Committee for Spelthorne and 32 locations were approved for implementation. A prioritised list of requests for amendments to waiting restrictions was reported to the March 2008 meeting of this Committee and 32 locations were approved for implementation. A further list of requests for amendments to waiting restrictions was reported to the June 2008 meeting of this committee. Additionally the introduction of restrictions as agreed at the March 2006 meeting of this Committee on the Benwell Meadow Estate, Sunbury and Govett Avenue, Shepperton, are included in this amalgamated amendment of on-street parking.
- 1.2 The formal notice was published in the local press and was also available at all libraries and the Borough Council Office with a full set of drawings. County Councillors were given all the information for their own ward to pass on to constituents. A page was created on the Surrey County Council website and drawings sent to residents on request.
- 1.3 The proposed restrictions, as agreed by the committees of March 2007, March 2008 and June 2008 were formally advertised during December 2008 and January 2009.
- 1.4 Notices were not erected along each affected road, due to the high number of locations and lack of resources at the time.
- 1.5 Additional resources made available during April 2009 allowed door to door surveys to be carried out at 15 locations most affected by these proposals.
- 1.6 The results of these door to door surveys are amalgamated with the responses that came in during the official advertising period to get the overall totals

## **2 RESULT OF FORMAL CONSULTATION**

- 2.1 A total of 233 responses were received during the formal consultation period and door to door surveys. 76 of these were in support and 157 were against the proposals.
- 2.2 The 157 objections received were concentrated in 14 locations. These are detailed below, followed by a recommendation made by the Parking Strategy & Implementation Team as to how to proceed.
- 2.3 Annex 1 contains a list of all the roads in which waiting restrictions were proposed to be introduced or amended, and listed in the next section are those for which objections were received. At all the other locations no objections were received so the restrictions will be introduced/amended as advertised.

**3 OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS****3.1 Moor Lane**

- 5 Objections received from residents concerned that there is a lack of alternative parking available.
- 14 responses in support of the proposal were received.

**Recommendation**

- Go ahead with proposal as advertised.

**Commercial Road**

- 8 Objections received from residents and businesses concerned that there is a lack of alternative parking and parked vehicles help reduce traffic speeds.
- No correspondence in support of the proposal was received.

**Recommendation**

- Do not proceed with the proposal.

**Budebury Road**

- 7 Objections received from residents. Some were concerned that there is a lack of alternative parking, but others objected because the proposed restrictions do not go far enough.
- 9 responses in support of the proposal were received.

**Recommendation**

- Go ahead with proposal as advertised, and add extension of the restrictions to the list of items for consideration at the next review.

**Feltham Hill Road junction with Fontmell Park**

- 2 Objections received from residents concerned that there is a lack of alternative parking
- 5 responses in support of the proposal were received.

**Recommendation**

- Go ahead with proposal as advertised.

**Clockhouse Lane**

- 3 Objections received from residents concerned about pavement parking.
- 3 responses in support of the proposal were received.

**Recommendation**

- Go ahead with proposal as advertised, in addition this will allow enforcement of pavement parking.

**Rosary Gardens**

- 4 Objections received from residents saying they are not aware of any parking problems.
- 3 responses in support of the proposal were received.

**Recommendation**

- Go ahead with proposal as advertised.

### **Govett Avenue and junction with Station Approach**

- Objection. Does not want the restriction imposed on a Saturday.
- Go ahead with the proposal as advertised. The restriction is needed to control the waiting of heavy goods vehicles in the road and to enable them to access the industrial estate. The restriction times are the same as those already existing in the street and it would be unduly complicated to have different times on one stretch of yellow line.

### **Staines Road East**

- 7 Objections received from residents saying they are not aware of any parking problems, and parked vehicles help reduce traffic speeds.
- 7 responses in support.

#### **Recommendation**

- Go ahead with proposal as advertised. Pavement parking is an issue and this would help deal with it. Also these lines are linked to planning permission for a local development.

### **Green Street**

- 5 Objections received from residents saying that there are too many schools in close proximity, restrictions will not be adhered to and therefore un-necessary
- 4 responses in support.

#### **Recommendation**

- Go ahead with the proposals as advertised. There is a need for the controls for safety reasons and to control the sometimes chaotic parking situation. (Enforcement of the restrictions will need to be addressed).

### **Peregrine Road**

- 2 Objections received from residents saying they would like restriction shortened and a new one introduced on the bend opposite.
- 1 response in support

#### **Recommendation**

- Go ahead with proposal as advertised as it will solve the problem of refuse vehicle access, which was acknowledged in one of the objections.

### **School Road**

- 2 Objections received from residents saying that the proposed restriction at the entrance to the slip road outside 45-49 School Road is not necessary.
- No correspondence in support of the proposal was received.

#### **Recommendation**

- Do not proceed with the restriction proposed at this location.

**Laleham Village Petition**

- 3.2 In addition to the 16 objections received from Laleham Village, on 10 March 2009, Surrey County Council received a petition signed by 73 residents objecting to any restrictions being introduced in Laleham.

**Recommendation**

Do not proceed with the proposal

**Benwell Meadow Estate Petition**

- 3.3 In addition to the 10 objections received from Benwell Meadow residents, on 2 March 2009, Surrey County Council received a petition signed by 12 residents in Brackenwood requesting that additional controls to deal with the problem of commuter parking are introduced.

**Recommendation**

Proceed with the proposal for junction protection. The Objectors are not against the idea of junction protection, they want more restrictions introduced. In addition the feasibility of a Controlled Parking Zone should be investigated.

**George Street – Staines**

- 3.4 Has been taken out of this committee report as it is now nominated for Controlled Parking Zone (Residents Permits) Status. Further information of this can be found in the Committee Report presented 16 March 2009.

**4 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 Implementation of the proposed amendments would cost £12,000 and would be funded partly from the Local Allocation 2009/10 (£4,000), and partly from the Members' Revenue Budget (£8,000), subject to that funding being made available.

**5 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 There are no specific equalities and diversity implications for this report.

**6 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 Failure to comply with parking restrictions can result in the issue of a Penalty Charge Notice.

**7 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 If the committee agrees to the recommendations, the proposed parking restrictions for Spelthorne are implemented.

**8 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 As above.

**9 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT**

9.1 Subject to approval of the committee, the Traffic Regulation Order will be made and the restrictions implemented.

**LEAD/CONTACT OFFICER:** Rikki Hill, Parking Projects Manager  
**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** 03456 009 009  
**E-MAIL:** Parking@surreycc.gov.uk

**BACKGROUND PAPERS:** Committee Report – ‘Controlled parking zone for Staines – outcome of public consultation’ 30 June 2008.  
Committee Report – ‘Review of requests for amendments to waiting restrictions’ 17 March 2008  
  
Committee Report – ‘Review of requests for Waiting Restrictions’ 12 March 2007.

**Annex 1**

**Ashford** Chaucer Road, Coleridge Road, Feltham Hill Road, Fontmell Park, School Road, The Coppice, School Road Service Road, Ashford Avenue, Glenfield Road, Denman Drive, Linkscroft Road, Park Road, Fordbridge Road, Manor Road, Doris Road, Alexandra Road, Chertsey Road, Feltham Road, Convent Road, Feltham Road/Convent Road Service Road, Anderson Drive, Chattern Hill, Chesterfield Road, Ashview Gardens, New Park Road, Burleigh Gardens, Rosary Gardens, Clockhouse Lane.

**Shepperton** Green Lane, Govett Avenue, Manygate Lane, Gaston Way, Station Approach, Broadlands Avenue, Gaston Bridge Road service road, Grove Road, Manor Farm Avenue, Old Charlton Road.

**Laleham** Staines Road, Northfield Road, The Broadway, Shepperton Road, Vicarage Lane, Ferry Lane, Thameside.

**Sunbury on Thames** Vicarage Road, Beechwood Avenue, Burgoyne Road, Bryony Way, Cavendish Road, Heathcroft Avenue, Heatherlands, Wychwood Close, Bryan Close, Heath Grove, The Rowans, Kings Avenue, Windsor Road, Wolsey Road, Cadbury Road, Green Street, Anvil Road, Lyndhurst Avenue, Peregrine Road, Windmill Road West, Windmill Road West Junction with Windmill Road, Brooklands Close, Staines Road East, The Avenue, Broomfield, Pinewood, Station Approach, Brackenwood, Meadows End, Furzewood, Nursery Road, Heathlands Close, The Ridings, Springfield Grove, Saxonbury Avenue, Elizabeth Gardens, Halliford Road, Cumberland Place, Fordbridge Road, Loudwater Road, Hanworth Road.

**Staines** Birch Green, Kingston Road, Gresham Road, Budebury Road, Wyatt Road, Laleham Road, Commercial Road, George Street, Worple Road, Worple Avenue, Witheygate Avenue, Augur Close, Richmond Road, Lammas Close, Moor Lane, Penton Road, Vicarage Road, Burges Way, Duncan Gardens, Cherry Orchard, Murdoch Close, Church Street, Greenlands Road, Sidney Road, Rosefield Road, Beehive Road, Edgell Road, Langley Road, Prospect Place, Stainash Crescent, Millmead.