

Response	Road Name	Open-Ended Response
	See next column	Responses from the following :Rydens Road, Wolsey Drive, Denton Grove, Rydens Avenue, [REDACTED], Walton Park, Danesfield Close, Meadowside, Shaldon Way, Ambleside Avenue, Cottimore Avenue, Braycourt Avenue, Brunswick Close, King George Avenue, Church Street , York Gardens, Beecot Lane, Colne Drive,Holly Avenue , Lindley Road, Redfern Avenue, Stuart Avenue , The Furrows , [REDACTED]
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	The proposed changes are unnecessarily be complex, an inconvenience to certain residents in Meadowside, and perceived to be costly. A simple one-way system should be considered and mooted for turnings into / out from Walton Park. Thus making it easier for pedestrians and traffic to negotiate - by virtue of the fact that only one way traffic needs to be considered.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I cannot see the need for such a crossing and certainly not for the closure of Meadowside. The only problem comes from the increasing useage of Rydens Road by speeding heavy vehicles going and frying from the recycling centre at Hershams Station. This will only be exacerbated if the waste recycling plant goes ahead. I would suggest a set of pinch gates to slow the traffic down.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I personally believe Rydens Road at the area in question is not too difficult to cross as it is straight with good pedestrian visibility. Also a crossing going to what is essentially an island of land surrounded by another road seems counterproductive as pedestrians still need to cross another road (Walton Park) if they are heading in the direction of Hershams or Molesey.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I do not support this proposal. I think the position of the crossing would not be attractive to pedestrians. The design requires pedestrians to cross two roads instead of one. The east-west line of the path from triangular green leads to the wrong side of Walton Park. If pedestrians are going to Hershams Station or Cardinal Newman School they will have to cross Walton Park. The scheme therefore requires most people to cross three road. Finally the displacement of traffic from Meadowside to other roads is not a good idea. Meadow side has the best view for a right or left onto Rydens Road.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I feel that this is totally unnecessary and not well thought out. Yes we need several safe crossing places along the Rydens road but this one is not one of them. Once you have crossed Rydens Road have to then cross again to get to the other side of Walton Park as most users will be using the train or walking to Cardinal Newman School. As far as I am aware there have never been any major incidents along this stretch of the road. I feel that money would be best put toward making the access to Hershams Train Station from Walton Park a lot easier and safer for all concerned.
I would SUPPORT the scheme	[REDACTED]	To improve pedestrian safety, this scheme needs to be coupled with effective speed limit enforcement along the length of Rydens Road (cameras etc. rather than the current ineffective flashing sign).
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I cross the road [REDACTED] and rarely have to wait more than a few seconds to cross the road. Your scheme looks unreasonably complicated for the purpose. Equally, I rarely use traffic Islands [REDACTED]. I would like to see the results of your feasibility studies before you go and spend such a large sum of our money on this scheme. Please do think before you make such a huge hash of our roadways - as you so clearly have on [REDACTED]
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I don't think this work is necessary. [REDACTED]. I am not against the closure of Meadowside but object to the building of a footway across the green triangle at the end of Walton Park which would destroy this nice feature and is a waste of money. If this project goes forward, the existing footways at the end of Walton Park are more than adequate wherever the proposed traffic island would be located since there is a pavement along the Rydens Road side of the triangle.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I oppose because I do not believe that there is enough foot fall in the area for the proposed island. Closing Meadowside is a disproportionate measure to facilitate the traffic island. The green triangle at the end of Walton Park Road is very pleasant feature and I think that with a path it will lose some appeal. Paths are often bypassed by a quicker route by the pedestrians that use them meaning grass becomes worn and dirt patches appear. I suggest that an island further north possibly into the next ward would be more suitable.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	Please do not ruin our local area with a pedestrian crossing. We and our neighbours do not want this.
I would SUPPORT the scheme	[REDACTED]	I support the Scheme. However to help cyclist, please do not construct the crossing near a road drainage gully/grating, as cyclist would swerve out to avoid the drainage gully, with car drivers swerving in to avoid traffic island. From a driver, who is a cyclist this is a danger, which transport planers seem not to take into consideration.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I think it's easy to cross the road safely and I like the uninterrupted patch of green at the end of Walton Park
I would SUPPORT the scheme	[REDACTED]	Partially support the application. The junction would be significantly improved from a safety perspective simply by closing Meadowside to vehicular access. I do not see a particular need for the traffic island, as I see young children crossing Rydens Road every day with plenty of time, and visibility is very good. Having improved the safety by closing Meadowside, this crossing would be straightforward. The pathway across the green is definitely unnecessary though, there is no reason not to walk around to the entrance of Walton Park, and it would disrupt the watercourse and grass habitat.

I would OPPOSE the scheme		A crossing point would be more useful near Severn Drive or the footpath by the allotments. People won't walk all the way to Walton Park to Cross the road then walk back down.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		Cross Rydens road Road safety measure that would benefit the area.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Apart from adverse effects to adjoining roads resulting from closing the Meadowside/Rydens road junction, I suspect that pedestrians from Ambleside Avenue would continue to be more likely to cross at the end of Ambleside as now rather than deviate to the proposed crossing location.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I would oppose the scheme for two principle reasons: 1) The majority of footfall that crosses Rydens Road occurs between Rydens Park and Walton Park Lane - a significant distance from the proposed Meadowside crossing. Practically, people are not going to walk further to the proposed crossing point, particularly during rush hour when commuters are already short of time. 2) The closure of Meadowside will increase the volume of traffic on Ambleside Avenue, an already busy street. At the timing of school drop off and pick up, Ambleside Avenue has a disproportionately high level of traffic, which would be exacerbated by the proposed scheme. The increased volume of traffic would be concerning, with proposed funding to be spent on a scheme which would very quickly become obsolete. I recommend plans to develop the scheme are shelved.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		I welcome the initiative to allow pedestrians to cross Rydens Road more easily and safely and would encourage further review of initiatives to slow traffic down on the road (speed cameras, speed humps, more pedestrian crossings elsewhere on the road, etc).
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Although I agree that a crossing would be beneficial to facilitate crossing Rydens Road at Walton Park, I do not believe that, given the layout of the proposed crossing (which requires pedestrians to double back on themselves) will be used as people invariably will take the shortest route. Furthermore closing Meadowside will force more vehicles to use the already congested junction at Furrows/Ambleside which will be both dangerous and inconvenient. I am sure that there must be other options which meet the objectives as well or better, and in particular slow traffic down eg by narrowing the road in key places to reduce traffic speed.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		As indicated, I would support the scheme. I would also like other traffic calming schemes to be looked at on Rydens Road (speed cameras, road humps?) as vehicles often travel very fast on this road.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		I agree that the closure of Meadowside to allow for a pedestrian crossing is a good idea. It would prevent any accidents, giving a safe crossing to people heading for hersham station. The only concern I have is that Meadowside could become a car park for the station, for those that will not pay to park in a empty station car park.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Totally unnecessary, causing more traffic chaos and a complete waste of tax payers money
I would OPPOSE the scheme		
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Agreed that a crossing could be helpful but disagree with the location of the crossing. The large flow of pedestrians come from Ambleside Avenue and will cross Rydens Road well before Meadowside. This would increase the flow of traffic down Ambleside Avenue which is already a very busy and fast road. A crossing would be much better placed by Hersham station which is a harder and more dangerous road to cross during peak hours.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I do not feel that a crossing is warranted, nor do I think it would be used at this location if it was built. The majority of foot traffic in the area walk down Walton Park, and then cross the road to Ambleside so I do not feel that this crossing would be used, albeit the distance between these two roads and the proposed crossing is not great. I think the cost will outweighthe benefits also
I would OPPOSE the scheme		The proposal appears to be an expensive indulgence. It fails to address the problem of Rydens Road, namely the difficulty of crossing a road where motorists simply will not stay within the speed limit. Would the new footway link be used? Most pedestrian traffic from Walton Park heads towards Ambleside Avenue. An alternative would be to provide a signal-controlled crossing towards Ambleside Avenue. This would slow and stop the traffic and allow pedestrians to cross.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I am writing to oppose the proposed pedestrian island in Rydens Road. I am at a loss as to why this idea is being pursued. There have been no casualties or fatalities to warrant this. Rydens Road is not a wide road and crossing it poses no problems. There are plenty of natural breaks in the traffic to ensure safety when crossing the road. What is the point of spending huge amounts of money when the benefits are unclear? I also think that the location of the crossing would adversely affect the junction of Ambleside Avenue and Rydens road which can be tricky to exit in a vehicle. If there are cars stopping randomly on Rydens Road I think this will impact on that junction and possibly result in more accidents.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I agree there should be a pedestrian crossing, or 2 pedestrian crossings to gain access to Walton Park on both sides across Rydens Road but closing off Meadowside will put additional pressure on surrounding roads at key times.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		This is a good idea, as crossing the road there currently can be very dangerous. I assume any parking controls currently active around Meadowside will be removed?

I would OPPOSE the scheme		used this road as pedestrians, cyclists and motorists and have never found a need for a pedestrian crossing whatsoever.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I am opposed to the proposal for the following reasons. 1 I am not convinced it is necessary. 2 I am not convinced that people that do want to cross Rydens Road will use the crossing, I suspect that most will wait for a gap in the traffic and cross at the point that minimises the length of the journey.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Unwarranted as 1) not necessary, 2) disruptive to affected residents whose roads impacted by proposed changes, 3) particularly at a time of budget cut backs, a notable proposed waste of our money, 4) no evidence that a significant number of locals have requested such, 5) Surrey C C claim that a pedestrian refuge island would be "the most appropriate solution" to an apparently unstated problems, 6) it is likely to add to the dangers on Rydens road, not reduce them, as it may encourage people to be less vigilant when crossing the road, 7) most people will not use it - they will cross the road where they presently choose to do so.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		A safe Crossing point is long overdue. A high number of children cross the road going to and from local schools and to Hersham station catch a train to school. Traffic can travel very quickly on this road despite attempts to alert drivers to the speed. While closure of the junction with Meadowside will be a minor inconvenience it is worth it for the benefits to those who need to cross safely.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		Why now, the closing of Meadowside is not an option, as it is used by many motorists to and from Ambleside School. It would make accident Black spot, as the road is too narrow, and also the pavements in Rydens road are shallow enough as it is. I have not seen anybody crossing Rydens road at any point in the whole road. The size of the Lorries, and speeding motor cyclists in the area now, would be a danger to pedestrians at that point. Other things to spend council money on, Potholes need filling to start with, and social care for the elderly springs to mind immediately.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		In my opinion this plan will help improve the residential feel of the area as well as provide better access for pedestrians crossing the road. I would support upgrading the crossing to a zebra crossing in order to slow down the average traffic speed.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		More likely to increase traffic flow into adjacent side roads and takes no note of already heavy traffic flow in area which diverts via Severn Drive / Lindley Road. SCC have NEVER replaced restriction signs at entrance to Severn Drive to limit such flows.
I would SUPPORT the scheme		I support the idea of closing off access to motorised vehicles in principle. However, the current design significantly fails people using bicycles. Level access for bicycle, tricycle and cargo bike users need to be considered. The current plans do not allow people on bicycles and other non-motorised vehicles to access Meadowside without mounting the pavement. The design is not fully in line with Elmbridge & Surrey Council's active travel strategy, by excluding safe & convenient access for cyclists.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I would SUPPORT the scheme, IF there was changes to the current plans. The problems as I see it are this;- The proposed footway, also needs a South Bound version to Walton Park to give line of sight options. A traffic island like proposed is terrible to people who cycle. It creates a fast and narrow pinchpoint and is obstructive and preventive of future cycling growth. Your existing widening is not enough for safe passage. The crossing needs to be a Zebra version.. and thus then removes this island. The closure of Meadowside would be fine if you facilitated safe segregated cycle access through this. Current plans are preventive of this method. And, cyclists do not mix with pedestrians at all no matter what you say. With current plans, you will have cyclists on the pavement at these points which is and will cause problems, danger and hate. If you can amend these problems and issues then I can see the scheme working...
I would SUPPORT the scheme		Much needed, I strongly support
I would OPPOSE the scheme		The monies would be better spent providing a safe crossing to Hersham Station, this is were the need is. This scheme can follow in another year, plus how many people cross the road at present at this location?
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I am very surprised that this proposal has been revived. It really is a senseless idea. , I have used Rydens Road on a and there has never been a need for a crossing of any kind. With local authorities being strapped for cash, it is utterly bewildering that you could even be considering such a pointless project. Never once have I seen any pedestrian encountering any difficulty in crossing Rydens Road. The view in both directions is clear and if a vehicle happens to be approaching, it is a simple matter of waiting for a moment until the way is clear to cross. There must be far more appropriate things to spend our taxpayers' money on. Creating a "refuge" in the middle of the road is actually dangerous. .
I would OPPOSE the scheme		What a truly ridiculous idea. I frequently cross Rydens Road at this location. Crossing the road is not a problem now and never has been. I cannot believe anyone would consider this plan as anything other than a total waste on money. Nobody wants this!
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I believe this suggestion would be a waste of money and also make the road more dangerous rather than safer. Rydens Road is a narrow road and even with the closure of one end of Meadowside it would still further narrow the road. With the number of large vehicles using the road, it would end up being harder to navigate and thus more dangerous. And of course notwithstanding what the residents of Meadowside may have to say about the closure of one end of their road. , I cross Rydens road and have no difficulty making it across safely. You should reject this scheme and spend valuable council money elsewhere where it's really needed.
I would OPPOSE the scheme		I have never had any problem crossing the road. .Who is suggesting this change? If traffic needs to be calmed this is not the solution.

I would OPPOSE  
the scheme

[REDACTED]

there is no problem with crossing Rydens Road even in the rush hour. You can see traffic easily and can always cross within a few minutes, without danger. What a waste of public money !

I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	Completely unnecessary on a clear open stretch of road, easy to cross without wasting money on this proposal !,
I would SUPPORT the scheme	[REDACTED]	Vehicles regularly drive too quickly at this stretch of Rydens Road. As a parent I would support any traffic calming measures in the area.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	I do not feel that a pedestrian crossing in this location is a good idea and oppose this suggestion. I think that the junction of Rydens Road and Ambleside Avenue would be even more dangerous which the extra traffic that would be generated from people wanting to access Rydens Road from The Furrows, Rydens Ave and Meadowside. I have watched pedestrians cross the Rydens Road and to cross where the crossing is proposed is dangerous - right in the middle of two junctions from Walton Park. I think that anyone crossing the road and stopping at the half way point would be a "sitting duck" for the traffic coming down the road. I have never witnessed people having difficulty crossing this road and I think the closure of Meadowside is an extremely bad idea.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	This is a scheme eases one issue and creates others. The next simplest exit on to Rydens Road for residents would be the junction at Ambleside Ave, which is busy, dangerous and difficult. More traffic would be forced here adding to the problem. The commuter parking on Meadowside [REDACTED]. Reducing direct access to our homes is unfair and unthinkable. This may effect property values negatively too. I cross Rydens Road at this location [REDACTED] and never find it problematic. Very rarely do I see pedestrians crossing here anyway, other than the commuters who have parked on Meadowside to avoid parking charges. Giving them a crossing would only encourage them further! This would negatively impact our lives and those of residents in the adjacent roads and we would be angry and saddened if it went ahead.
I would OPPOSE the scheme	[REDACTED]	<p>Page 17</p> <p>There is absolutely no justification for this scheme. You have not intimated the cost of it, but local people are speculating that it could be anything up to £100,000. What an outrageous waste of public money. I have been involved in extensive discussions with many local residents and not one of them has a good word to say about your proposal. I therefore don't understand who is "suggesting" it. The person concerned needs to step forward and be identified; and to explain exactly why he/she finds the crossing of Rydens Road to be "challenging". It simply ISN'T. The road is wide open and gives a clear view for a long distance in each direction. If a car or a lorry is approaching, all that is required is to wait for a second or two and then it is easy to cross in complete safety. Why on earth has public money been spent on a feasibility study?? All you have to do is to stand at Meadowside and monitor pedestrians crossing Rydens Road at busy times. The evidence of your own eyes would soon tell you that there is absolutely no need for a crossing. Indeed, a "refuge" island would create far MORE danger. Inviting people (including young school children) to go half-way across and stand on an island in the middle of the road is madness. With traffic passing close by on either side, it would only take a stumble or an error of judgement or a moment's lack of concentration to cause an almighty tragedy. Far safer to wait on the pavement for a second or two, until it is safe to cross. The intended closure of Meadowside would make no sense and would cause incredible inconvenience to house owners. I frankly cannot understand why you say that the previous consultation was "inconclusive". Nobody around here, to my knowledge, has ever requested a crossing. Quite the reverse: people are 100% against it. The proposal has been dubbed the "Krazy Crossing". [REDACTED] "furious" and extremely distressed about this latest consultation. I think the alleged support for the scheme must be a figment of your imagination. SCC originally sent its contractor along to begin work ages ago, without proper notice or consultation. When residents objected, the contractor in charge of the work commented "I would never put a crossing here in a million years". Precisely!!! There are dozens and dozens of highways problems that you could spend our money on, but please don't invent unnecessary projects. This one seems to us to be a solution in search of a problem. There just ISN't any problem, so please consign this project to the bin once and for all. It's nothing short of disgraceful that the public has been put to all the anxiety and trouble of repeatedly fighting off this proposal. It beggars belief that SCC is still trying to flog it, after having previously been told in no uncertain terms that it's a farcical waste of money. Why was a "feasibility study" conducted? Why have detailed plans been drawn up? What a waste of time and money. The so-called "desire line" for the crossing is from Ambleside Avenue into Walton Park. The position of the planned crossing is well away from that line, so what's the point? People simply aren't going to walk 40 yards out of their way and then back to Walton Park.</p>

<p>I would OPPOSE the scheme</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>I'm not sure who has suggested we need a pedestrian crossing in Rydens Road but over many years I have never in all that time had any difficulty crossing the road. Traffic has increased over those years as it has throughout the borough and local residents are frustrated by the number of lorries that thunder down the road on their way to the Weylands Waste Plant but it is not difficult to cross the road. [REDACTED] As you have identified the main crossing point is from the corner of Ambleside Ave to Walton Park as this is the route to Hersham Station. No-one wanting to cross the road is going to walk beyond this point to do so. The proposal is therefore a complete waste of taxpayers money. There has already been one consultation on this proposal which you say proved inconclusive. I do question therefore why you are continuing to pursue this when it is no more than 'suggested'. There are no local strong feelings about the need for a crossing indeed local residents are becoming increasingly frustrated that the Council are not listening to them. The works required to install this crossing are pretty major and will undoubtedly cost a very large sum of taxpayers money. Money that should be spent on repairing our roads not satisfying the whim of a Councillor. Surrey County Council have already got egg on their face from the cycle lane fiasco in Terrace Road which has been a disgusting waste of money. This proposal is just further evidence that our Surrey County Councillors are completely out of touch and does nothing to instil any confidence in their ability to serve the needs of the residents.</p>
<p>I would OPPOSE the scheme</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>I feel the money would be better spent on traffic calming to slow cars and restrict HGV's, thus benefiting the whole of Rydens Road.</p>
<p>I would OPPOSE the scheme</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>I feel the money would be better spent on Traffic Calming to slow cars and restrict HGV's, thus benefiting the whole of Rydens Road.</p>
<p>I would OPPOSE the scheme</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Surely a more feasible implementation would be to construct a traffic calming project to control Heavy Goods Vehicles that BLIGHT the use of Rydens Road. To place a Pedestrian Island in the suggested area would cause a very dangerous situation indeed. Perhaps you could spend public money on emplacing a weight restriction on the Rydens Road and also constructing a more speed control operation on the whole length of Rydens Road</p>