

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM SUPPORTERS

In addition to the County's consultation, the Residents' Association has carried out its own voting process within its roads and received a majority in favour of 77%. It also worked to ensure a 100% response to the County's consultation from those residents, leaving all non-responses being from owners of properties bordering those roads and with no financial obligation following any privatisation. Should these non-responses be considered as having no objection to the proposal, the aforementioned percentages in favour of the stopping up, or having no objection to it, increase to 74% and 73% respectively, which would indicate that those not affected account for the reduced majority obtained from the County's consultation.

Further to your recent letter in respect of the above, we, the owners of ?, wish to support the Proposal. (this is one of 40 similar comments)

This is just to confirm that we, as long-standing owners of ? are in support of the above proposal to privatise and remove public rights of way over Round Oak Road and Wey Road.

I am in full agreement with the proposal with the proposed removal of the public rights over Wey Road and Round Oak road

I write with respect to the proposed removal of public rights of way over Wey Road and Round Oak Road, Weybridge. I am the secretary of the Ellesmere RTM company, which is the legal representative of the proprietors of the Ellesmere property on Round Oak Road, and I write on its behalf. Further to your recent letter, we, the proprietors of Ellesmere, Round Oak Road, Weybridge KT13 8HT wish to support the Proposal.

We are SUPPORTIVE of the proposal outlined in your letter dated 29th October. Further we do hope and request that the council will now expedite the process which has already been voted on, discussed and agreed by the majority of owners in the two roads.

In response to your letter dated 29 October, we, as the owners of Water's Edge, Wey Road, wish to register our total agreement with the privatisation scheme as proposed.

As owners of ?, Round Oak Road for over 30 Years, we have read and note the points raised in Ian Taylor's letter to us of 29th Oct 2012, and confirm that we fully support the proposal to remove the public rights of way over Round Oak Road and Wey Road.

I am sending this email to confirm as the owner of Flat's ? and ? Weycroft, 78 Portmore Park Road, Weybridge that I have no objections to the privatisation of Wey Road and in fact I am in support of it.

I also run the Management Company for Weycroft, Weybridge Limited and can confirm there are no objections with us either

In reference to the above subject, I ?? of no. ? Stretton Court, Wey Road, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 8GZ, have no opposition and therefore support the plan brought forward to me by Mr Noel Groves Chairman of the Joint Roads Ownership Sub Committee.

I have no objection to Wey road becoming a private Road as long as this move does not affect my current position and address.

I bought this property off plan in 2005 with this address

The Gables
? Stretton Court
Wey Road
Weybridge
KT13 8GZ

Due to the high fees we pay for maintenance of the Gables,do agree with Mr Groves that it will not be fair for us to pay for road maintenance

I refer to my earlier email of November last year when I raised on objection to the above proposal. However, I have since been contacted by the Wey Road Residents Association and it would seem that there are advantages in this scheme going ahead, as the proposed new management company will indemnify the residents/owners of Stretton Court of any associated costs. Consequently, I would like to rescind my original objection.

I should like to confirm that my Company (UK Power Networks) have been in contact with those proposing the order. Both parties have agreed that an easement will be granted in relation to the existing access and cable rights to ensure that my Company's equipment is protected.

I should therefore like to confirm that my Company has NO OBJECTION to the proposed Stopping Up Order. Please acknowledge receipt of this E-Mail and also confirm that the objection has been removed.

I have now had assurances that St John Ambulance would be indemnified against any cost if the road were to be made private and as a consequence, St John are happy to withdraw their objection.

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM OBJECTORS

We are not in agreement with the proposal to remove public rights of way over Wey Road and Round Oak Road.

I am writing to register my objection to the proposal to remove public rights of way. My objections are that I have received no legally binding assurances over access to my property that are assignable to potential future purchasers of my house, seen no credible management plan for the road and believe it to be a recipe for neighbourhood disharmony.

Please note that we emphatically oppose the application for removal of public rights of way over Wey Road and Round Oak Road Weybridge.

I am emailing to confirm I do not support the proposed removal of public rights over Wey Road and Round Oak Road.

We wish to inform you that we are very much against the privatisation of Wey Road and Round Oak Road, Weybridge, a view we made clear to the Wey Road and Round Oak Residents Association several months ago, when voting took place.

We like others, particularly in Round Oak Road, strongly object to the privatisation of our Road.

Your letter states that should "a significant majority of owners wish it to cease to be a highway". I am unsure what this means but we were originally told that this was in excess of 80%. Once an initial vote was taken and this figure was not reached we were told two thirds would suffice. The figure for our road being less than 60%.

I see no benefit at all from privatisation and only disadvantages. These roads have been subject to flooding in the past and the liabilities from future floods for the property owners will be substantial.

The risks involved in being responsible for all the services are unacceptable and the arguments that have been put forward by the few who are strongly in favour have no substance. Older residents have been scare mongered in to voting for change because of unfounded parking problems, etc.

I have experienced the problems and arguments caused by road privatisation in the past and there is every likelihood that the differences in the two roads (e.g. Wey Road is in desperate need of re-surfacing whereas Round Oak Road is not) will lead to significant disagreement.

We would ask you to refuse this application.

I strongly object to the proposal of the removal of public rights of way over Wey Road and Round Oak Road Weybridge. I can see no reason why the roads need to have gates as they are very quiet roads with few cars parked in them. Those that are parked mostly seem to be white vans associated with work being done on the houses of residents.

I own Flat ?, Stretton Court, Wey Road , and there are no allocated parking spaces at this development. My concern is that while the 16 unallocated parking spaces are generally

sufficient for the 14 flats, once parking in Wey Road is restricted these will quickly fill up with non-residents. This will be an inevitable consequence of installing gates across Wey Road. In particular the adjacent St John's Ambulance HQ is very busy at least three evenings a week as well as when they operate daytime courses. They have very limited parking themselves. I already find that I frequently need to find a space in Wey Road and am unclear what alternatives will be available.

Overall I am puzzled as to why such a move is considered by some to be necessary and hope that it does not go forward. Such a move is likely to make my property harder to sell when the time comes, as any purchaser will expect there to be adequate parking.

I write on behalf of the trust which owns Flat ? Stretton Court, Wey Road.

I am not in favour of this becoming a private road. I have much experience of private residential roads, and sharing the costs of road maintenance has always been a problem.

As the owner of ? cedar lodge Wey road I am writing to let you know that I do not agree to the road being made private. Cedar Lodge is a bloc of six flats and we all agree on this. We have informed the residents association of our decision.

I am the owner of Flat? Cedar Lodge, Wey Road in Weybridge. I am on vacation at present but have just been informed by other owners in the Building that you are asking if we would agree to the privatisation of Wey Road.

I am writing to advise that I am perfectly happy with existing arrangements where Wey Road is adopted by the Council and have no wish to see it privatised and we become responsible for maintenance and lighting.

I trust this clarifies my position which I believe is shared by other owners in our building.

Following our telephone conversation, I am writing to confirm my objection to the proposed removal of public rights of way over Round Oak Road.

I am extremely concerned to note that if this action was taken, my property would be landlocked with no secured right of access to the public highway. It is not reasonable to expect an existing resident to incur legal costs to agree such a right of way and presumably my title deeds would need to be amended. It would obviously make any future sale of my property impossible if I was unable to prove that such a right of way existed.

I understand that the residents in favour of this plan also propose to charge homeowners without any consideration as to the value of each property (unlike Council tax) which I regard as an entirely unfair proposition.

I accordingly ask that the Council does not proceed to make an application to the Magistrate's Court for an order stopping up my road.

I am the owner of Flat ?, Cedar Lodge, Wey Road, Weybridge, KT13 8HP.

I write in relation to the proposed privatisation of Wey Road and Round Oak Road.

I wish to place on record my objection to this proposal.

I am the owner of Flat ?, Cedar Lodge, Wey Road, Weybridge KT13 8HP.

I am writing to lodge my objection to the proposal

Further to my telephone conversation with Mr Taylor this morning I confirm that (we) object to the proposed privatisation of the above roads.

We do feel this would have an adverse impact on ourselves and also it could affect the livelihood of businesses in the town by taking away yet more parking.

Please note that I wish, by way of this email, to register my strong disagreement to this proposal, which in my opinion has no merits and could incur many potential future problems. When (we) purchased Flat ? Stretton Court in January 2010, we were given no indication at all of this proposal and the searches revealed nothing in this regard.

As your records will indicate, there is a St. Johns Ambulance Station in Wey Road and I cannot understand how this station will effectively operate if such a proposal is adopted.

I believe that the council tax paid to Surrey CC in part pays for the maintenance of Wey Road and Round Oak Road, including its drainage, lighting and street cleansing and I do not wish to forego this commitment from the Council and incur additional costs by lending my support to this proposal, to which I object.

In response to your recent letter re the subject proposal I wish to register our **NO** vote.

Personally I am strongly opposed to any such proposal. My reasons and comments are: -

I find the whole business to be a self-interested and selfish attitude to the rest of the population of Weybridge and those who work and shop here.

I believe the proposal is divisive both to the immediate area and to Weybridge as a whole.

The driving force behind the proposal is the concern over parking and the potential for creep further into the 2 roads.

I have to say that parking is an issue but is not a problem. It only affects probably no more than 35% of the households including my own from say 0800 – 1800 Monday to Friday.

The real problem with parking are the continued examples of inconsiderate & ignorant parking very close to driveway exits from properties, this could be easily rectified by the application of yellow lines in the appropriate areas.

Further the recent advent of the revised parking restrictions has ameliorated the overall level of parking, although I expect some increase in the seasonal run up to Christmas.

It does not impact on the quality of my life

The proposal has an air of NIMBYism and a lack of interest in the whole community. If people are to work and shop in Weybridge some provision for parking is a necessity for the wellbeing of the whole locality. If people do not feel they can work or shop here because of lack of parking then they will go elsewhere with longer term consequences on the viability of the town.

I note that if the proposal goes ahead then SCC will relinquish responsibility for the upkeep of the roads, drainage and lighting systems plus EBC would no longer carry out street cleansing.

Since the area of the two roads lies with the floodplain as designated by the Environment Agency I have concerns that a non-professional operation would not have the necessary expertise to fulfil the demands placed upon it in times of an emergency, for instance in the basic demand of provision of sandbags.

I am also concerned about the level of insurance cover that might be available to residents

There were a few very vociferous and strongly opinionated persons pushing very hard to gain a positive vote amongst the residents and I understand that some no voters were put under pressure.

Further although there were general meetings and some additional small scale Forums there was no open debate with the proposers and seconders for each side of the argument.

In these times of financial pressure I find it hard as a pensioner with a fixed income to justify additional non-essential expenditure to satisfy a self-centred wishes.

Finally I would be grateful if you could answer a question about the strip of land on the edge of my property adjacent to the road. This is some 2.8 -2.9 metres in width and is in effect a grass pavement and EBC currently mow the grass during nine (9) months of the year outside my property although the majority of my neighbours take it upon themselves to carry out this work; should the proposal go ahead would the new residents operating company be responsible for this service together with maintenance of the eight (8) trees I this strip of land, I have no desire to be responsible for these trees and any liability that might occur should they cause damage.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

I refer to your letter dated 29/10/12 ref. SUR-010/HIT/IT requesting approval from owners and residents of "Round Oak" and "Wey" roads in Weybridge for removal of Public rights of way over these roads and to have them privatised.

I wish to make it clear that I am not in favour of this project as it seems to give little or no benefit to residents while propagating a mire of on going legal problems, without recall.