

**OFFICER REPORT TO LOCAL COMMITTEE
(REIGATE AND BANSTEAD)**

REIGATE AND BANSTEAD 2012/13 PARKING REVIEW

16 SEPTEMBER 2013

ANNEX 1 - SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS

SUMMARY

The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 requires the county council to consider any objections received in response to advertising proposals for making changes to its traffic regulation orders.

This report summarises the objections and comments that were received following the advertisement of the parking review.

Once we have advertised new restrictions and controls, it is recommended only to make minor changes. Any significant changes would require us to re-advertise the proposals, which would significantly delay other areas of the review, and incur additional costs to the process.

This report considers objections and comments received from the proposals advertised from 30 May – 27 June 2013, and the amendment notice advertised from 20 June – 12 July 2013.

All locations are listed in the table on the next three pages of the report. The locations where no comments or objections were received are not discussed in further detail; any such locations are recommended to be 'introduced as advertised'.

This should be read in conjunction with the plans in Annex 2, which are arranged by Division and then numerically by drawing number.

ITEM 9

Location number	Roads	Town	Proposal	Reason for change	Drawing no(s)	Drawing pack	Drawing pack (recommendations post advert)	objection	support	Other comment	Total correspondence	Division	Member
1	A217 Brighton Road (service road), Mulberry Gate, Hurley Close, Magnolia Drive	Banstead	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at entrances to described roads off the service road.	Maintain access and sightlines at the junctions. Particular concerns that if an incident did occur that vehicles could be pushed over the embankment onto the dual carriageway.	18157	Banstead	-	0	0	0	0	Nork and Tattenhams	Mr Nick Harrison
2	Garden Close, including j/w Wilmot Way	Banstead	Convert existing SYL (08:30-18:30 Monday - Saturday) at Junction to DYL 'No waiting at any time'. Introduce SYLs 'No waiting 08:30-18:30 Monday - Saturday' on northern side of Garden Close including turning head.	Maintain access for emergency and service vehicles. Vehicles currently park on southern side.	18009	Banstead	Banstead, Woodmansterne and Chipstead	6	0	0	6	Banstead, Woodmansterne and Chipstead	Mr Ken Gulati
3	High Beeches (os no. 83, and nos. 4 and 7)	Banstead	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at 'Junction' near nos. 4 and 7. Also introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at access to 'Beechome' up to existing access protection marking at no. 83.	Increase forward visibility at specified locations.	18001, 18155	Banstead / Banstead	-	0	0	1	1	Nork and Tattenhams	Mr Nick Harrison
4	Highdown Lane	Banstead	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at bell mouth. Remainder of the road is private.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junctions.	18158	Banstead	-	0	0	0	0	Banstead, Woodmansterne and Chipstead	Mr Ken Gulati
5	Longcroft Avenue, Woodmansterne Lane, Fiddicroft Avenue	Banstead	Increase DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at junction of Woodmansterne Lane and Longcroft Avenue. Install DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at junction of Longcroft Avenue and Fiddicroft Avenue, and introduce SYLs 'No waiting Monday - Saturday, 08:30-18:30' between Croydon Lane and Fiddicroft Avenue on the south-western side.	Increase forward visibility at junctions and maintain access for emergency / service vehicles.	18146	Banstead	-	1	1	0	2	Banstead, Woodmansterne and Chipstead	Mr Ken Gulati
6	Partridge Mead, Park Wood Road	Banstead	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at junction.	Prevent obstructive parking to allow school children to cross the road safely.	18002	Banstead	-	0	0	0	0	Nork and Tattenhams	Mr Nick Harrison
7	Picquets Way (junctions with Tattenham Way, The Drive, The Bridles, access to nos. 35-45 Picquets Way)	Banstead	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at junctions specified.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junctions.	18012, 18133	Banstead / Banstead	Nork and Tattenhams	1	2	0	3	Nork and Tattenhams	Mr Nick Harrison
8	Tattenham Way	Burgh Heath	Extend DYLS 'No waiting at any time' to existing Bus Stop, introduce limited waiting parking bays, 'Monday - Friday 08:00-18:00'.	Increase parking turnover to enable customers to visit shops.	18022	Tattenhams	Nork and Tattenhams	1	1	4	6	Nork and Tattenhams	Mr Nick Harrison
9	Chipstead Close	Earlswood	Extend DYLS 'No waiting at any time' to cover the bend on the eastern side.	Maintain access for emergency / service vehicles.	18073	Earlswood	-	1	0	0	1	Redhill East	Mr Jonathan Essex
10	Earlswood Road	Earlswood	Introduce SYLs 'No waiting Monday - Saturday 08:00-18:00' on the south-western side between no 41 and 57.	To prevent obstructive/footway parking.	18075	Earlswood	-	0	0	0	0	Redhill East	Mr Jonathan Essex
11	Hanworth Road (j/w Woodhatch and j/w Horley Road)	Earlswood	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at both junctions.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junctions.	18167	Earlswood	-	0	0	0	0	Earlswood and Reigate South	Ms Barbara Thompson
12	Hooley Lane incl. j/w Redstone Road, Victoria Road, Earlsbrook Road	Earlswood	Extend SYL 'No waiting 08:00-18:30 Monday - Saturday' at Brighton Road end. Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at specified junctions. Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at road narrowing.	At the western end to prevent parked vehicles interfering with traffic signal loop. To increase forward visibility and maintain access at junctions, and prevent parking on both sides of Hooley Lane (causing footway parking).	18072, 18137	Earlswood / Earlswood	Redhill East	3	0	0	3	Redhill East	Mr Jonathan Essex
13	Whitebushes Estate, incl. Three Arch Road, Denton Close, Bushfield Drive, Yeoman Way, Spencer Way, Mason's Bridge Road, Ivydene Close	Earlswood	Introduce new sections of DYLS 'No waiting at any time' along stretches of specified roads and at junctions. Upgrade sections of existing 'No waiting Monday - Saturday 08:00-18:30' to 'No waiting at any time', and revoke sections of the same on Bushfield Drive.	Increase forward visibility at junctions and maintain access for emergency / service vehicles / bus. Allow additional parking at northern end of Bushfield Drive. Supported by local police.	18154 / 18101	Earlswood / Earlswood	-	0	0	0	0	Earlswood and Reigate South	Ms Barbara Thompson
14	Merland Rise (including j/w Chapel Grove, Great Tattenhams, Tattenham Grove and Headley Drive)	Epsom Downs	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at junctions. Change existing SYL between new build out and Headley Drive to DYL 'No waiting at any time'.	Increase forward visibility on the brow of the hill and near the build out.	18025, 18160	Tattenhams / Tattenhams	Nork and Tattenhams	0	0	1	1	Nork and Tattenhams	Mr Nick Harrison
15	Ruden Way	Epsom Downs	Install SYL 'No waiting Monday-Saturday, 08:00-18:00' on north-western side down to no.101 and on the south-eastern side from the new access at no.88, southwards to Poplar Close. Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at Poplar Close and new development at no.88. Extend DYLS 'No waiting at any time' near junction with Reigate Road.	To prevent parking on both sides of the road which causes congestion and access issues.	18001, 18156	Banstead / Banstead	Nork and Tattenhams	6	0	2	8	Nork and Tattenhams	Mr Nick Harrison
16	St Leonards Road (j/w Chapel Way, Elm Gardens, garages between 15 and 17, garages between 53 and 55)	Epsom Downs	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at specified junctions.	To prevent parking on junctions (particularly at school pick up / drop off times).	18025, 18160	Tattenhams / Tattenhams	Nork and Tattenhams	1	0	0	1	Nork and Tattenhams	Mr Nick Harrison
17	Tattenham Grove, The Spinney	Epsom Downs	Change existing SYL Tattenham Grove on western side (near junction with Tattenham Crescent) to DYL 'No waiting at any time'. Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at junction of Tattenham Grove and The Spinney. Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' on eastern side of Tattenham Grove between Tattenham Crescent and the proposed DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at The Spinney.	To prevent parking on both sides of the road which causes congestion and access issues.	18159	Tattenhams / Tattenhams	Nork and Tattenhams	1	0	0	1	Nork and Tattenhams	Mr Nick Harrison
18	Crescent Way	Horley	Remove section of parking bay o/s 52 and replace with SYL 'No waiting Monday-Friday, 10:00 - 12noon'. Remove section of parking bay o/s 10 and replace with SYL 'No waiting Monday-Friday, 10:00 - 12noon'. Remove Disabled parking bay o/s no 16 and replace with 'Permit holders only, Monday - Friday, 10:00 - 12noon'.	To allow new accesses near no 52 and no 10. Remove Disabled parking bay as it is no longer required. Install permit bay in place as is the standard parking bay in the area.	18121 / 18119	Horley / Horley	-	0	0	0	0	Horley East	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
19	Russells Crescent	Horley	Remove section of parking bay and replace with SYL 'No waiting Monday - Saturday, 08:00-18:00'.	To allow new access near no 8.	18116	Horley	-	0	0	0	0	Horley East	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
20	Smallfield Road (service road o/s Britannia Homecare)	Horley	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' on the southern side of the service road.	To prevent obstructive footway parking.	18111	Horley	-	0	0	0	0	Horley East	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
21	Station Approach (near j/w Rosemary Lane)	Horley	Extend DYLS 'No waiting at any time' by 10m in a northerly direction along Station Approach.	To increase forward visibility when exiting Rosemary Lane.	18117	Horley	-	0	0	0	0	Horley East	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
22	The Crescent	Horley	Introduce new disabled parking bay (at any time, no time limit) o/s no. 105. Remove Disabled parking bay and section of parking bay o/s no. 31 and replace with SYL 'No waiting Monday - Friday, 08:00-18:00'. Replace existing parking bay o/s no 23 with Disabled parking bay operating 'At any time, no time limit'.	Update disabled bay provision to reflect residents' needs, and remove bays where new accesses have been constructed.	18121, 18122	Horley / Horley	Horley East	0	0	1	1	Horley East	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
23	The Drive	Horley	Remove Disabled parking bay o/s nos. 50/52 and replace with 'Permit holders only Monday-Friday 10:00-12noon' parking bay.	Update disabled bay provision to reflect requirements.	18152	Horley	-	0	0	0	0	Horley East	Mrs Dorothy Ross-Tomlin
24	Wellington Way, Horley Row	Horley	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at the junction.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junction.	18106	Horley	-	0	1	1	2	Horley West, Sidlow, and Salfords	Mrs Kay Hammond

Location number	Roads	Town	Proposal	Reason for change	Drawing no(s)	Drawing pack	Drawing pack (recommendations post advert)	objection	support	Other comment	Total correspondence	Division	Member
25	A217 Brighton Road (near Texaco garage and opposite)	Lower Kingswood	Introduce limited waiting parking bays to operate 'Monday-Saturday, 08:30-18:30, 1 hour no return within 2 hours'.	Increase parking turnover to enable customers to visit shops.	18163	Walton on the Hill & Lower Kingswood	-	0	0	0	0	Merstham and Banstead South	Mr Bob Gardner
26	Buckland Road (incl j/w Josephine Close, Rookery Way, and Josephine Avenue)	Lower Kingswood	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at all junctions specified.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junctions.	18163, 18045	Walton on the Hill & Lower Kingswood	-	1	0	0	1	Merstham and Banstead South	Mr Bob Gardner
27	Brighton Road, Brook Road	Redhill	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' on the northern arm of the junction of Brighton Road and Brook Road. Change existing SYLS to DYL on southern and then western side of Brook Road, and extend to meet existing. Replace existing SYL with Free Parking outside number 12/14 Brook Road. Introduce DYL 'No waiting at any time' on eastern side of Brook Road near traffic signals.	To prevent parking on the junction, replace existing hatching with correct road markings (DYLS), rationalise existing controls, create extra parking provision where feasible.	18072, 18071	Earlwood / Redhill	-	0	0	0	0	Redhill East	Mr Jonathan Essex
28	Daneshill	Redhill	Extend DYLS 'No waiting at any time' westwards on south side of road to eastern kerb line of Woodfield Close.	To remove 'pinch point' and visibility issues on Daneshill. Also to aid access from Woodfield Close onto Daneshill.	18063, 18064	Redhill / Redhill	-	2	0	1	3	Redhill West and Meadvale	Mrs Natalie Bramhall
29	Grovehill Road	Redhill	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' on southern side of Grovehill Road between Ridgeway Road and Garlands Road, and between Upper Bridge Road and Ridgeway Road.	To prevent obstructive footway parking which causes significant road narrowing and makes footway unusable.	18071	Redhill	Redhill East	9	0	1	10	Redhill East	Mr Jonathan Essex
30	Kendal Close, Winderemere Way, Conniston Way, Penrith Close	Redhill	Introduce sections of DYLS 'No waiting at any time' and 'No waiting Monday - Friday 08:15-09:15 & 14:45-16:30'. Remove some existing 'No waiting at any time' in Kendal Close.	To prevent obstructive parking at school pickup and drop-off times, to reduce congestion and improve sightlines and safety. Provide some extra space where safe to do so within Kendal Close.	18064	Redhill	-	4	1	4	9	Redhill West and Meadvale	Mrs Natalie Bramhall
31	Linkfield lane	Redhill	Introduce 'No waiting Monday - Friday 10:00 - 12:00' between Park Road and Regent Crescent, DYLS 'No waiting at any time' between the existing School Keep Clear markings and the crossing near Park Road, and limited waiting parking bays in the layby outside the school, operating 'Monday - Friday, 08:00 - 18:30, 30 mins no return 2hrs'. Also introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' on the bend opposite the junction with North Street, and on the junction with North Street and Flint Close.	To prevent parking on bends and junctions, and obstructive parking at school times. Also to prevent all day parking which reduces space for parents and visitors to the school.	18063, 18066	Redhill / Redhill	Redhill West and Meadvale	0	0	2	2	Redhill West and Meadvale	Mrs Natalie Bramhall
32	Linkfield Street	Redhill	Implement DYLS 'No waiting at any time' between Charman Road and the existing SYL on the western side.	To increase forward visibility and prevent parking on the bridge.	18068	Redhill	-	0	0	1	1	Redhill West and Meadvale	Mrs Natalie Bramhall
33	Ranelagh Road, Shrewsbury Road, Brownlow Road j/w Hatchlands Road, Shrewsbury Road, Brownlow Road j/w Whitepost Hill; Whitepost Hill; Elm Road	Redhill	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at all junctions specified, and along northern side of Whitepost Hill between Elm Road and Blackstone Hill.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junctions, maintain two way traffic along Whitepost Hill.	18068, 18077	Redhill / Redhill	-	3	0	0	3	Redhill West and Meadvale	Mrs Natalie Bramhall
34	Hatchlands Road, Whitepost Hill, Blackborough Road (Reigate), The Chase (Reigate), Blackstone Hill (Reigate)	Redhill	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at specified locations.	To prevent parking near the bend and traffic island on Blackborough Road, to prevent parking on both sides of Blackborough Road causing congestion and footway obstruction, and to increase visibility at junctions.	18078	Redhill	Redhill West and Meadvale	11	1	3	15	Redhill West and Meadvale	Mrs Natalie Bramhall
35	Noke Drive	Redhill	Introduce 'Monday-Saturday 08:00-18:30 20mins no return 2 hours' parking bays.	To allow to park when visiting the Royal Mail Post Office collection depot.	18067	Redhill	-	0	0	0	0	Redhill East	Mr Jonathan Essex
36	Junction of St Mary's Road/Effingham Road, St Mary's Road/South Road, St Marys Road/Oakhill Road, South Road/Parkgate Road, and St Mary's Road/Bell Street	Reigate	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at all junctions specified.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junctions.	18168	Reigate	-	0	0	0	0	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
37	Alma Road, Beverley Heights, Sheridan Drive	Reigate	Introduce 'Disabled Parking bay, at any time, 3 hours no return 1 hour' o/s the Church. Introduce 'No waiting at any time' at the two junctions of the island adjacent to the church with Alma Road. Introduce SYL 'No waiting Monday - Friday 10:00 - 11:00' o/s 18 - 22-24. Change existing advisory 'School Keep Clear' zig-zag markings, to mandatory, to operate 'Monday - Friday, 8:15-16:30'. Introduce SYL 'No waiting Monday - Friday 08:00-18:30' waiting restrictions along Alma Road north of Holmesdale School up to the junction with Beverley Heights. Introduce DYL 'No waiting at any time' on the junctions with Beverley Heights and Sheridan Drive.	To increase access for disabled persons at the church, and improve visibility in the vicinity of the island. To improve increase space for visitors to the school, and improve road safety at school pickup and drop-off times.	18082, 18165	Reigate 1 / Reigate 2	Reigate	3	2	6	11	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
38	Burnham Drive and Summerly Avenue	Reigate	Extend sections of DYLS 'No waiting at any time'.	Prevent access and visibility problems due to commuter parking.	18084	Reigate 1	-	0	0	0	0	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
39	Chart Lane	Reigate	Near St Mary's Church, change existing advisory disabled parking bays to mandatory, 'Disabled parking, at any time, 3hrs no return 1 hr'. Introduce 'Monday - Saturday 08:00 - 18:30 1hr no return 1 hrs' parking bays in existing unrestricted area. Remove the parking bay in front of no 15 Chart Lane, replace with SYL to operate 'Monday - Saturday 08.00 - 18.30' to allow new vehicle crossover.	Increase parking amenity for visitors to the school and nearby shops. Allow access to off-street parking created by new vehicle crossover.	18091, 18093	Reigate 1 / Reigate 2	-	0	0	0	0	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
40	Croydon Road	Reigate	Extend DYL 'No waiting at any time' from 39 Croydon Road, north into the access to the fire station and for the remaining length of the existing Keep Clear Markings at Fire station entrance.	To remove parking on footway on north side that currently reduces carriageway width and causes obstruction to footpath.	18081	Reigate 1	-	1	1	2	4	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
41	Doods Road	Reigate	Change existing SYL to DYL 'No waiting at any time'. Extend eastwards up to and including junction with Wilmots Close. Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at junction with Wray Common Road.	Prevent obstructive footway parking. Increase access and visibility at the junction.	18081, 18166	Reigate 1 / Reigate 2	Reigate	8	0	1	9	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
42	Eversfield Road, Deerings Road, A25 Reigate Road	Reigate	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at these junctions, extend the existing DYLS 'No waiting at any time' on Deerings Road near the junction with Croydon Road. (NOTE: Although it does not require a Traffic Regulation Order, it is also proposed to introduce a bus stop clearway operating Monday - Sunday 7am-7pm on Reigate Road near the junction with Eversfield Road at the same time as these proposals.)	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junctions. Prevent obstruction of the bus stop on Reigate Road.	18080	Reigate 1	Reigate	1	0	0	1	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff

ITEM 9

Location number	Roads	Town	Proposal	Reason for change	Drawing no(s)	Drawing pack	Drawing pack (recommendations post advert)	objection	support	Other comment	Total correspondence	Division	Member
43	Fort Lane	Reigate	Include existing DYLS near M25 junction into the TRO. Introduce 'No loading at any time' restriction in addition to existing DYLS 'No waiting at any time'.	Prevent obstructive parking / loading that causes problems for motorists trying to enter / exit Fort Lane.	18164	Reigate 2	-	0	0	0	0	Reigate / Merstham and Banstead South	Dr Zully Grant-Duff / Mr Bob Gardner
44	Holmesdale Road (access to Prospects Court)	Reigate	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at the access. Extend 'Free Parking' to meet existing bays at either side of access.	Prevent obstructive parking, and improve visibility on exiting Prospects Court.	18085	Reigate 1	-	0	4	0	4	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
45	Lynden Gardens	Reigate	DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at junctions and in the main part of the road.	To remove footway parking and sightline obstruction.	18168	Reigate 2	Reigate	6	0	0	6	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
46 / 49	Manor Road, Somers Road	Reigate	Extend DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at the junction. Introduce 'No waiting Monday - Saturday, 08:00 - 18:30' on the south side of Manor road from the proposed extension to the 'No waiting at any time', to western boundary of 5 Manor Road.	Increase visibility and safety at the junction. Prevent parking on both sides of Manor Road which causes congestion, problems for residents exiting driveways and encourages footway parking.	18083	Reigate 1	Reigate	12	2	4	18	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
47	Park Lane	Reigate	Extend SYLS 'No waiting Monday-Saturday 08:00-18:30' on eastern side past vehicular access to Priory Lane cottage, and on western side to a point opposite northern boundary of park cottage.	Vehicles parking near the bend and on both sides of carriageway causing obstructions.	18126	Reigate 2	-	0	0	0	0	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
48	Reigate Road	Reigate	Extend DYLS on Reigate Road, to the west from the junction with Ringley Park Road.	To remove vehicles that are currently parking near the brow of the hill of Reigate Road reducing visibility for vehicles exiting Ringley Park Road.	18079	Reigate 1	Reigate	0	1	1	2	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
50	Wray Common Road	Reigate	Extend existing DYLS 'No waiting at any time' and introduce further restrictions to prevent obstructive parking near accesses and on approach to Reigate Road.	To reduce parking on blind bend and ease traffic flow between Doods Park Road and Reigate Road	18128, 18166	Reigate 2 / Reigate 2	18128 - Redhill West & Meadvale 18166 - Reigate	3	1	4	8	Redhill West & Meadvale / Reigate	Mrs Natalie Bramhall / Dr Zully Grant-Duff
51	Wray Park Road	Reigate	Introduce / extend DYLS 'no waiting at any time' near and opposite the junction with Alders Rd, and at well used accesses.	To increase visibility and safety at junctions and accesses.	18082	Reigate 1	-	0	0	1	1	Reigate	Dr Zully Grant-Duff
52 / 57	Ashurst Road, Cross Road, Epsom Lane South / Station Approach Road, The Avenue, Cross Road	Tadworth	Introduce SYLS 'No waiting Monday-Saturday, 08:00-18:30' along northern side of Cross Road and on the western side of Ashurst Road. Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' on the junction of Cross Road and Epsom Lane South.	To prevent parking on both sides of these roads causing congestion, and difficulties for service vehicles.	18039, 18040	Tattenhams	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	53	2	11	66	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling
53	Chetworth Road j/w Merland Rise	Tadworth	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at the junction.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junction.	18160	Walton on the Hill & Lower Kingswood	Nork and Tattenhams	0	0	1	1	Nork and Tattenhams	Mr Nick Harrison
54	Deans Lane	Tadworth	Extend DYLS 'No waiting at any time' on the bend on the eastern side towards Meadow Walk.	To prevent parking near the bend.	18042	Tadworth	-	1	1	1	3	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling
55	High Street	Tadworth	Introduce SYLS 'No waiting Monday - Saturday, 08:00-18:30', DYLS 'No waiting at any time' and some limited waiting parking bays operating 'Monday - Saturday, 08:00-18:30, 1hr no return 1hr'.	Prevent all day commuter parking, increase road safety and access, and increase turnover for shops.	18041	Tadworth	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	24	0	6	30	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling
56	Shelvers Way, Shelvers Hill, Shelvers Green, Hill View Close	Tadworth	Introduce SYLS 'No waiting Monday - Saturday, 08:00-18:00' and DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at junctions on Shelvers Way. In Shelvers Hill change existing disabled bay o/s 7-9 to operate '08:00-18:30 Monday - Saturday, 3 hours no return within 1 hour'. Introduce new parking bays o/s nos. 3,7,9,15 and 16, to operate '08:00-18:30 Monday - Saturday 1 hour no return within 1 hour', and replace existing parking bays in layby areas opposite 7 - 9 with the same conditions.	Prevent all day parking, increase road safety and access, and increase turnover for shops. Rationalise existing controls.	18034	Tadworth	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	7	3	0	10	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling
58	Tadorne Road, j/w Tadworth Street	Tadworth	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at the junction.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junction.	18161	Tadworth	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	0	0	2	2	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling
59	Tadworth Street (j/w Epsom Lane South and The Hoppety)	Tadworth	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at all junctions specified.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junction.	18161	Tadworth	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	3	1	1	5	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling
60	Tadworth Street (near Chinthurst School)	Tadworth	Introduce DYL 'No waiting at any time' passing place between existing School Keep Clear markings and Station Approach.	Reduce congestion at peak times.	18041	Tadworth	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	6	0	2	8	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling
61	Tadworth Street (near Heathcote)	Tadworth	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at the access to Tadworth Court Children's Hospital, and extend the extending DYLS south-westwards near the traffic island at Heathcote.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at access. Give required clearance for busses / large vehicle to negotiate traffic island.	18036	Tadworth	-	0	1	1	2	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling
62	Gun Island (junction of Ebbisham Lane / Walton Street), Chequers Lane, Walton Street	Walton on the Hill	Introduce new sections of DYL 'No waiting at any time' on and near the island.	To prevent obstructive / dangerous parking at the traffic island, on Chequers Lane near the junction with Beech Lane, and along Walton Street.	18043	Walton on the Hill & Lower Kingswood	-	1	1	2	4	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling
63	Howard Close (incl j/w Chequers Lane)	Walton on the Hill	Introduce DYLS 'No waiting at any time' at j/w Chequers Lane, and in the bus turning area.	Increase forward visibility and maintain access at junction. To enable vehicles to use turning area.	18162	Walton on the Hill & Lower Kingswood	-	0	1	0	1	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling
64	Walton Street (near Walton on the Hill Primary School). Sandlands Road	Walton on the Hill	Introduce SYL 'No waiting Monday - Saturday, 08:00-18:30' passing place opposite school, and other lengths of DYL 'No waiting at any time'. Introduce 'Goods Vehicle Loading only' bay outside new retail development at 41 Walton Street, revoking existing parking bay.	To reduce congestion and obstruction of bus route, particularly at school pickup and drop-off times. Assist new retail development with receiving deliveries.	18042	Walton on the Hill & Lower Kingswood	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	3	1	0	4	Tadworth, Walton and Kingswood	Mr Michael Gosling

<u>Location:</u>	Garden Close, including j/w Wilmot Way - Banstead	
Location number	2	
Drawings	18009	
Objection	6	
Support	0	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	6	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
35, 1.1, 38, 39, 44, 48	6	Double yellow lines should be provided along the northern side of Garden Close, to maintain access particularly for delivery, refuse, and service vehicles.
35, 38, 39, 44	4	A number of local roads have recently had double yellow lines down one side, and this has solved their access problems.
35, 39, 44	3	The road has been blocked on many occasions.
35, 48	2	The road currently suffers from parking in evenings and weekends, due to cafes and restaurants on the high street.
48	1	The council could encourage use of the car park by reducing fees.
Response		
Accept the suggestion to amend the proposals from single to double yellow lines for the reasons given. Public off street car parks are a matter for borough/district councils.		
Recommendations		
Amend the proposals to introduce double yellow lines rather than single yellow lines. This will not be re-advertised, but street notices / other such measures will be taken to raise awareness of the revised scheme.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	High Beeches (os no. 83, and nos. 4 and 7) - Banstead	
Location number	3	
Drawings	18001, 18155	
Objection	0	
Support	0	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	1	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
2.1	1	I fully support the proposal to provide DYL's on the curve in the road in front of 'Beecholme' (Dwg 18155). The current situation with vehicles parked on this curve, is a safety hazard, as vehicles travelling in one direction have to use the wrong side of the road to travel round a near blind bend. I have lived close to this bend for the last 32 years, and the situation got worse some years ago when 'Beecholme' had a part change of useage to accommodate some key workers (who had cars), instead of providing only sheltered accommodation for senior citizens, who had few cars of their own. I am worried that with a parking ban in place, some vehicles will park elsewhere in the road and interfere with the traffic flow even more than they do now. A possible solution to this, although it will cost money, is to remove the wide grass verge in front of 'Beecholme', leaving the footway intact, and provide some parking bays in the space created. This way would provide parking for some vehicles outside 'Beecholme' e.g. contractors vans, but leave the road clear. There is a possibility that vehicles may then be parked on the opposite of the road, unless a restriction is imposed.
Response		
If problems develop elsewhere in the road we can address such issues in a future parking review. The conversion of verges to parking spaces is prohibitively expensive in most situations; this should be discussed with the area highway team if customer wishes to pursue further.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

<u>Location:</u>	Longcroft Avenue, Woodmansterne Lane, Fiddicroft Avenue - Banstead	
Location number	5	
Drawings	18146	
Objection	1	
Support	1	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	2	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
36	1	Please install the proposed restriction in order to help alleviate problems with entering/exiting driveways on Fiddicroft Avenue. (Unclear but perhaps asking for restriction to be extended remainder of Longcroft Avenue covering resident's driveway).
3.1	1	We object to the proposed plans of no-waiting on one-side of Longcroft Avenue at the Croydon Lane end for the following reasons: 1. There has been no consultation with the residents to understand our requirements and our concerns about our road. 2. There are two-traffic problems in Longcroft Avenue a)inconsiderate parking b)speeding traffic 3. Cars are parked outside our house, making it difficult for us to have clear visibility when driving off our drive onto the road. Cars are at times parked inconsiderately making it difficult for us to get in and off our drive and on at least one occasion we have had to ring Sunrise Homes in Croydon Lane to ask staff members who park on Longcroft Avenue to move their car so that we can move ours. Poor parking is a problem Monday-Sunday with cars arriving from 6.30am and leaving 7pm or later. I will forward photos of how inconsiderate parking can be at times. We do not always know who is parking outside our home and they can at times leave their car there for even longer than one day. 4. Longcroft Avenue is a well-known and used rat-run for local traffic between Woodmansterne and Croydon Lane by cars, trucks, lorries even articulated wagons. The planned parking proposals of encouraging cars to park on one-side further encourages speed making it easier for the traffic to drive down the road. Our son was almost knocked off his bike when we were crossing the road on the way home from school, she was speeding, he was crossing the road; he is 4yrs old. There are frequent verbal exchanges between drivers who meet head on and don't want to 'give way' - this will be further exasperated. 5. We are encouraged that you are finally considering Longcroft Avenue to be a problematic road for parking and traffic, but disappointed that you have not consulted with us prior to this.
Response		
<p>Longcroft Avenue is not wide enough to support parking on both sides - the restriction simply reinforces this. It is not anticipated that traffic speeds will be increased as a result of the proposals.</p> <p>Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location can request that it is added to our next parking review.</p> <p>This advertising process allows for comment on the proposals and they can be adjusted if required, we do not have sufficient resources to enable informal consultations at every location considered within the review.</p>		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Picquets Way (junctions with Tattenham Way, The Drive, The Brindles, access to nos. 35-45 Picquets Way) - Banstead	
Location number	7	
Drawings	18012, 18133	
Objection	1	
Support	2	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	3	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
4.1	1	Whilst I applaud that it has finally been recognised (as identified to SCC in my previous emails) that parking behaviour and discipline during school times present significant risks to pedestrians and traffic along Picquets Way I have objections and proposals to the proposed implementation strategy: 1. The proposed no waiting at any time (assumed to mean double yellow lines) would affect the ability to park outside my house at weekends and potentially devalue my property. An alternative consideration (which may be incorporated within the proposals) should be time and seasonal restrictions limiting the no waiting to the relevant busy periods of Monday to Friday 07:00 to 17:00. 2. The proposal does not fully address health and safety concerns but merely 'pushing' the problem further along Picquets Way. 3. Unless adherence to these proposals are monitored and policed drivers will, in practice, ignore such restrictions in busy periods (such as they currently do).
5.1	1	We very much support your proposal for no parking at any time on the corner of Picquets Way and Tattenham Way and also of Picquets Way and The Drive. However, we feel that these no parking lines should be EXTENDED further as the visibility of entering and leaving Picquets is very difficult due to inconsiderate parking in these areas. They cause blind spots.
6.1	1	We support the proposals for Picquets Way so far as they go, however more needs to be done to deal with overspill parking from the Beacon school and parents parking outside the school at drop off and collection times. We appreciate that the Beacon's principal (repeatedly) asks parents not to drop and collect their children from Picquets Way but her requests go unheeded. The current no waiting restrictions on the west side of Picquets Way (during school time) should be extended along the whole length of the western side of the road contingent with the school boundary - there is an unexplained gap currently which encourages parents to stop. The restrictions need to be enforced - they are not currently.
Response		
Proposals can be reduced outside no 21 Picquets Way without compromising road safety. Proposals can be slightly extended on Tattenham Way. Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location can request that it is added to our next parking review.		
Recommendations		
Introduce slightly amended proposal as shown in Annex 2.		

Location:	Tattenham Way - Burgh Heath
Location number	8
Drawings	18022

Objection	1
Support	1
Other comment	4
Total correspondence	6

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
191.1	1	Concerning the proposed change to parking outside The Parade shop on Tattenham Way. It appears you have not considered the type of businesses being conducted in those shops. There is a hairdressing salon where it's most likely a lot of customers may take more than an hour for their appointment. An older person having a perm, or hair coloring, is likely to be far longer than an hour, and it may not be possible for them to find a space close by the shops. There is a cafe where people may or may not be more than an hour. A beauty/massage salon is about to open, an hour's massage immediately tells you a parking space outside the shop isn't going to work. You are penalising these businesses by restricting the parking time.
56	1	Please extend the yellow lines down to No 86. Parking either side of the driveways at this location causes great difficulties and dangerous for residents entering / exiting driveways.
4	1	Please refresh the access protection markings near No 93.
22	1	Yellow lines should be applied down to No 78. Parking either side of the driveways at this location causes great difficulties and dangerous for residents entering / exiting driveways.
181.1	1	Dear Sir or Madam I have reviewed the plans for the control parking by the parade in Tattenham Way, I am all in favour of this proposal for control parking as I feel it would benefit both residents and the shop owners. But I think that this would be a pointless installation unless you were to put control parking on the opposite side of the road too from 99a down to 91, I also think it would be a good idea to extend the control parking along the parade to 94. I did wonder whether it would be possible to move the bus stop back towards the traffic lights at the junction of Reigate road, and cut a lay-by for the bus into the grass verge between the entrance to the flats and a service road for the Parade. This would stop traffic bottle-necking on this section of Tattenham Way when the bus stops, this would allow traffic to keep moving in both directions without drivers rush to try and squeeze through a small gap to beat the lights before they change. I am sure this would also make it safer for the school children, mums with prams and elderly residents who crossed the road back and forth from the sweet shop at number 1 the Parade to the alleyway between 101 and 99a at all times a day.
180.1	1	I support the proposed changing of the parking time outside the shops on Tattenham Way. However, as a property owner just two doors away from the shops, I would welcome this being rolled out further down the road as well. It has become almost impossible to get off my driveway safely each day due to large vans parked outside covering the white lines (which need repainting) and obscuring my view of the traffic on the road. I have to edge out and play russian roulette with the traffic (with two small children in the car) - this is not acceptable and I have had several "near misses". There is a bookmaker and "greasy spoon" cafe in the parade which both attract tradesmen in large vans for long periods of time - they fully or partially block driveways and obscure white lines. I have lived in Tattenham Way for over 7.5 years and have NEVER seen a traffic warden on this road. The double-yellow lines on the corner near the shops and bus stop markings outside the shops are completely ignored and parked on constantly. Please can you consider further restrictions on Tattenham Way to make life easier and safer for those those that live in the road and pay their Council Tax. Thank you for your time.

Response

We can amend some of the bays to allow 2 hours waiting for visitors requiring longer (such as at the Salon).
 We do not believe that further proposals should be proposed as part of this review as this would require us to 're-advertise' the proposals which will extend considerably the completion date of the review as well as incurring additional costs. Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location can request that it is added to our next parking review.
 Bus stops are managed by our Passenger Transport Team who can be contacted with suggestions regarding this issue.
 We can arrange for the refreshment of the Access Protection Markings at the location concerned.
 Enforcement of parking controls is carried out by borough/district councils on our behalf. This can be raised with them.

Recommendations

Introduce a revised scheme allowing waiting for up to 2 hours in some bays, as shown in the revised drawing in Annex 2.

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Chipstead Close - Earlswood	
Location number	9	
Drawings	18073	
Objection	1	
Support	0	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	1	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
8.1	1	<p>I would like to object to the proposed additional parking restrictions for Chipstead Close. My objection concerns the fact that parking in and around the area of the Victoria Road/Emllyn Road/St Johns Road junction is already in short supply. There are not sufficient spaces for the amount of cars owned by residents, and as a result, residents are often forced to utilise yellow line areas outside restricted times and move cars in the morning when restrictions come into place. The problem is particularly bad on Victoria Road, as very few houses have off-street parking, and the average house is only as wide as the average family car, yet many households have multiple vehicles. Finding unrestricted parking in the evening is a regular problem. To eliminate potential overspill parking in Chipstead Close would, in my view, be short sighted and only serve to exacerbate the issue.</p>
Response		
Proposals were made following concerns from residents of Chipstead Close. The road can not support parking on both sides of the road at this location.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

<u>Location:</u>	Hooley Lane incl. j/w Redstone Road, Victoria Road, Earlsbrook Road - Earlswood	
Location number	12	
Drawings	18072, 18137	
Objection	3	
Support	0	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	3	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
53	1	Proposals will cause problems for delivery vehicles and customers to access local supermarket (junction of Hooley Lane/Victoria Road).
7.1	1	I object to the proposal to have the extra mon-fri 08:00-18:00 at the top of Hooley Lane. Except at busy times there is not much traffic going up Hooley lane so I do not see any plausible reason why this should be introduced. Also - I work in Redhill opposite the BP Garage south side of town where there is a little unrestricted street parking only, and no long term parking car parks. Traffic through Redhill centre is bad during the day and this will be made worse by people such as myself who currently park on the south side on the street being forced to use long term car parks on the north side of Redhill. I suggest a better strategy for traffic management is to provide long term parking in the south side of Redhill first, then to consider more restricted street parking in this area (btw I would still object to the above Hooley Lane extension for the same reason).
39.1	1	I agree that parking controls should be in force to stop parking on the corners of junctions, but I feel the extent of your proposal into Redstone Road goes too far down the road. There is no off road parking available in this part of Earlswood/Redhill, and these restrictions would cause more parking wars in the area. We dare not go out!!
Response		
<p>We can review (reduce) the length of the yellow lines at the junction of Hooley Lane / Victoria Road to ensure that deliveries can still be made. Other junctions have been treated with double yellow lines 10 metres from the junction which is the recommended minimum distance as given in the Highway Code, so these lengths should be retained.</p> <p>As stated in the Statement of Reasons, the proposal to remove some parking at the western end of Hooley Lane is due to problems associated with vehicles interfering with the traffic signal loop, and are consequently required to go ahead.</p> <p>Off street parking is not a function provided by the county council; public off street car parks are operated by borough/district councils.</p>		
Recommendations		
Revise proposals at the junction of Hooley Lane / Victoria Road. All other proposals to be introduced 'as-advertised'. See revised drawing in Annex 2.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Merland Rise (including j/w Chapel Grove, Great Tattenhams, Tattenham Grove and Headley Drive) - Epsom Downs	
Location number	14	
Drawings	18025, 18160	
Objection	0	
Support	0	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	1	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
190.1	1	Does the proposed no park on the Tattenham Corner side of Merland Rise now mean the stupidly positioned bus stop will now be moved? You have drawn the no parking line past the traffic island which means it covers the bus stop area, presumably either stop or island will be repositioned. The current position of the bus stop almost opposite the traffic island results in road blockage every time a bus is present. Currently traffic is unable to get between bus and island, vehicles in Merland Rise wishing to turn right have their vision blocked and can't tell if it's safe to exit. The moving of one or the removal of the other would be beneficial.
Response		
Neither the bus stop nor the pedestrian refuge will be modified as part of this review. Although the situation is not ideal, both facilities adequately perform their functions although admittedly some congestion may take place for a short period of time when the bus is picking up passengers. Positioning the bus stop further away from the junction presents difficulties as the bank at the side of the road becomes steeper which is of particular concern for those with mobility difficulties.		
Recommendations		
Extend proposals slightly on Great Tattenhams, west of its junction with Merland Rise to cover the length of the bus stop to ensure the bus can fully pull into the stop and minimise disruption to traffic. Following discussions with local residents, we also recommend to extend the 'no waiting at any time' on Tattenham Grove (both sides), near its junction with Merland Rise, and on Merland Rise (eastern side) south from the junction with Chapel Grove. See revised drawing in Annex 2.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Ruden Way - Epsom Downs
Location number	15
Drawings	18001, 18156

Objection	6
Support	0
Other comment	2
Total correspondence	8

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
49, 74	2	Problems are caused by local workers. I do not believe the proposals will solve the problem, only shift the parking further down the road, and inconvenience local residents. Instead, permit parking should be introduced.
18	1	The proposals should extend further, to prevent displacement of vehicles further down the road (south). Otherwise those residents further down will experience congestion and problems entering/exiting driveways.
50	1	Problems are due to planning allowing the conversion of the Driftbridge Hotel to flats, removing parking from the garage. Proposals will inconvenience local residents.
9.1	1	Whilst welcoming in principle the proposed parking restrictions, I am concerned that one major problem will persist. This is the lack of sight of oncoming traffic down Ruden Way towards Reigate Road when turning into Ruden Way from the South (Reigate Road/Firtree Road traffic lights) because of bending of road. Whilst I see that the yellow lines will be extended from the junction (welcome this) I stongly believe that the restriction should be on the opposite side to the proposal at least as far as the entrances to the Garage Workshop. By doing this it will ALSO eliminate parking on the footpath (frequent now) as access to the path will be blocked by parked vehicles. As most of the parking at present is by persons working nearby (see Sundays by comparison), would not a one hour period (eg. 10.0am - 11a.m.) be just as effective but less disruptive to residents?
11.1	1	Object to this proposal. It will in effect just move the problem further up the road. Over the last few months we have had difficulty entering and exiting our driveway because of parked vehicles left during the day either by builders from the various building sites being allowed in Ruden Way or commuters leaving their vehicles to travel on the train. If parking restrictions are going to be put in place in Ruden Way then put them all along the road please or not at all.
12.1	1	I strongly object to this decision. Parking in our road has been an issue for some time, large lorries delivering goods have been on the increase since 3 new housing estates have been built in the backs of gardens over many years. These vehicles have been hindered along with dust carts and recycle lorries passing due to the amount of cars parking in our road. The main cause of the cars parking is from staff working at the Audi and volkswagen garage situated in Ruden way and fir tree road. To our knowledge staff are meant to park out of area at a designated parking location and be shuttled down to the garage. At present this is not been upheld . Staff continually park within our road, If a yellow line where to be enforced on one side of the road as proposed all spaces on the opposite side of the road would still be taken up by garage staff, leaving residence with no spaces for visitors or there own cars to park outside there own houses which is a disgrace. The garages have plenty of off street parking available to them but still allow staff to park in our street causing hassle to other road users. Another solution would be to introduce a residence permit system into force to allow our visitors still to park outside our houses or very near by. But to have no parking times between 8.00 am to 6.30 pm monday to saturday is totally unfair to the residence of this road especially on a Saturday when family and friends visit most often. I feel this would need more consultation before any decision is made!
13.1	1	Though I welcome most of your plan, I think the 'no parking at any time' should be on both sides of the road up to just passed the trackway opposite the Volkswagen garages exit roads. This trackway is used by vans delivering goods to the back of the shops, and residents whose garages are at the back of their houses, and the view on emerging from the trackway is usually dangerously restricted by parked cars making it extremely awkward to get out into Ruden Way proper.

<p>Response</p> <p>We have no powers to restrict local workers from parking in the area other then through parking controls such as those proposed.</p> <p>We have extended the 'no waiting at any time' near the junction with Reigate Road to what we consider is a reasonable length to allow movement of vehicles in and out of the junction. To extent them further would risk causing additional 'displacement' problems. However, this proposal could be considered in a future parking review.</p> <p>Although it is acknowledged that displacement could occur to the south of the proposed area of control, the road does become wider further south, and therefore the problems would be less severe. Any displacement problems could be reviewed in a future review of parking in the borough.</p> <p>Residents parking has not previously been suggested for this location, and although it could be considered in a future review, it is difficult to justify given the fact that the vast majority of residents have significant off street parking areas. Furthermore, there would be a cost to residents for such a service.</p> <p>Given the concerns about residents' amenity, we suggest that the same effect could be achieved with a control operating reduced hours.</p> <p>Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location should ensure that it is added to our next parking review.</p>

<p>Recommendations</p> <p>Introduce proposals over the lengths initially proposed, but reduce the hours of operation of single yellow lines to 'Monday - Friday, 10am - 4pm'. Shown in the revised drawing in Annex 2.</p>

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	St Leonards Road (j/w Chapel Way, Elm Gardens, garages between 15 and 17, garages between 53 and 55) - Epsom Downs	
Location number	16	
Drawings	18025, 18160	

Objection	1
Support	0
Other comment	0
Total correspondence	1

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
10.1	1	DYL around junction to garage area between 15/17 and opposite 24 St. Leonards Road. Movements into and out of the garage area are VERY few. There was a problem with "school" cars entering the garage area and preventing owners getting cars in or out of their garages. This has been solved by the lockable barrier. "School" cars can be a problem but largely as a result of inconsiderate parking such as across driveway entrances and on grass verges. At present, up to three cars can park around the garage entrance area without impeding traffic flow or creating a safety hazard. If "school" cars can not use this, inconsiderate parking will increase. Parking for residents in this area is at a premium, particularly in evenings and at weekends. If cars can not park by the garage entrance they will have to park elsewhere in the road, possibly on both sides of the same stretch of road. This would then create more safety and traffic flow problems than at present. In conclusion, it is my opinion that parking around the garage entrance area does not create a problem. But if it is prohibited, then parking will become more difficult for residents and traffic flow in the road would be disrupted.

Response
At the access to the garages, the highway boundary ends at the 'back of footway', so the proposals will be reduced to that extent. The northern extent of the lines at this location on St Leonards Road will also be reduced to the boundary of no 13/15 so as not to finish part way across the private access of no 13.

Recommendations
Amend proposals as indicated. See revised drawing in Annex 2.

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Tattenham Grove, The Spinney - Epsom Downs	
Location number	17	
Drawings	18159	
Objection	1	
Support	0	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	1	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
52	1	Proposals do nothing to solve the problem of commuter parking. An 08.30 - 10.00am Monday - Friday restriction should be introduced on both sides of the road. This will allow short term visitors to park, whilst maintaining traffic flow. To restrict parking to one side will exacerbate problems that residents currently have in entering/exiting their driveways.
Response		
The road is too narrow to allow parking on both sides of the road. Introducing a restriction along one side of the road reflects the 'standard' practice of parking on the street at the moment. Most residents have significant off street parking areas and consequently the negative effects to residents should be minimal. The location should be re-visited in the next parking review to consider further controls to aid residents in entering and exiting their driveways.		
Recommendations		
Introduce 'as advertised' except a slight reduction in the yellow lines near no. 2. See revised drawing in Annex 2.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	The Crescent - Horley	
Location number	22	
Drawings	18121, 18122	
Objection	0	
Support	0	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	1	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
NA	1	Officer comment.
Response		
Customer no longer wishes to pursue application for a disabled bay outside 105 The Crescent, as is applying for off street space instead.		
Recommendations		
Recommend not to proceed with proposed disabled parking bay outside 105 The Crescent.		

<u>Location:</u>	Wellington Way, Horley Row - Horley	
Location number	24	
Drawings	18106	
Objection	0	
Support	1	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	2	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
55	1	Proposed restrictions will push cars further into Kingsley Road and Avondale Close. The problem of Gatwick Parking needs to be addressed.
57	1	Proposals will aid safety and improve the area's congestion at busy times.
Response		
If problems develop elsewhere in the area we can address such issues in a future parking review.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Buckland Road (incl j/w Josephine Close, Rookery Way, and Josephine Avenue) - Lower Kingswood	
Location number	26	
Drawings	18163, 18045	
Objection	1	
Support	0	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	1	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
77	1	Letter concerning original proposals which have since been addressed with a modified proposal.
Response		
None.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

<u>Location:</u>	Daneshill - Redhill	
Location number	28	
Drawings	18063, 18064	
Objection	2	
Support	0	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	3	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
19.1	1	Please could you consider extending the parking restrictions to the opposite side of the road outside No. 20 upto the crossroads? This is a busy 'rat run' and cars parking outside No. 20 block the view of No. 18 & 20 when pulling out of the drive. Cars speed around the corner & we've recently had a few near collisions when reversing out. Parking up nearer the crossroads causes cars to slam their breaks on when coming around the corner only to find a parked car In front of them. Cars having to pass parked cars near this junction will undoubtedly cause tail backs around the crossroads. Many thanks.
20.1	1	The proposed new parking restrictions on Daneshill do not extend across the property numbers 16 and 14. Currently, cars park outside these properties during the week, Monday through to Friday. This means for property numbers 16 and 14 it is extremely dangerous to negotiate exiting from the properties as the view is obscured by the parked vehicles and also entering our drives as the cars park close to the entrances. I would suggest putting a restriction at this location during the working week to eradicate this dangerous situation.
45.1	1	I wish to object that these additional parking restrictions do not go far enough and may exacerbate existing problems with commuter parking. This currently makes access from Danes Hill into Woodfield Way dangerous because of continuous parking all along Woodfield Way and turning left into Brooklands Way, where the extent of the parking makes it impossible to see if cars are coming towards you. The existing double yellow lines need to be extended further into Brooklands Way and there needs to be a limited parking restriction introduced in Woodfield Way and brooklands Way in order to deter long term commuter parking.
Response		
We do not believe that further proposals should be proposed as part of this review as this would required us to 're-advertise' the proposals which will extend considerably the completion date of the review as well as incurring additional costs. Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location can request that it is added to our next parking review.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>		Grovehill Road - Redhill
Location number	29	
Drawings	18071	
Objection	9	
Support	0	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	10	

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
60	1	Residents parking is required in this area. Removing parking from one side will encourage speeding, what is needed is alternate parking. Is difficult to get out of your house without being mown down on the footpath. I have a Blue Badge, where do you suggest I park? What happens for deliveries etc?
15	1	Plans to introduce double yellow lines are commendable for safety - but a residents parking scheme must be introduced at the same time to allow residents to use the remaining space rather than commuters.
23.1	1	Whilst I agree in principle with the idea of restricting parking in Redhill town centre and surrounding residential roads, the suggested plans will cause issues for residents of Grovehill Road. I personally do not drive to work, taking public transport instead, and therefore need to be able to park on Grovehill Road during the day. As there are a number of flats on this road without off road parking, the residents of these flats, and a number of the houses, park on the road. There is already limited parking for those residents and spaces are often hard to come by. If parking is limited to one side of the road, residents will be unable to park there during the day. As it is, if I am not at work during the week, I cannot leave the road by car and expect to be able to park again if I return before the end of the working day. As a number of residents have previously suggested, a better solution would be to bring in residents only parking permits which would free up a lot of space during the day and allow residents to park near their homes. In addition, the side of the road suggested as being available for parking is not practical. The owners of 63a have a hedge that stretches along much of the road and limits the pavement area considerably, therefore restricting space for pedestrians walking along the pavement, which in turn means many walk along the road instead despite there being more room on the other side of the road. I would also suggest some traffic calming measures, such as table ramps at the junction with Upper Bridge Road or reduced speed limit to 20 miles an hour, would be advantageous as drivers often speed down the road, especially at the bend at the junction with Upper Bridge Road. Given the number of pedestrians who walk down the road rather than the pavement, I am surprised this hasn't led to an accident.
24.1	1	I object to proposed no waiting zone extension which presumably will also prevent overnight parking. It is very difficult to find parking in the area and this will only exacerbate the problem.
25.1	1	I object to the proposal to implement parking restrictions on one side of Grovehill Road. I understand that people have complained that it is often impossible to walk along the pavement on either side of the road. However, if examined closely the problem is revealed as being caused primarily by hedges growing over property lines and not by careless parking. For example, the long tall hedge along the property next to no. 63 extends more than a foot out beyond the property line across the pavement, even when it has been trimmed. Currently this hedge has not been trimmed this year & extends even further across the pavement. Opposite this property is one where there is a wall topped by a hedge. This hedge has also been allowed to grow out well over the property line. If these hedges were trimmed back & properly maintained, there would be much easier access along each side of the road. Most of the cars parked along the road during weekdays belong to commuters, not residents. Implementing restrictions will unfairly penalise residents. We need somewhere to park our cars. Implementing new restrictions will simply shift any problems to new sites.
26.1	1	As a resident of Grovehill Road I object to the 2 'no waiting at any time' proposed restrictions. Efforts to increase safety for pedestrians and reduce the overcrowding of cars on the street is to be applauded. However, I object to the current proposals as the 'no parking at any time' restriction on the lower & mid parts of Grovehill as these would cause a huge negative impact on residents and penalise homeowners as opposed to tackling the crux of the issue. The problem for residents is the streets close proximity to the town centre and railway station. Commuters use the street to park all day when commuting to work using the train avoiding paying charges for such parking. Parents of young children in the street do the school run and as soon as they vacate their parking space a commuter will take it for the whole day. The change of the current 'no parking between 10-11am' restriction on Grovehill to become 'no parking at any time' will hugely inconvenience residents as it currently provides a limited degree of flexibility for loading and unloading children, shopping and the like plus gives us a place to park when the commuters take up a large portion of the available spaces in the local streets. There is a further problem but to a lesser extent where 'holiday parking' occurs with people leaving cars in the local area before catching the train to Gatwick Airport for their holidays. The road has recently started being used by a local taxi firm to leave cars also. I am an Airline Pilot and return home from long shifts at work at any hour of the day. The proposals as suggested would make it impossible for me to get home, park near my house and get to bed for any flight that gets me home after about 0730-0800 in the morning. Residents parking (as requested multiple times / petitioned for in recent years) is required else residents will never be able to park anywhere near their homes as a direct result of the restrictions. Other communities with this problem have the benefit of a residents parking scheme (for example Kingston or Farnham) and even our own borough has such schemes (Horely, Merstham and Tandridge). If a no waiting at any time zone is created in the Grovehill Road area, residents parking must be provided to relieve the problems described. Fundamentally commuters need to be encouraged to use the pay for spaces provided by the council or Rail Company and residents need to be prioritised to be able to park nearby their own homes. Addressing this would resolve the current safety issue without it being to the detriment to the homeowners who have paid a premium to live in close proximity to the town centre.

27.1	1	<p>As a resident, parking in Grovehill Road is incredibly challenging because in a street which already has limited parking for those who live there, commuters, shoppers and town workers use it as free parking during the day. It is not uncommon for residents to have absolutely nowhere to park during the day, not only in Grovehill Road but in surrounding streets, which is incredibly inconvenient for any resident but especially so for those with children or older/infirm residents. Another challenge is when residents need to hire contractors to do work at their homes - there is simply nowhere for them to park their vehicles. I object to the proposal because the current option for restricted parking on one side of the road gives residents (and contractors) at least some option to park outside of 10-11am when all other spaces are taken up by nonresidents. The plan to abolish this existing restricted parking will make life almost impossible for residents, whilst not addressing the fundamental issue of nonresidents using Grovehill Road as a free parking option. I request that instead of the drastic measures which do not tackle the underlying issue but make things impossibly difficult and unviable for residents, the council instead considers residents parking for this street (and possibly surrounding streets). This would deal with the issue of parking and congested roads, which the council needs to address, whilst not preventing residents from parking in their own street.</p>
28.1	1	<p>I am writing to object to the 2 'no waiting at any time' proposed restrictions. I currently own a house on Grovehill Road and I specifically object to the current proposal to remove the current no parking between 10-11 and replace with the 'no parking at any time' restriction on the lower & mid parts of Grovehill. The main issue I have with this proposal is you are penalizing residents as opposed to supporting them which I believe is one of your clear mandates. The issue which you are not tackling and have failed to tackle despite multiple attempts and petitions in recent years, is that non residents (including commuters, people flying from Gatwick, shoppers) take up the majority of parking in the road to avoid paying for parking elsewhere. This leaves residents, who pay a premium to live near to the station and town centre, at a disadvantage which this proposal will only worsen. The clear solution which we have requested and many other councils in similar such roads and areas deploy is residents parking where the cost to administrate can be covered by the annual cost to residents for their own parking and through the sale of additional parking. I have made the assumption you do not already offer residents parking anywhere else otherwise I assume it would already be in place. I have recently built an extension to my house and have received two complaints which the planning team told me had to be taken seriously by the council, investigated and responded to. This took up time and incurred cost to me personally even though the complaints were in fact not upheld, however I agree with that basic and fundamental principle in the right to object and that the council should take the objection seriously and investigate it fully. Please can I ask that you do the same with this objection. What you are proposing penalizes local residents, the very people you aim to support and simply does not address or resolve the core issue. By putting in place residents parking you would provide a balanced solution ensuring local residents can park by their homes as they should expect, whilst resolving the current safety concerns which I recognise are important. I look forward to your investigation and response into this matter</p>
29.1, 30.1	2	<p>As a homeowner on Grovehill Road I object to the 2 'no waiting at any time' proposed restrictions. Efforts to increase safety for pedestrians and reduce the overcrowding of cars on the street is indeed required. However, I object to the current proposals as the 'no parking at any time' restriction on the lower & mid parts of Grovehill as these would cause a huge negative impact on residents and penalise homeowners as opposed to tackling the crux of the issue. The number of parking spaces versus the number of households without off road parking and the volume of commuters that use the street needs to be addressed. Residents parking (as requested multiple times / petitioned for in recent years) is required else residents will never be able to park anywhere near their homes and our properties will be devalued as a direct result of the restrictions. Fundamentally I object the removal of the current 'no parking between 10-11am' restriction on the lower part of Grovehill to become 'no parking at any time' as it currently provides residents a limited degree of flexibility for loading and unloading children, shopping and the like plus gives us a place to park when the commuters take up all 90% of the available spaces when we do the school run etc. I object the 'no waiting at any time' proposal on the mid part of Grovehill for the sheer volume of spaces this would remove from the street and I would propose a 'no parking between 10-11am' restriction to give residents flexibility as detailed above. I also question that if these two areas of Grovehill Road are a problem then why is the VERY SAME issue being ignored on the top area of the road between Upperbridge road and Linkfield Street?!? The turning off Linkfield onto Grovehill is an exceptionally dangerous blind spot and pedestrians on that part of Grovehill are also forced to walk on the road, arguably more treacherously than the lower to mid parts. Fundamentally commuters need to be encouraged to use the 'pay for' spaces provided by the council and residents need to be prioritised to be able to park nearby their own homes. Addressing this would resolve the current safety issue without it being to the detriment to the homeowners who have paid a premium to live in close proximity to the town centre.</p>

Response
 We acknowledge that there is demand from some streets in Redhill and other areas across the borough for permit parking schemes. This is something we will be investigating and looking to address in due course. We do not feel able to accommodate this within the current parking review however as this would required us to 're-advertise' the proposals which will extend considerably the completion date of the review as well as incurring additional costs.

Recommendations
 Cancel proposals and re-consider alongside a permit scheme in due course.

ITEM 9

Location:	Kendal Close, Windermere Way, Conniston Way, Penrith Close - Redhill	
Location number	30	
Drawings	18064	
Objection	4	
Support	1	
Other comment	4	
Total correspondence	9	

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
72.1	1	I object to the proposed full parking restrictions outside No. 4 Kendal Close and on the opposite side of the road because along with the other proposed restrictions in Kendal Close and Windermere Way, we will have to compete with the increasing number of road users to receive deliveries and to allow friends and family to visit us without having to walk some distance. I have not seen the evidence that the Council has collected to support the proposals but based on over 20 years experience of observing the daily violation of the existing restrictions (including the unsightly and ineffective road bollards) and the conclusion that I have reached is that the proposals will not have any marked effect on the actions of parents and others who collect and drop children at Wray Common school but will have a serious inconvenience to residents who observe the present restrictions. Residents already have a range of negative impacts caused by increased school use. The main reason for the ineffectiveness of the current and proposed restrictions is (will be) the complete lack of inspection, enforcement and appropriate action by the appointed authorities under their current legal powers. This is despite numerous verbal and written requests to the police, the school and to R & B Council to take action based on evidence given of the regular offenders who violate the restrictions. What we currently find is that regular offenders cars park on double yellow lines, mount the pavements even whilst people and children are using them, park on the pavements restricting the use of the pavements particularly by pushchairs and are generally abusive if residents try to collect evidence. The correct cause of action is to first enforce the present restrictions by those officers with the powers to act. The evidence indicates that there is a strong business case to allocate those officers with the powers to act, take the necessary action and to easily recover the associated costs of allocating the appropriate resources. Until the authorities use their powers to consistently enforce the current parking restrictions, the proposed enhanced restrictions as designed will only serve to cause additional inconvenience to residents in Kendal Close and elsewhere.
73.1	1	I am a resident of the above road near to wray common school. I have seen the proposals to extend the double yellow lines. Since the council approved the addition of extra classes the parking situation has deteriorated resulting in a dangerous parking situation at the peak times of 8 until 9.15 and 2.30 until 3.45. Often it is very difficult to get into or out of the road during these times. Whilst I appreciate efforts to improve the situation, I have grave doubts that increasing the number of double yellows will make any difference at all, unless they are enforced more regularly and cars are ticketed. The current restrictions are constantly ignored by some parents. Today at 3 pm there were at least 4 cars parked on the double yellow lines, one of these was a Reigate and Banstead registered taxi! This is a daily occurrence. Unless the enforcement of the restrictions is improved by spot checks say 2 times per month with fines being given there is little point spending more money painting yet more lines.
74.1	1	I have viewed the proposals for alterations to parking restrictions in Kendal Close and Windermere Way, and would like to make the following comments. I believe that the proposed alteration to restrictions would not be effective unless properly enforced. There is currently no enforcement of the existing restrictions, and I believe a Freedom of Information Act request would confirm this. Members of the public currently park on the double yellow lines at this location with impunity. I anticipate a continuance of this, irrespective of any alterations to the parking restrictions. Extending the parking restrictions will in my opinion be a total waste of public funds, unless supported by robust enforcement.
94.1	1	To: Mr David Curl. I think your ideas are good. But as the parking situation has become so intolerable in these named roads, I feel your proposals do not go far enough. I would suggest a single yellow line, down one side of both roads, with 'no parking between 8.0 - 9.30' & again 'between 3.0 - 4.30' (This has been done in Hustleigh Drive, Redhill & has been very successful).
40.1	1	If you restrict parking here then the traffic will have a nice clear path and will speed up. Children should be able to walk to school independently but this proposal benefits car drivers and residents and will be dangerous for children walking. The best way to improve congestion in this spot is to close the Wray Common school's drop off 'D' so traffic is deterred from driving right up to the school
41.1	1	Dear, I would like to express my disappointment about two areas: 1. Kendall Close: I believe parking restrictions around Wray Common School are quite tight already. Although I understand parking restrictions are needed to keep children safe while walking to school, I also would like the Council to consider that this works the other way around as well: people dropping off their children, especially with younger siblings joining the school-age children, should be given the opportunity to park a little bit closer by so as to minimise the travel length to the school and to minimise the risk for accidents. 2. Lynwood Road: This road has campaigned (heavily) for over 15 years now to have some parking restrictions implemented, but these requests are never heard. Signatures were collected to show that 98% of the residents were behind a change much alike the residents parking schemes implemented in Horley. Lynwood Road is the only road within walking distance to the station and the town centre where no parking restrictions apply, and as a resident it is impossible to park in the road between 8.15 am and 5 pm, as the road is inundated with commuters. This road is full of young families who desperately need the parking to get the children home safely. In addition, commuters often park blocking access to drive ways (although some houses do not have drive ways and NEED on-street parking) and parking in the turning point at the end of the road (dead end road). I would hope that residents, in exchange for paying ALOT of council tax, are heard and consulted when parking schemes are implemented and I am extremely disappointed that Lynwood Road does not even feature in this review.

ITEM 9

86.1	1	I live at the junction of Kendal Close and Windermere Way. I regularly observe the difficulty and chaos which occurs on a regular basis as a result of the parking and traffic flow. Since you increased the size of the school (Wray Common) the traffic has become much worse. I welcome your interest to improve the situation. I wonder how giving no restrictions to parking at the entrance to Windermere Way will help, as cars would then be able to park on both sides all day. Why not extend the green line parking along Windermere, between Coniston and Kendal to enable free flow to and from the school and avoid jams. (which currently can back onto Coniston) However, creating a car park along the road by the common, with a footpath giving access to the school from the north, would greatly simplify the matter.
44.1	1	My son attends Wray Common School. The local council have insisted that the school accept more pupils. As the school is in a built up area it can get clogged up in the mornings and afternoons. But to put parking restrictions in this area without offering alternative areas to park is shocking. This is a primary school therefore the little children need to be taken to school and parents have to then drive to work, thus needing their cars. We as parents are being penalised for the decision made by the council to expand the amount of pupils at the school. This is unacceptable and should not be enforced.
47.2	1	I would first like to say that I am pleased that some extra parking restrictions are proposed to be introduced near Wray Common School, which will hopefully make it safer for my children going to and from school. We usually walk but there is a lot of crazy driving and parking/driving on pavements which has resulted in near misses at times.

Response
We have developed these proposals following a very large number of complaints from parents at the school, and in consultation with representatives from the school. The proposals help ease congestion and dangerous parking, allowing the safe movement of vehicles and pedestrians. We have retained some of the parking between Windermere Way and Coniston Way in order to help suppress traffic speeds, although this could be reviewed in future if this section is deemed problematic. The section on Kendal Close between the school and Windermere Way should be clear during 'school times', but allows for parking on one side outside of these times. Although this does remove some flexibility for residents, most have very significant off-street parking areas, and parking is readily available throughout the area outside of 'school times'.

Recommendations
Introduce 'as advertised'.

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Linkfield lane - Redhill
Location number	31
Drawings	18063, 18066

Objection	0
Support	0
Other comment	2
Total correspondence	2

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
42.1	1	I have looked at the proposed plans for parking restrictions, I notice that restrictions are only between 10-12. You are obviously stopping the commuter parking but not the school parking. There is a large car park within a few minutes of the school, why can't a part of this be used for the school, it is away from the road traffic, on the same side as the school so much safer for the children and would make life for residents who pay large council rates a lot safer when trying to turn onto what must be the most narrow part of Linkfield Lane, I'm sure that if parents were given the option they would pay a small yearly amount for a permit for the car park, has the option ever been put to them?
82	1	Proposals to introduce 'no waiting 10am - 12 noon' will not help parents wishing to collect whildren from nursery school at 11:45 am.

Response
Although the objection does not say, we assume the car park mentioned is the Gloucester Road car park. Parents are able to use this car park, but we have no powers to 'force' people to use it.

Recommendations
Introduce a revised proposal replace proposed 'no waiting 10am - 12 noon' with 'no waiting Monday - Friday 10am - 11am'.

ITEM 9

Location:	Linkfield Street - Redhill
Location number	32
Drawings	18068

Objection	0
Support	0
Other comment	1
Total correspondence	1

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
47.1	1	A while ago some new parking restrictions were implemented on the lower part of the street and around corners of roads off of Linkfield Street. This caused the parking problem to move to the top of the street. During the week cars, presumably from people working in Redhill, are parked from the brow of the hill all the way down except in front of driveways. This causes a lot of road rage as the whole hill effectively becomes a one lane road. At rush hour in the afternoon you really don't want to be outside the front of my house. Some of the language and name calling is not fit for childrens ears. In addition to all this aggravation, it is dangerous. I have many times witnessed cars driving all the way up the hill on the pavement as this is the only way they can get passed. This has also caused several near misses involving pedestrians that I have heard about. My eldest child walks to and from secondary on her own and my middle child will be doing this come September. I worry about their safety. Is it going to take a horrible accident before some planning is put into place to stop this crazy parking on the brow of the hill. Please do something about the parking issues at the top end of Linkfield Street and also provide more parking in Redhill for the workers who drive in. Linkfield Street is not a carpark!

Response
We do not feel able to accommodate this within the current parking review however as this would required us to 're-advertise' the proposals which will extend considerably the completion date of the review as well as incurring additional costs. Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location should request that it is added to our next parking review. The police do have powers to deal with dangerous/obstructive parking without the need for parking controls.

Recommendations
None. Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Ranelagh Road, Shrewsbury Road, Brownlow Road j/w Hatchlands Road; Shrewsbury Road, Brownlow Road j/w Whitepost Hill; Whitepost Hill;	
Location number	33	
Drawings	18068, 18077	
Objection	3	
Support	0	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	3	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
31.1	1	My main concerns on road safety: Hatchlands road needs parking restrictions but more so requires speed restrictions and a safe crossing. There are 4 churches, pre school, access to schools, shops, pub, vets and several other facilities. With it being a busy road children and adults need to be able to cross in safety and cars must be restrained on speed.
32.1	1	We object to the proposal for parking restrictions on the corner of Hatchlands rd. and Brownlow str. There is a limited amount of parking as it stands for the people working across the street in the law courts. The restrictions you propose will only make the situation worse. I also cannot see why these restrictions are proposed as the current situation does not impact at all with the flow of traffic? It is hard enough to find parking during the day as it is and adding restrictions to the area will only make it worse.
44.2	1	As a resident of Shrewsbury Road I object to the plans for double yellow lines. Although I have off street parking, many of my neighbours do not and therefore where are they supposed to park. Also, when we have visitors it will be impossible for them to park either on Hatchlands Road or Whitepost Hill. This has not been thought out properly. If you take away parking then you should offer an alternative area to park in. There is absolutely no need at all to have yellow lines in this road.
Response		
Most junctions have been treated with double yellow lines 10 metres from the junction which is the recommended minimum distance as given in the Highway Code, so these lengths should be retained. Parking at the junctions causes problems for vehicles entering and exiting the junction and blocks sightlines compromising safety.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

<u>Location:</u>		Hatchlands Road, Whitepost Hill, Blackborough Road (Reigate), The Chase (Reigate), Blackstone Hill (Reigate) - Redhill
Location number	34	
Drawings	18078	
Objection	11	
Support	1	
Other comment	3	
Total correspondence	15	

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
93.1	1	RE THE PROPOSAL TO RESTRICT PARKING ON THE ROADS SURROUNDING THE TRIANGULAR PIECE OF LAND BOUNDED BY THE ABOVE STREETS, WHILST THIS IS WELCOME THE CONSEQUENCE OF THIS PROPOSAL WILL BE TO ENCOURAGE DRIVERS TO PARK ELSEWHERE. THEREFORE, PLEASE CONSIDER IMPOSING A BAN ON PARKING AROUND THE JUNCTION OF BLACKSTONE HILL WITH THE CHASE AND WHITEPOST HILL, AS WELL AS ALONG THE SOUTH SIDE OF WHITEPOST HILL BETWEEN BLACKSTONE HILL AND SHREWSBURY ROAD. FAILURE TO IMPOSE THIS RESTRICTION WILL FURTHER INCREASE THE NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS ALONG THIS STRETCH OF BUSY ROAD.
54	1	Objection from Redhill United Reformed Church. Concerns regarding reduction of available provision for various users groups such as mothers and children, people attending services, afternoon and evening activities such as scouts etc, choral societies. Concerned that if people can not park nearby then users will attend events elsewhere and this will impact on the viability of the church. Suggest leaving the section of Blackborough Road opposite the church as it is, or only restricted Mon-Fri 8am-6pm.
58	1	Proposals will remove much needed parking for local residents and businesses - particularly the area in front of 47 - 51 Hatchlands Road. This will encourage speeding. Local businesses that will be affected include Hatch Pub, the dentist and the clinic. The two churches will also be negatively affected. Parking will be displaced into surrounding roads and cause congestion there.
59	1	Proposals will remove much needed parking for local residents and businesses - particularly the area in front of 47 - 51 Hatchlands Road. This will encourage speeding and compromise the safety of the junction. It will also have a negative effect on the environment as more vehicular traffic is encouraged. It will damage our quality of life and right to a family life, reduce access to property, compromise security as our car will not longer be outside our house, and we will be forced to consider off street parking at our cost. Parking will be displaced into surrounding roads and cause congestion there. Other measures to improve the area should be considered such as traffic calming, pedestrian crossing points, residents parking, or encouraging residents to construct off street parking areas.
15.1	1	People parking opposite the church is dangerous on the junction of Whitepost Hill, I fully support the long overdue proposed parking restrictions.
16.1	1	I have operated Jo Jingles pre school music and movement classes for 3 months to 5 year old children at the United Reformed Church Hall in Blackborough Road where the parking restrictions have been proposed for the last 16 years. There is nowhere else in the immediate vicinity for parents to park whilst they attend the classes which are from 9.00am to 3 pm on 3 days of the week. Blackborough Road, Devon Crescent, The Chase and Blackstone Hill are all extremely busy with parked vehicles even at 9.00am (Blackborough Road mostly with vehicles for the police station I understand!) so there is already a severe lack of parking for people coming to the church, the local vet, counseling offices and family planning clinic, these proposed restrictions would make it much worse if not intolerable. Not only are we there with over 150 children attending during these three days but there are other activities at the church in other rooms, who would also have parking issues for their clients. The impact of these proposed parking restrictions would be significant on four fronts. Firstly it would force dozens of local mums with buggies, pushchairs and just walking children to try and park much further from the church and be forced to walk several hundred metres, cross several roads in often very bad weather during the winter to get to the Church Hall, significantly increasing the possibility, even likelihood of accidents. Secondly we would no doubt lose a lot of our customers costing us a significant proportion of our income forcing us to leave Redhill as a venue, losing a long standing local small business serving the community. Thirdly the church would lose hall hire fees which is a major part of how they fund the maintenance of the hall and church which could cause them serious funding issues for the future. Fourthly, the local residents would probably be up in arms when they realise this proposal will shunt a significant number of cars into their local roads as many people try to park in their roads to get as close to the Shaws Corner services they are trying to use. Whilst I understand what the proposals are trying to achieve I do not believe this proposal will solve the local issue, provide parking for the area instead.
17.1	1	I am objecting to the proposed implementation of no waiting at any time road markings on Blackborough Road on the opposite side of the road to the church. The church and church hall are in frequent use throughout the week and weekend, both in the day and the evening. It is used as a church and also for a number of groups, including mother and baby groups and youth groups. The majority of the people using it park along Blackborough Road and, when these spaces are full, they park on Devon Crescent. This makes it difficult at times to park outside or near to our house. If the users of the church and church hall are not able to park on Blackborough Road they will without doubt park on Devon Crescent making it much more difficult for the residents to park.
18.1	1	I wish to object to the proposed lies round the health centre block in Blackborough Road and The Chase opposite Redhill United Reformed Church (shown as St Paul's on the map). Church users already have very little parking space and many of those using the premises, particularly in the evening, are elderly and cannot walk far so preventing parking at any time will further restrict community use by the church. I have two suggestions firstly, to put a single line in Blackborough Road to stop parking between 8.30 a.m. and 6.00 p.m. This is the busy time when there is most congestion. The better suggestion is to make the Health Centre island one way. By doing that you will be able to keep parking both sides of Blackborough Road.

ITEM 9

21.1	1	<p>Whilst we support the need for parking restrictions in the Roads surrounding the Health Centre at Shaws Corner, we are concerned that they will further increase parking in Devon Crescent which is already under pressure from the Citroen car showroom and the Hatch Public House. We have also observed an increasing number of cars parked during the day, presumably by staff from businesses in the area. The result is very limited on street parking for residents. It is reasonable to conclude that many other side roads in the area suffer the same levels of non-resident parking and in supporting the need for more rigorous controls we believe that they must be accompanied by the introduction of resident parking schemes to ensure that the problem is not merely moved from the main roads to the residential side streets. The problem in Devon Crescent is further complicated by the fact that it is used during peak hours as a 'short cut' to avoid the junction at the War Memorial.</p>
33.1	1	<p>Please note our objection to this proposal as it will penalise local residents, who will still need to park their cars near to their properties. Shaw's Corner, contains a Church, Chapel, Vets, Pub, Orthodoxist and a Clinic, all of whom receive visitors. Introducing a yellow line scheme, will merely move the traffic / parking issue elsewhere. I do believe there is some merit in introducing yellow lines on the corners of Shrewsbury & Brownlow Rds as it is difficult to exit these roads safely. Please also note that the Council has previously refused permission to alter our own properties to accommodate parking spaces. We would therefore be grateful if you could consider the needs of residents and the local community before you progress with this.</p>
34.1	1	<p>By removing car parking you will increase the speed of traffic onto white post hill and blackborough road. Currently the speed of traffic is too high and it does not need to be increased as this proposal will. If this proposal goes ahead either residents parking should be introduced or traffic calming measures added to bring the speed down. Further pedestrian crossing accesses should be introduced to allow easy access across the A25 near to the war memorial as it will be harder to cross than it is now with no parking along the road. Not really a thought out or integrated plan.</p>
36.1	1	<p>Main concern is around road safety: 1. Parking restrictions will clear some of the pavements of cars and make it easier for pedestrians to walk on the pavement, but will allow cars to continue to speed along Hatchlands Road. Traffic calming measures are desperately needed. 2. My house (number) is outside of the new parking restrictions and therefore I will continue to have great difficulty in getting my car out of the drive. Can the restrictions come up to my house? Cars coming off the A25 to go up Whitepost hill or Blackborough road already speed up at this point. Again could we have traffic calming as lack of parked cars will make it easier to speed. 3. There is no crossing on Hatchlands Road between Reigate Grammar school and the Donyns leisure centre, despite there being a pub, dentist, 4 churches, vets, law courts, allotments with cut through to schools, shops on Reffels Bridge etc on this Road. Parking restrictions will allow cars to speed more and make it even harder to cross. Please can you consider a pedestrian crossing on Hatchlands Road with all the parking restrictions that accompany this, as part of this parking review?</p>
37.1, 38.1	2	<p>I understand that the Council proposes parking restrictions for the reasons set out in the Statement of Reasons. With respect, these are not sufficiently detailed reasons and to the extent that reasons are made out they are not necessary and proportionate reasons in the public interest to justify the damage that would result. Reducing parking in this area is not sensible. The reasons given in the Statement of Reasons consider only the effect that parking restrictions would have on vehicle users, passing through this residential area. The thrust of the argument is to reduce parking in order to increase traffic flow. This ignores the relevant considerations of local residents and businesses, environmental concerns raised by increased traffic, and pedestrian safety. Local businesses will be affected by parking restrictions, including the Hatch Pub and the Dentist on Hatchlands Road, who have no off street parking. In addition, two local churches (the Baptist Church and the United Reformed Church – neither of which have car parks) hold services on Sundays and during the week that raise the demand for parking substantially. The Council has not considered this. Lastly, parking restrictions will simply displace parking into neighbouring roads and cause severe congestion and adverse effects by doing so. This is a residential area where parking is already at a premium. The proposals would seriously affect the quality of life of local residents and this has not been properly considered.</p>
46.1	1	<p>While I welcome the Council's attempts to restrict parking near junctions for safety reasons, I am not confident that the consequences of introducing DYLS in the roads surrounding my street have been fully anticipated. Devon Crescent will remain the only residential street in this immediate area with no parking restrictions. We are used to people using our street for parking during the day but this is largely for users of the United Reformed Church at Shaw's Corner which offers a variety of community activities. Customers at the Hatch pub also park here. Neither the church nor the pub have car parks. However, my objection is that Redhill station users and people who work in Redhill will avoid paying parking fees by parking on our street from early in morning until well into the evening. It is already a well used cut-through to avoid the busy Hatchlands Road junction in rush hour and it will now become an unofficial long-stay car park! I fully support the introduction of more DYLS in this area - on Elm Road particularly where many drivers show totally lack of consideration for safety and inconveniencing others, but there needs to be some protection built-in for Devon Crescent residents and some measures to deter commuter parking. We are a one-car family and have off-road parking so I do not need to use parking on the road personally. However, the narrowness of the road, its canver and the steep entrance from Reigate Road, (not to mention its proximity to the sharp bend on the A25 which has caused many accidents) mean that it is already a difficult road for residents to access. Please take these factors into account before implementing these proposals.</p>
Response		

ITEM 9

Given the points raised, we believe that proposals outside 47-51 Hatchlands road can be removed for the amenity of local residents, and recognise that the parking here may help slow traffic.

The parking occurring on the section of Blackborough Road narrows the carriageway and footway, and causes damage to the footway and services underneath. Furthermore, driving on the footway is dangerous, and illegal. This is a busy road and it is not wide enough to accommodate parking safely on both sides. Therefore we believe that this should go ahead as planned. Parking is still un-restricted on the western side of the road which also provides a traffic calming effect.

Requests for traffic calming and pedestrian crossing points are outside of the scope of this parking review, however such requests can be investigated by the area highway team.

We carry out regular reviews of parking and can look at any displacement issues that may result due to the implementation of new controls in a future parking review. We do not believe that further proposals should be considered as part of this review as this would required us to 're-advertise' the proposals which will extend considerably the completion date of the review as well as incurring additional costs. Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location should request that it is added to our next parking review.

Recommendations

Introduce a revised proposal as described above. See revised drawing in Annex 2.

ITEM 9

Location:	Alma Road, Beverley Heights, Sheridan Drive - Reigate	
Location number	37	
Drawings	18082, 18165	
Objection	3	
Support	2	
Other comment	6	
Total correspondence	11	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
49.1	1	The Governing Body of Holmesdale Community Infant School are in favour of the proposed changes in the parking regulations in Alma Rd, as they believe that they will ease congestion outside the school during drop off and pick up times. They continue to be concerned over the lack of pavement to the north of the school as it means that parents and children are having to walk in the road.
50.1, 51.1	2	Object to the proposal to allow parking northern side of Alma Road between Wray Park Road and Holmesdale Community Infant School. Parking here creates a danger for cyclists.
50.1, 51.1	2	Object to the proposal to allow parking northern side of Alma Road between Wray Park Road and Holmesdale Community Infant School. When cars park here at the moment, it creates a danger for pedestrians with a risk of car doors coming into contact with them, and will create problems for vehicular traffic queuing to get into the school car park
52.1	1	Support the proposals to apply no waiting at any time on Alma road near to the war memorial and St Marks church. These changes will ensure that the pavements are not obstructed and improve the ability of pedestrians to walk up and down Alma road.
53.1	1	After the addition of a new reception class in Sep 2012, there has been a discussion between parents and the head of the school regarding extra traffic congestion around the school. To help ease this, parents have requested if some of the parking restrictions could be lifted for around 30-60 mins twice a day to allow parents to pick children up more easily. However, looking at the proposals parking restrictions are being added. This is very disappointing, as it feels that the Highways authority are not supportive of the introduction of the extra class and the lack of parking opportunities around the school. Many parents park illegally on double yellow lines, just to run in and grab their kids in the hope they won't get caught, as often they have more than one school run to do and cannot turn up 30 mins early to park far away and walk due to the lack of time. Please consider altering the restrictions on one side of Alma Road, to allow parents to stop between 8.30-9.00, and 2.45-3.15pm. Then at least it will be controlled chaos, as opposed to illegal chaos!
54.1	1	I object to the proposed single yellow line north of Holmesdale school and the double yellow line at the entrances to Sheridan Drive and Beverley Heights. In your statement of reasons, this proposal is put forward in an attempt to improve/increase space for visitors to the school. It will increase space for pedestrian visitors to the school, however most arrive by car. This proposal will merely move the parking crisis further up Alma Road, if anyone takes notice of the markings, which currently they do not. Unless policed, the additional markings will do nothing to alter the situation. Last year when Holmesdale School were granted permission for temporary classrooms there were conditions imposed on the permission [RE 12/00889]. A revised travel plan was due to be submitted by the school no later than 10/01/2013. The plan was required to mitigate the potential impacts on highway safety and amenity of the additional traffic generated by the proposal. This plan was not submitted, as Surrey County Council are aware. This would indicate to me that neither SCC or Holmesdale School take the issue very seriously and so to impose parking restrictions on the residents of a Residential Area of Special Character for the benefit of the school who are in breach of their planning seems unreasonable. The restrictions impact the neighbourhood for the entire day, all year round, for the benefit of the school whose visitors are present in Alma Road for two 50 minute intervals on 5 days of the week, term time only. As the school is set to increase its PAN from 90 to 120 in September 2014 I think the whole issue with parking at the school needs to be examined in more depth and I do not see this current proposal as the solution. Would it not be better to wait for the travel plan to be submitted together with the application for permanent school extension before making decisions about parking at this location? The proposed double yellow lines on the street corners are unnecessary as parking within 10 metres of a junction is contrary to the Highway Code and is therefore by default, prohibited.
55.1	1	I can understand the proposed changes but think they should go further. Firstly, there should be some restriction opposite Beverley Heights because cars are often parked at this junction. Secondly, there should be limited restriction in Beverley Heights to stop cars being left unattended for days at a time causing difficulty for refuse and delivery vehicles.
8	1	Support the proposals for no waiting 8am - 16.30 Monday - Friday (sic). However restrictions should be extended to cover both sides of the road to Beverley Heights, as the road is narrow at this point, and parked vehicles cause a hazard for pedestrians as there is no footway on either side of the road.
8, 61, 62	3	The continued presence of parked vehicles near number 31 Alma Road reduces space for parents and visitors to the school.
11	1	Proposals only seem to cater for historic problems. As school admissions increase, and more commuters park in the area, problems may overflow into Raglan Road. This issue needs to be addressed.
11	1	The suggested location for the disabled bay in the 'horseshoe' may prove obstructive for both pedestrian and vehicular traffic. It should be relocated to Alma Road.
61, 62	2	Support the proposals. However additional controls are required within Beverley Heights as it is likely the vehicles from Alma Road will be displaced to Beverley Heights. At present, Beverley Heights is well used by parents during pick up and drop off, but it will not be able to cope with this and all day parking too.
Response		

ITEM 9

We believe that the majority of the proposals made are the correct way forward, however, there are significant concerns from local residents regarding potential issues as a result of 'displacement' into Beverley Heights. Therefore we propose not to introduce the 'no waiting 08 am - 6.30 pm, Monday - Friday', and re-consider this element of the proposals along side possible further controls in Beverley Heights under the next review.

Due to points raised regarding the section of proposed 'no waiting 10-11am, Monday - Friday' regarding safety concerns and the fact that this location is regularly used (informally) as a crossing point, we have decided not to go ahead with this.

Following concerns about the location of the proposed bay, and in consultation with the church, we have decided not to proceed with the proposed disabled bay. Blue badge holders may still park on yellow lines for up to three hours with a blue badge displayed.

Other parts of the proposals should go ahead to help with visibility at junctions and traffic flow. Double yellow lines allows enforcement by enforcement officers; without them only the police can take action.

Recommendations

Introduce revised proposal as discussed, see revised drawing in Annex 2.

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Croydon Road - Reigate
Location number	40
Drawings	18081

Objection	1
Support	1
Other comment	2
Total correspondence	4

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
56.1	1	Many of the houses on the left hand side(going into reigate) are victorian house and therefore have no off street parking , the road gets full up with people not from the road taking up the few spots there are at the moment ,if the parking is further reduced then this would have an unfair impact to residents A better plan would be a free residents parking scheme maybe 2 perments and 1 vistors for house's without off street parking and 1 for flats and for houses with off street parking ,this would then reduce the numbers of vehicles parking on the street Or, parking permits available in the fire station car park which is never full , or maybe if the issue is around the fire engines leaving the fire station perhaps in the long term move the fire HQ to a cheaper and geographically better positioned and build senible priced family houses on the site which is not fully utilised by the fire service at the moment and make some money for the council.
57.1	1	Our concern is that we also suffer congestion and road width restrictions due to numerous vehicles, often as many as 7 parking opposite on the north side from the Fire Station onwards. We have photographic evidence of the cars parked on the north side of the road from number 98 if it would be useful. It seems your proposals of restricted parking as outlined will simply move parked cars further up beyond the Fire Station. The same arguments prevail re carriage way restrictions. We have noted the serious inconvenience causes fire enginges, buses and other traffic. Also the danger to mothers with prams negotiating the parked cars on the pavement. In addition it has become extremely hazardous for us to exit driveways.
58.1	1	I am in general support for the extension of the no waiting zone either side of the entrance to the Surrey Fire Station HQ on Croydon Road. However my concern is the impact this will have on parking and road safety north of this location as it will displace residents and visitors who currently park in this location. Over the last few years there has been an increase in the number of cars parked on both sides of Croydon Road as far up as the Coleman Centre. This predomiantly occurs during peak hours but also happens during evening events at the Coleman Centre. When cars are parked on both sides on the stretch of road between the Fire Station and the Coleman Centre road and pedestrian saftey is compromised. As consequence of the speed of traffic on the road cars are forced to park half on and half off the pavement of both sides. On the western pavement this can prevent pedestrians passing. As a resident who parks on a drive off the road it has become practically impossible to enter and exit safely. Visibility is virtually non existant and with traffic hurtling down from the Common (usually unaware that they are in a 30 m/h zone) when cars are parked both sides traffic has to stop in both directions to allow entry and exit for residents on the eastern side of Croydon Road. Whilst I understand the logic for the proposed restrictions this is clear going to compound the problem further up the road. A peak time parking restrictions on the western side of the Croydon Road are desperately required before there is a serious accident. And I fear that it is only a matter of time before there is an accident. Croydon Road needs further restrictions and speed prevention measures to improve resident, pedestrian and road user safety.
63	1	Proposals address a real problem of congestion, however vehicles are now staring to park further up the road towards the Coleman Redland Centre. The parking on the 'odd' side of the road causes great difficulty for large vehicles to pass each other, and creates a danger as vehicles speed up to pass the narrowed section.

Response
We accept that problems may extend further 'up' the road, and consequently believe that the road should be considered again in the next parking review within the borough. We have not received request for permit parking at this location previously, customers wishing to pursue such controls at this location should ensure that it is added to our next parking review. Please note, there would be a charge for permits issued if such a scheme were introduced.

Recommendations
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.

Location:	Doods Road - Reigate
Location number	41
Drawings	18081, 18166

Objection	8
Support	0
Other comment	1
Total correspondence	9

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
59.1, 60.1, 65.1	3	"I object to there being a change to - "no parking or waiting at any time" in Doods road (double yellow lines), on the even numbers side of the road. As there is such limited parking spaces in Doods Road families with children and delivery vans must have the ability to unload I believe that an unloading only restriction on the even numbers side of the road is safe and reasonable.
61.1	1	Whilst I think your review for this road is logical and needed (double yellows on north side of road) I wanted to raise the issue of why the short stretch of single yellow needs to remain? It runs from about 9-13 Doods Road approx. This could relieve some of the pressure that will come from the introduction of the doubles and not compromise safety.
62.1	1	You propose to apply 'no waiting at any time' restrictions up Doods rd. I strongly oppose this, as it would make it almost impossible for suppliers to drop off parcels/ food deliveries etc, as there is rarely any free parking on the other side of the street. Rather than hampering the residents in this way, it would be better to make the other side of the street residents only parking, with a short term voucher system for visitors parking. This would free up space for delivery vans to park by preventing students from the college and other locals from taking most of the spaces during the day. Furthermore, if any amendments are to be done, the whole of Doods road needs to be resurfaced, rather than simply constantly repairing individual potholes - as this is done almost monthly it would surely now be more cost efficient to resurface the road? With the number of heavy trucks that use the street as a short cut, and cars driving up it at high speeds, the surface is rapidly deteriorating.
63.1	1	As Chairman of the Residents Association I have had a number of objections from residents as to the proposed changes in the line markings on the North Side of Doods Road. The parking situation in Doods Road is such that the North side of the road sometimes has to have cars parked in order to unload and deliver, for Ambulances to stop to pick up some of our elderly residents and for children to be dropped off safely. We would request that this facility remains in place and that current restrictions be maintained. We would also request that the Yellow line at the bottom (Croydon Road end) be decommissioned as has been promised by numerous Council officers during my time as Chairman. This line was originally there as there was a Bus Stop and I requested this to be released a number of years ago and was told that someone would come and remove the line. In the interim a council officer actually came and repainted it and when I approached him he told me that he had been told to repaint it instead of removing it. We now have a distinct lack of space in Doods Road for parking due to many houses having dropped kerbs and we would ask that this be addressed as soon as possible.
64.1	1	Much of the proposed double yellow lines on the north side of Doods Road is unnecessary as parking is currently restricted by a single yellow line. This is only rarely ignored and double yellows would change the character of the road giving less of a residential feel. A better solution would be to install width restricting pinch points to inhibit speeding taxis and large heavy lorries. This could be done as part of desperately needed resurfacing work. The addition of a short stretch of double yellow lines to protect the junction of Willmotts Close and Doods Road would be sensible.
66.1	1	The proposal to make one side of Doods Road 'no waiting at any time' is unreasonable. We are already restricted to parking on one side of the street only and there are a large number of commuters who use the local station & students from Reigate college who park in Doods Road already - thus restricting the use for actual residents even further. We all have deliveries from time to time and many of us pick up & drop off kids etc. Where are they supposed to temporarily park?? Please can you consider making the road 'residents permits only' for a period of an hour a day Mon-Fri, (e.g. 9-10am) which will deter commuters & students from parking in Doods Road and actually leave the road for its residents to park. Also, I would like to suggest making the bottom section of the road (from Croydon Road up to Wilmots Close) a weight &/or speed-restricted section. The number of heavy trucks and lorries that thunder up the road making deliveries to the old peoples homes up the top really spoil the residential nature of the road. There are many families with young children in Doods Road and I & many of my neighbours consider the heavy lorries and speeding cars (of which there are many) quite dangerous. The vibrations you can feel in your house when such lorries go past are alarming! While we're at it - please can you consider resurfacing the road - it is well overdue and it seems the council has quite given up on filling in the potholes continuously and has left it to deteriorate. The journey up the road is way too bumpy - you may be getting lots of claims for damage to residents' cars soon unless something is done about it.
67.1	1	The current single yellow lines on the North side of Doods Road work adequately and we only occasionally have problems. Doods Road residents have limited parking and increasing restrictions to 'no waiting at any time' will only worsen parking problems, making life more difficult (and, no doubt, more costly for Doods Road residents). Double yellow lines won't deter larger lorries and 'white vans' parking where they like but they may well deter your average resident from dropping off their shopping, children, elderly relatives etc. It is a restriction which will adversely affect who it is intended to help; it isn't necessary; it isn't what we want, and it wastes money.

Response

ITEM 9

We recognise that the proposals may have a negative effect on some residents on the northern side of the road. The section of single yellow lines was not considered in this review and we do not feel able to change this without re-advertising the proposal which would delay the review and incur additional costs. Customers wishing to progress this suggestion should request that it is added to our next parking review.

Recommendations

Introduce a revised proposal as shown in Annex 2.

<u>Location:</u>	Eversfield Road, Deerings Road, A25 Reigate Road - Reigate
Location number	42
Drawings	18080

Objection	1
Support	0
Other comment	0
Total correspondence	1

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
68.1	1	I completely agree that parking should not be able to take place on the corner of Eversfield and Deerings Rd as it is potentially dangerous, however, the restrictions you are suggesting I believe go too far. Currently they look like you intend to run them across my gate meaning I would not be able to park in front of my gates. I am pregnant and already have two children under the age of 3 and as such have had to buy a large car that is quite difficult to manoeuvre behind the gates. I currently park in front of my gates. I would prefer it if the lines were to run as far as my dropped curb still giving me the option to park in front of my gates. This would still mean a car would not be parked within over 8 metres of the corner thus ensuring drivers would have a clear line of sight round the corner. Also, the proposed stopping point of the current lines would inevitably mean that some cars would park over it slightly and would probably mean I was unable to open my gates fully to reverse in which would leave me absolutely nowhere to park and unload my 3 small children. I hope what I've proposed makes sense - it would seem to allow for safe driving and parking and yet still allow me easy access to my property.

Response
We believe that the proposal can be reduced at the location (north end of Eversfield Road, western side) without compromising road safety.

Recommendations
Introduce a revised scheme with a slightly reduced section of yellow line as discussed. See revised drawing in Annex 2.

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Holmesdale Road (access to Prospects Court) - Reigate	
Location number	44	
Drawings	18085	
Objection	0	
Support	4	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	4	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
69.1, 70.1, 71.1, 48.1	4	Support proposals, currently cars park at the access causing a danger to pedestrians and motorists. Police action has been ineffectual. Double yellow lines will be a significant improvement.
Response		
None.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Lymden Gardens - Reigate	
Location number	45	
Drawings	18168	
Objection	6	
Support	0	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	6	

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
37, 24, 14, 46, 47	5 (incl 1 letter of representation with 23 signatures, and 1 with 13 signatures)	Parking availability for residents is limited; this area already acts as an overflow from surrounding streets. Residents will not have enough space.
37, 24, 46	3 (incl 1 letter of representation with 23 signatures, and 1 with 13 signatures)	Support proposals for double yellow lines on the corners, and in particular the sharp bend in Lymden Gardens.
37, 24, 46	3 (incl 1 letter of representation with 23 signatures, and 1 with 13 signatures)	Proposals will lead to problems receiving deliveries / visitors.
37, 46, 47	3 (incl 1 letter of representation with 23 signatures, and 1 with 13 signatures)	A Monday to Friday 08.30am to 17.30pm (or similar) restriction or 9.00am - 11.30 am would suffice to prevent local shoppers/commuters from parking. Otherwise problems will be displaced into other areas of the estate. (Lymden Gardens and Sheldon Close).
24	1	Removing parking will lead to increased traffic speeds.
24	1	Current arrangements allow for office workers/shoppers to visit the town which supports the local economy.
47	1	Introducing the proposed no waiting at any time will de-value homes.
75.1	1	I agree there is currently a problem with parking. This problem is not one of the residents' making. It is caused by people who work in Reigate and use Lymden Gardens as a convenient and free car park. To make most of Lymden Gardens "no parking at any time" would unfairly penalise the residents, many of whom are two car families. Although every house has a garage, the garages were built in the late 60s and are such that only small cars can be easily parked. To cure the problem, surely a restricted time for parking (say between 10 and 11am) would suffice with, if necessary, residents' parking permits. The current proposal seems extreme and brings to mind the words "sledgehammer" and "nut".

Response
Acknowledge the comments made.
Recommendations
Introduce a revised scheme, shortening some lengths of double yellow line and replacing one section with 'no waiting Monday - Friday 10am-11am'.

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>		Manor Road, Somers Road - Reigate
Location number	46 / 49	
Drawings	18083	
Objection	12	
Support	2	
Other comment	4	
Total correspondence	18	

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
42	1	Support proposals, but yellow lines should extend further west to enable safe exit from no6.
9	1 petition signed by approx 233 signatures	Support for proposals on Somers Road. Request additional spaces on Somers Road to create a chicane effect, change of free parking in St Albans Road to additional 30 min bays (or no waiting 7am-8am). Object to proposals for yellow lines in Manor Road. Based on the requirement for parents to park to pick up/drop off at Micklefield School. (Additional requests outside of parking review remit e.g. crossing point).
76.1	1	The current proposal will merely push the existing inconsiderate and dangerous parking problems further along Manor Road. In particular, it is likely to lead to an increase in people parking close up to and either side of my drive entrance and exit and the drives of my near and opposite neighbours. This would make pulling in and out more dangerous, especially as it is just past the bend in the road. There is a particular problem with Micklefield School parents' parking. This would be better dealt with by changing the parking restrictions outside Micklefield School so as to allow parents to park briefly to collect and drop off their children.
77.1	1	I note that it is proposed to introduce a no waiting zone on the south side of Manor Road. This is intended to run from Monday to Saturday. Whilst I agree that this is required Monday to Friday, there is no need for it on a Saturday as cars do not park in Manor Road for the train, the school or for work generally in Reigate on that day.
78.1	1	Objection: The surrounding area is already under pressure in terms of street parking for local residents during the day and early evening due to local workers and commuters. Has any systems thinking been undertaken to consider the possible unintended consequences for the more immediate areas resulting from restricting parking even more? The parking demand will still be there but the resource will be even more limited and it will become even harder to find parking during the day and early evening. Manor road itself is hardly a busy road leading to what are effectively dead ends. Further, parking in that area to date is unlikely to have affected residents in any tangible manner given that most if not all houses on the road have off street parking. It would be a touch inequitable (or are we not all considered equals in this area?) if others experience yet more pressure / inconvenience in order for those residents to avoid a small problem of on street parking when they have alternative parking options (clear from Google maps) and others in the area have limited options. I would like to understand why it is felt necessary to restrict parking even further in this area in all likelihood to the further inconvenience for the many residents in this area having the only option of using street parking. I would like to know what you think the consequences will be of restricting parking even more in the general area? As Reigate becomes ever busier has any thought been given to the idea of looking into the feasibility of park&ride in the Reigate area to allow residents a bit more slack when it comes to parking?
79.1	1	I object to the parking restrictions proposed on Manor road. There is already limited parking on Somers and St Albans Road due to commuters taking all available spaces. During the school run it is a daily struggle to find any space close to the school. It is understood that 3 additional spaces are being proposed in Somers road which would be gratefully received but still does not alleviate the problem considering the number of cars wanting to park there. Though a long walk from the school (especially for the little children) Manor Road is the only available parking option to parents. Please do not take this away from us and our children. Thank you.
80.1	1	My three children attend Micklefield School. As with many Micklefield families who do not live locally, I have no option to drive to take and collect my children, aged 3, 5 and 7 years. I have to escort my 3 and 5 year olds into school and wait for the classes to go in. I have to personally receive my children off the teachers at dismissal. Many days, as well as trying to keep hold of my 3 children I am wrestling with gym bags, musical instruments and school bags. It is quite impossible to park near the school as all the spaces are taken up by commuters. The short stay parking should be extended in Somers Road to enable us to drop off and pick up safely and to park within a reasonable distance of the school. The existing parking in St Albans Road should be restricted and made no parking between the hours of 7am and 8am to make it less attractive to commuters and more available to the school teachers who otherwise have no parking and to parents doing the school run. The parking in Manor Road should be likewise restricted between the hours of 7am and 8am, not between the house of 8am and 6.30pm as proposed.
81.1	1	I am writing in support of the proposed no waiting restrictions Monday - Saturday, 08.00 - 18.30 hours along the south side of Manor Road, and also with the proposed extensions of no waiting at any time on the south side of Manor Road and the north side of Somers Road. At present, vehicles park on both sides of Manor Road. The road itself bends right and then left when approached from Somers Road. The combination of parked cars, together with the bends prevents any traffic travelling east down Manor Road to be seen by vehicles travelling from Somers Road into Manor Road until they meet head on. Residents of Manor Road find it impossible to see whether any vehicle is approaching from either direction as they attempt to leave their driveways, due to loss of visibility caused by the parked cars and have to trust that any approaching vehicle will stop. Drivers emerging from Pilgrims Way or Nutley are unable to see whether a vehicle is coming east from Manor Road. By restricting parking on the south side of Manor Road, oncoming vehicles will be visible both from the east and the west and will be able to pass each other.

82.1	1	<p>My son goes to Micklefield School and I have no option but to drive him to and from school. Restricting the parking areas around the school and local roads is not helpful for when we have to drop off and pick up. Some of us have no option but to travel a distance to the school as the schooling entry system has been limited and we are unable to secure places at the state schools we wanted in the first place and we are having to pay for the privilege now as the council have already been too slow at recognising the shortage of primary school places. To further penalise those of us who have to travel to be able to provide our children with the education they deserve by placing more parking restrictions and creating more hurdles and disruption to the beginning and end of the school day is thoughtless. I see your changes as another way you have created to earn money by sending out more wardens at key times especially in the afternoons and this is just unfair. Some of us work and have to leave work to allow sufficient time to get to the school to pick up and having further parking restrictions now means I may need to leave work earlier which will impact my pay just so I can get to school in good time to pick my son up. I question whether your parking proposals are looking at safety or just another way to potentially earn money. I appreciate that 3 new short term spaces will be provided in Somers Road near the school which will be of a help but at the the detriment of the removal of other longer term spaces which in my view should remain where they are!</p>
83.1	1	<p>As a parent of a Micklefield child, I find the proposals to limit parking in Manor Road really frustrating and objectionable. It is hard enough as it is to find somewhere to stop for a few minutes to drop off/pick up my child - without places being further reduced. I know the Council plans to put 3 more 30 min bays in Somer's Road, but this is a drop in the ocean of what is needed. Why not put metered parking all the way down Somer's Road opposite the school? You could limit it to 20 minutes. And the council would make money. Parents wouldn't mind paying to park - it's preferable to the wardens who cynically patrol at drop off/pick up times to nab them. We have no choice but to park illegally at the moment. So why not make it easy for us and make money for the council by putting in meters?</p>
87.1	1	<p>Like many parents on this side of Redhill, we have opted to send our daughter to school privately to Micklefield in Reigate. It has become increasingly difficult to park safely in order to drop off and collect our children. Our daughter is at the end of Year 1 which means that I still need to leave the car and see her through the school gates in the morning. The parking is so limited on Somers Road that it is difficult to do this quickly and traffic wardens are inclined to pounce all too eagerly. Please make it easier for us to transport our children safely to school. The changes to Manor Road will also affect us as there will be less parking there. Our children's safety is of paramount importance and this includes them being seen safely into school in the morning.</p>
88.1	1	<p>I am a parent to Micklefield children and I extremely concerned about the parking situation (or lack of!) on Somers Road and the councils proposals. If this does go ahead, all those who drive to school will feel the impact of these new regulations. Parking is already a struggle and this would leave us in a worse position. Especially with the changes to restrictions on Manor Road where parking will be limited, making it more difficult for us to park near the school. The only extra bit of parking that is being proposed in the consultation, is space for ONLY three extra cars outside of Micklefield with 30 mins waiting - and absolutely no more - so we will still have to face the gamut of traffic wardens on a regular basis and we will also be experiencing a net reduction in spaces in Manor Road overall. So in fact we will be worse off, when it comes to parking. The point being emphasised is there is a real risk of a child being killed, because sensible parking and road safety provision is not being sufficiently provided. The development is another increase in weight of traffic at an already over weight location. Now with traffic assured to be directly crossing the pavement, both from the flats and the shopping.</p>
89.1	1	<p>I am disappointed to see the proposals do not provide any consideration for the parents and children at Micklefield School. Somers Road has traffic passing at excessive speed. This is very dangerous especially at the time of the school runs (between 07:50 and 08:40 and between 15:00 and 15:45) with traffic flying past at speeds of at least 30mph - 40mph plus in some cases. There is no pedestrian crossing at all to help the pupils to school safely. Something similar to the current crossing in London Road would work well to slow traffic and help children cross safely. Further more there is next to no parking available to parents bringing their kids to school from further afield. I cycle my child to school but am forced to collect him in the car - because of my working hours there is no parking available within a walkable distance at collection time. A timed period which allows people to wait during school run hours along Somers Road would alleviate this. I also see the proposals actually reduce this along Manor Road which will only serve to make the situation worse. The fact that the old Surrey Mirror site sits there with parking blocked off just adds insult to injury! Why can this site not be used to provide some sort of facility to the local businesses and parking for the school? I would appreciate if a safe crossing was considered highest priority for the area outside Somers Park and the provision of a wait period allowed during school run hours as the next priority. This would go a long way to provide an environment which both provides for the needs of the community while keeping everyone safe protecting the setting of the road. Thank you.</p>
90.1	1	<p>Important road for parking during the school drop off and pick up</p>
91.1	1	<p>Parent of Micklefield School pupil and 2 prospective pupils. Not enough parking for parents to safely deliver their children to school. Commuters use spaces when they should be using station car park - there should be far more 30 mins spaces available in the vicinity. Somers Road is extremely dangerous due to Council's lack of road safety measures near the school. Fatality waiting to happen.</p>

ITEM 9

92.1	1	<p>This relates to Somers Road, Manor Road and St Albans Road in Reigate. Although I do not reside in Reigate my Granson attends Micklefield School on the extremely busy Somers Road. I frequently take and collect him from that school and find the parking/dropping off arrangements totally unacceptable and downright dangerous. The road appears to be a cut through with commuters speeding through. There are insufficient parking places close and because the children are very young one has to stop, park and take the children carefully across the road and wait while they are taken into school. One cannot just briefly stop and drop the children off as one can do if they are older. This situation is compounded by train commuters taking up most of the parking places and the extremely over-zealous attitude of the parking wardens. They show no sympathy or consideration for the difficulties. To plan to provide just 15 metres of extra 30 mins parking spaces close to school is both miserly and inappropriate for such a busy area. Moreover, I understand you intend to make the situation even worse by implementing parking restrictions (single yellow lines) along part of Manor Road, where I and many Micklefield parents park to walk the children to school. On top of this, the Council appears to have done nothing so far to put in place speed restrictions or traffic calming measures outside or near the school. This present situation is putting the lives of children at risk and the overall situation is an accident waiting to happen. Please take into consideration the above issues, amend your plans appropriately and put in place a safe and acceptable solution for both the residents and parents and children on these roads.</p>
25	1	<p>Comments from Governors of Micklefield School. The school has introduced a number of safety improvements. Support the proposed 30 min bays in Somers Road. Do not support the introduction of such restrictions into St Albans Road (not currently proposed), where the current arrangements should be retained. Suggestions to re-locate the school sign and erect a new wig-wag sign.</p>

Response

We understand that being able to park for school pick up and drop offs is important to parents of children at the school, and that parking is under pressure from a number of different user groups including residents, staff, and commuters. We therefore consider it appropriate to reduce the times of the single yellow line on Manor Road to 'Monday - Friday, 10am-11am'. This will prevent the all day parking which causes problems for residents of the road, but means that space may be available for parents at 'school times', and for residents of the area that do not have off street parking.

We will not be able to consider the request for further changes (such as additional spaces on Somers Road or St Alban's Road) as part of the current review, as such significant changes would require us to re-advertise the proposals which would mean delaying the whole review by several months and adding additional costs to the process. These suggestions will be considered in our next review of parking in the borough.

Other suggestions such as school signage/wigwags and crossings have been referred to the Area Highways Team.

Recommendations

Introduce a revised proposal on Manor Road, 'no waiting Monday - Friday, 10am-11am'. Introduce remaining proposals 'as advertised'.

<u>Location:</u>	Reigate Road - Reigate	
Location number	48	
Drawings	18079	
Objection	0	
Support	1	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	2	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
84.1	1	I support 100% the proposed restriction on parking at any time on Reigate Road on the brow of the hill near Ringley Park Road. The practice of parking there by people who should know better has made it extremely fortunate that no one has been killed or seriously injured. I would strongly recommend that the restriction is also extended in the other direction towards Redhill at least as far as the Police Station, as there has recently been a tendency for workers to park there, which is also very dangerous. Many thanks for your consideration.
85.1	1	We Support the extension of the No Waiting at Any Time restrictions to the west of the junction with Ringley Park Rd as shown on Plan No 18079 - Project 3282/R & B However there is also a problem with parked vehicles also to the east of the junction. These cars are obscuring the sight lines and causing conflict between opposing traffic in the turning lanes marked out on the A.25. Further they cause cyclists to come into conflict with motor vehicles The Residents Assn therefore requests that you also provide an extension of the No Waiting at Any Time restrictions to the EAST of the junction with Ringley park rd and add the detail to the Plan for a similar distance on the east side of the junction
Response		
We can amend the proposals by a small amount - this allows us to avoid the costs and delays associated with re-advertising the proposals.		
Recommendations		
Extend the 'no waiting at any time' to the east along Reigate Road for a length of 10 metres. Introduce remaining proposals 'as advertised'.		

ITEM 9

Location:	Wray Common Road - Reigate
Location number	50
Drawings	18128, 18166

Objection	3
Support	1
Other comment	4
Total correspondence	8

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
43	1	Proposals still allow parking on Wray Common Road between the 'dogleg' and the entrance to The Cedars - this parking here is dangerous.
95.1	1	I am writing on behalf of Harlow Court Limited, which is owned by all the tenants at Harlow Court and manages the property on their behalf. This matter has been discussed at a residents' meeting and I have been asked to convey serious concerns on behalf of all residents. We believe that it is only a matter of time before there is an accident unless action is taken to improve the situation. It is impossible to tell for sure from the map provided but it looks as though no change is planned to extend sightlines around the entrance to Harlow Court, simply the addition of double yellow lines to the existing openings to replace the current white lines. Therefore we object on the grounds that the proposed changes are inadequate and need modification. Increased sightlines are needed in both directions in order to provide for safe exit from this property. Increasing development in the area and additional cars believed to emanate from the Police station means that there are always cars parked up right up to the current restriction on parking around the opening. Often these are high-sided vehicles which completely block all vision for vehicles leaving Harlow Court. Traffic accelerates extremely hard away from the A25 and there have now been many near-misses as traffic exits completely blind from Harlow Court. It would be ridiculous not to resolve this problem as part of a revision of parking restrictions in this area.
96.1	1	I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DOUBLE YELLOW LINES NEAR THE JUNCTION OF REIGATE ROAD DUE TO THE FACT THAT THIS WILL PLACE TOO MUCH PRESSURE ON THE RESIDENTS PARKING AT HARLOW COURT WHERE THERE ARE ALREADY TOO MANY CARS FOR THE AREA AND THEY WILL HAVE NOWHERE ELSE TO PARK. THIS WILL CAUSE TOO MANY PROBLEMS AND NON RESIDENTS MAY START PARKING IN THE PRIVATE GROUNDS OF HARLOW COURT IF THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE PLACE TO PARK ON THE STREET.
97.1	1	I object to the proposed double yellow lines along the stretch closest to the train line. I strongly feel that this will add more pressure on parking outside of my flat. Harlow court does have a private parking area but the entrance to this is an incredibly dangerous blind spot. There is no restriction to how close cars/ vans can park to the entrance, therefore it is very difficult to see any cars coming from both directions when exiting Harlow Court. The entrance often has large vans/ large cars parked either side. Residents at Harlow court have contacted the council on various occasions to ask for a very short area of parking restriction e.g. 5 metres, either side of our entrance. Nothing has come of this and I am amazed there has not been a serious accident in this location. Cars from Harlow Court have to almost pull out onto Wray Common road totally blind, Further to this cars travel very fast along the road.
98.1	1	Clairville Court Management Ltd. would like to request that you consider lengthening the yellow lines on the opposite side of the road to our gates to end just over the railway bridge (Wray Common Road). If drivers start to park here it could prove to be quite dangerous as it will make the road very narrow with cars having to come onto wrong side of road and there are a lot of school children and general public using the pavement on our side as there isn't one on the other side. This is a busy cut through road with humps to restrict speed and we feel that parking at this point would be very detrimental. We did, at one time, have a dangerous bend sign which came down and was never replaced and we would appreciate if it could be considered to replace this when these works are carried out On behalf of Directors, Committee and residents.
99.1	1	I am in support of most of the recommendations for Redhill & Reigate but I am concerned about the removal of restrictions. I think they should remain. Shouldn't the council consider Park and Ride for Redhill? Or increase the busses and cut the cost of fares then more people would use them and reduce the number of cars on the road.
100.1	1	The extension of parking restrictions at the junction of Wray Common Road and Doods Park Road is absolutely essential as current parking at this spot is an accident waiting to happen.
3	1	Concerned about visibility at the access to Harlow Court. Increased traffic and parking on Wray Common Road make egress dangerous and difficult.

Response
We believe that proposals deal with safety concerns of the road. We do not believe that the restrictions need to be extended further north toward/over the railway bridge at present, although such proposals could be considered in a future parking review. Given the number of concerns regarding the access to Harlow Court, the double yellow lines at this section should be extended slightly. The request for the 'bend' sign can be considered by our area highway team. Suggestion for park and ride scheme / cheaper bus tickets are outside of the scope of the parking review.

Recommendations
Introduce a revised proposal as shown in Annex 2.

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Wray Park Road - Reigate	
Location number	51	
Drawings	18082	
Objection	0	
Support	0	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	1	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
11	1	Proposals do not address the problem of vehicles parking on Alders Road, too close to Wray Park Road. Other proposals in the area are likely to make this situation worse.
Response		
We are proposing to scale back some of the other proposals nearby so the problem should not be worsened. Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location should request that it is added to our next parking review.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

ITEM 9

Location:	Ashurst Road, Cross Road, Epsom Lane South / Station Approach Road, The Avenue, Cross Road - Tadworth
Location number	52 / 57
Drawings	18039, 18040
Objection	53
Support	2
Other comment	11
Total correspondence	66

Comments	
Due to the number of comments, and people who mentioned multiple locations within one piece of feedback, it is difficult to summarise the exact number of objections received, and not feasible to reproduce a copy of each of them within this report. Here is a summary of comments for each road considered.	
Ashurst Road	Proposals will just displace vehicles further along Ashurst Road and cause additional problems for motorists using the road and residents entering/exiting their driveways. Proposals will reduce access to local businesses/shops. Problems are caused by commuters and workers who park up and get transferred to large businesses. Proposals will displace vehicles closer to Tadworth Primary School, creating more problems for parents wishing to collect/drop off children. The yellow lines proposals is OK but some 2hour parking bays should also be provided.
Cross Road / Epsom Lane South	Though parking on both sides on Cross Road is not ideal, it works and there has to be a place for commuters to park - vehicles will otherwise be displaced to other less suitable locations in Tadworth, such as Ashurst Road (residential section). These changes are very welcome, commuters and occasionally holiday makers park (sometimes thoughtlessly) on Cross Road causing difficulty for delivery vehicles, home access and crossing the road (residential section). Proposals will displace vehicles closer to Tadworth Primary School, creating more problems for parents wishing to collect/drop off children (residential section). Proposals will just displace vehicles to Ashurst Road or other nearby roads and cause additional problems (residential section). There is not need to introduce double yellow lines opposite the shops, the current situation works well (shops section). 1 hour does not allow enough time for visitors to many of the shops (shops section). There is no provision for blue badge holders (shops section). Long term parking should be provided on the northern side of the road, and '1 hour' on the south side (residential section).
The Avenue / Station Approach	1 hour does not allow enough time for many visitors to the church. The restrictions do not need to apply on Saturdays.

Response
<p>A significant number of responses complain about the lack of a car park in the area, however, off street parking is not a function provided by the county council; public off street car parks are operated by borough/district councils and concerns relating to this should be addressed to them.</p> <p>Another commonly identified issue was that workers for large local companies park in the area and are transferred to their respective places of work. We have no powers to prevent this practice from taking place other than through parking controls such as those proposed.</p> <p>A number of people also highlighted that the current level of enforcement was not sufficient, we will raise this with Reigate and Banstead Borough Council who carry out enforcement of parking controls on our behalf.</p> <p>We recognise how important parking space is to the local area, but we need to ensure that the road is safe for motorists, and allows traffic to move freely along the highway. We do not have a specific duty to provide parking spaces, although we accommodate and manage it wherever feasible, balancing the varying and often conflicting needs of different user groups.</p> <p>We propose not to go ahead with proposals in Ashurst Road given the concerns of residents about potential displacement of vehicles further north along the road.</p> <p>In Cross Road (shops section) it is now proposed not to go ahead with the proposed 'no waiting at any time', but believe the 1 hour parking bays should be retained as this will allow greater turnover of spaces for shoppers. We note that there are no disabled bays provided near the shops, and will consider this in the next review of parking in the borough.</p> <p>In Cross Road (residential section) it is now proposed to amend the proposed single yellow line to operate 'Monday - Friday, 8am - 9.30 am'. This should reduce the pressure on parking and associated problems for residents of the road, but free up some space for deliveries etc, and visitors to the local shops.</p> <p>In The Avenue / Station Approach, it is now proposed to leave the bays as they are at present, for visitors who need longer than 1 hour.</p>

Recommendations
Introduce a revised scheme as discussed above, see revised drawing in Annex 2.

<u>Location:</u>	Chetwode Road j/w Merland Rise - Tadworth	
Location number	53	
Drawings	18160	
Objection	0	
Support	0	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	1	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
51	1	Proposals should ensure that the double yellow lines extend far enough south along Merland Rise to meet the newly created parking area. This will prevent the a car parking in this space, which currently reduces visibility, and causes congestion.
Response		
The half width parking area had not been created at the time these proposals were first made. We can extend the proposals slightly at this location up to the lay-by.		
Recommendations		
Amend the plans as described, see revised drawing in Annex 2.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Deans Lane - Tadworth	
Location number	54	
Drawings	18042	
Objection	1	
Support	1	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	3	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
197.1	1	Whilst broadly in agreement with the proposals for Walton-on-the-Hill, I am concerned that an increase in restrictions will result in increased pressure on Duffield Road. Already we experience parking congestion during the day at school drop-off and collection times, and in evenings where the Riddell hall is in use. It is not unusual for residents to not be able to find parking spaces at these times. I would like to ask the Council to consider therefore resident's parking on Duffield Road, particularly from 8.00 to 10.00, and 15.00 to 20.30.
193.1	1	Double yellow lines need extending North from Heath cottages towards Waplings by 20 metres on east side. When coming around corner from south you often have to brake to avoid cars in the middle of the road coming from the north passed parked cars. I believe this had been brought up at the Village Forum in the past. I hope my views will be noted. Thank You
187.1	1	The parking restriction on Deans Lane need to wxtend further tyowards the blue ball it is insufficient at present again speed is the issue .
Response		
We have not previously received requests for permit parking in this location. If such a scheme were introduced, there would be a charge for permits. We do not believe that further proposals should be considered as part of this review as this would required us to 're-advertise' the proposals which will extend considerably the completion date of the review as well as incurring additional costs. Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location should request that it is added to our next parking review.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

Location:	High Street - Tadworth
Location number	55
Drawings	18041
Objection	24
Support	0
Other comment	6
Total correspondence	30
Comments	
<p>Due to the number of comments, and people who mentioned multiple locations within one piece of feedback, it is difficult to summarise the exact number of objections received, and not feasible to reproduce a copy of each of them within this report. Here is a summary of comments received.</p> <p>Proposals will result in detrimental effect to the shops and local community due to the number of spaces being lost. Parking is under demand from residents, shop staff, the nursing home, and commuters. Support for the removal of commuter parking. The one hour restriction does not allow long enough to visit some of the facilities, perhaps 2 or 3 hours would be better. Parking may be displaced into Tower Road or Chapel Road which are under pressure already. Permit parking should be considered for High Street. The idea of no parking 8am to 6:30pm on the south side of High Street was particularly absurd and ill thought out. There are too few parking spaces for the number of shops. Support for the removal of parking on the northern side of the road where it narrows. Restrictions should only operate Monday - Friday. Petition received against proposals signed 'by nearly 300 customers' of the High Street. The objection states that there are too few parking bays and too many yellow lines. Instead a two hour restrictions should be introduced throughout most of the street. Parking should be prohibited between 7 and 9 am to remove commuters.</p>	
Response	
<p>We did not consider it appropriate to introduce a blanket '7am-9am' restriction for fear of displacement into surrounding roads and the inconvenience that this could cause to residents. Again, we have introduced a measured number of parking bays for the same reason. Given the concerns about the amount of space being controlled, we believe we can reduce the lengths of yellow lines at certain locations, and change some to operate 'Monday - Friday 08.00-09.30 am' only. As a number of people pointed out that 1 hour bays do not provide long enough for some of the shops, we consider it appropriate to amend them to allow 2 hours waiting. At the section outside/opposite nos 15/17, we chose to mark bays opposite as on the southern side of the road there are dropped kerbs so the number of bays we could introduce would be reduced; we are maximising road space by placing them on the northern side of the road. We have not previously received requests for permit parking in this location. If such a scheme were introduced, there would be a charge for permits. We do not believe that further proposals should be considered as part of this review as this would required us to 're-advertise' the proposals which will extend considerably the completion date of the review as well as incurring additional costs. Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location should request that it is added to our next parking review.</p>	
Recommendations	
Introduce a revised proposal as discussed above, see drawing in Annex 2.	

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Shelvers Way, Shelvers Hill, Shelvers Green, Hill View Close - Tadworth	
Location number	56	
Drawings	18034	
Objection	7	
Support	3	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	10	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
166.1	1	Very, very concerned about the introduction of pay and display meters for certain bays. I'm a Funeral Director from Stoneman Funeral Service and can see that this is going to cause us no end of problems. Even though there are no bays planned for outside our premises the introduction of these bays will affect us terribly. So many more people will try to park where there are no bays so they don't have to pay, so in effect lots of people will try to use the space outside our premises. We need access to the front of our premises at all times, (I.E) hearses and private ambulances. If everyone else is fighting for these spaces because you don't have to pay then we ourselves will have trouble getting our vehicles outside our premises to load the hearse with flowers which in turn will make us late for our funerals. What do you suggest we do when bringing people to lay in our Chapel of Rest and we can't park outside our premises? Look forward to hearing your comments on this matter.
167.1	1	We do not want any more parking restrictions. We need our local shops and do not want to put them out of business. If there is no available parking we are forced to abandon local shops and waste our time, money on petrol, and natural resources - having to drive to the nearest Superstore. Why should we be forced to do this against our will? We would like to see MORE PARKING SPACES NOT LESS. We have paid money for houses within a village setting with thriving local shops... We have not chosen to change the face of the village and put the shops out of business.
168.1	1	On Shelvers Way (between Shelver Hill and Hill View Close) there is a proposed no waiting at any time - this would alleviate some of the minor traffic issues associated with cars around this particular area. Other Shelvers Way proposed no waiting areas (beyond Hill View Close and past Shelvers Green) I do not think will have an effect on the traffic flow one way or other.
13	1	Support proposals but would like to see more parking bays.
32, 80	2	Proposals on the north side of Shelvers Way are unnecessary and will prove a hindrance to local residents and shop users.
21	1	Proposals for Shelvers Way will displace vehicles in Epsom Lane South, causing more congestion and problems for residents entering/exiting driveways.
1	1	Support proposals.
6, 66	2	Proposals on the north side of Shelvers Way are unnecessary and will prove a hindrance to local residents and shop users, instead 2 hour parking should be provided.
71	1	Objection - the proposed yellow line on Shelvers Way near the junction with Ashurt Road should be replaced with residents parking. The proposed limited waiting bays will cause problems for residents trying to park. The no waiting at any time is not required. The proposals will cause a great deal of problems for residents trying to park.
Response		
<p>There are no proposals to introduce pay and display meters. The introduction of parking bays should help ensure that there are spaces available for visitors and in-turn help the shops. We have proposed a measured number of parking bays as there are residents who also use the area for parking and we must find a balance between various user groups with conflicting requirements. We do not consider it appropriate to allow parking near to the busy mini-roundabout on Shelvers Way which narrows the road and believe that this should go ahead.</p> <p>We have not previously received requests for permit parking in this location. If such a scheme were introduced, there would be a charge for permits. We do not believe that further proposals should be considered as part of this review as this would required us to 're-advertise' the proposals which will extend considerably the completion date of the review as well as incurring additional costs. Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location should request that it is added to our next parking review.</p> <p>In order to help residents park when returning home in the evenings, we suggest reducing the hours of operation of the parking bays to 'Monday - Saturday, 8am - 4.30 pm'.</p>		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals with revised hours of the limited waiting parking bays. See revised drawing in Annex 2.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Tadorne Road, j/w Tadworth Street - Tadworth	
Location number	58	
Drawings	18161	
Objection	0	
Support	0	
Other comment	2	
Total correspondence	2	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
13, 30	2	Proposals should be extended further up Tadorne Road to improve traffic flow.
Response		
Agree that it would be beneficial to make a small extension to the yellow lines at this location.		
Recommendations		
Introduce a revised proposal as show in Annex 2.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Tadworth Street (j/w Epsom Lane South and The Hoppety) - Tadworth
Location number	59
Drawings	18161

Objection	3
Support	1
Other comment	1
Total correspondence	5

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
184.1	1	Firstly I would like to point out that the map is incorrect to the side of my property in Tadworth Street as the road marking proportion is incorrect as a compulsory order was made in the past on the piece of land showing on Tadworth Street. I cannot see why parking restriction would even be needed there as It is clearly on a bend in the road and would be impossible in case to be able to park there. In the 8 years I have lived here a car has never even been left there let alone parked, so what is the benefit of parking restriction be? Secondly, the car park space on the other side of the hoppity in tadworth street is used for visitors and especially as in Proffits Cottages in the hoppity as we have very limited parking space where we live and would then have no parking spaces at all for visitors or for two car homes. I cannot possibly see on the hoppity side why parking restrictions are even being considered and obviously no consideration to the residents of these roads mentioned.
13	1	Support proposals.
30, 67	2	There is room for at least two cars to park in the 'bay' near the junction with the Hoppety without a problem. Local residents / their visitors need to use this area.
187.1	1	The parking restriction at the junction of the Hoppety and Tadworth Street is redundant, The hazard for nmotorists is the speed of traffic along Tadworth St and restricted vision by new BT Telegraph pole which appears much fatter than the one it replaced.

<u>Response</u>
We believe that the proposals can be reduced to allow parking in the 'bay' without compromising road safety.

<u>Recommendations</u>
Introduce a revised proposal as shown in the revised drawing in Annex 2.

Location:	Tadworth Street (near Chinthurst School) - Tadworth
Location number	60
Drawings	18041

Objection	6
Support	0
Other comment	2
Total correspondence	8

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
176.1	1	My children attend Chinthurst School on Tadworth Street and I have to strongly object to your proposed changes. I cannot understand how the council can possibly think these changes will benefit the majority of the community in Tadworth. Restricting parking outside the school will have dangerous implications on the younger children whose parents have to park and come into school. Your proposals will also have absolutely no effect on traffic flow, merely moving parking to a location further away. Do not waste time and money on a pointless proposal.
177.1	1	The waiting outside Chinthurst school is creating a real danger zone, with waiting cars creating a restriction in the street, plus crossing the road to park on the wrong side of the road, and creating a danger for cyclists like me, which forces traffic into the path of oncoming traffic. I would strongly suggest you consider making the whole of this stretch a no waiting zone.
178.1	1	Grounds for objection are that the proposed "No waiting at any time" passing places near the entrance to Chinthurst School will severely affect the safety of pedestrians, especially children, at times when children are being delivered to or collected from the school. This will be caused by increased congestion at the school entrance and the additional hazards associated with children traversing from more distant parking places that would have to be used. The intensity and speed of local traffic make it all but impossible nowadays for children to walk to the school on their own. They must be delivered and collected by parents. The young age of most of them requires parents to walk them into the grounds. The number of spaces presently available (about a dozen) is already inadequate. No other parking is available within a distance that is safe for young children and their bags, sports gear etc to be walked to the school by parents. Having to park there (about 200 metres away on a dangerous road) will add unacceptably to the danger experienced by children. The school, which has been on its site for about a century and is supported by families who pay rates to this council, has experienced progressive loss of amenity with respect to parking in more recent times and it is essential that further loss, in the absence of alternatives, is curtailed. Tadworth Street is not a vital thoroughfare, and any congestion during school arrival/departure times can be avoided by drivers taking alternative routes. The problem is trivial at non-peak times, and inconvenience to drivers is minor at peak times.
179.1	1	I object to the addition of a no waiting at any time passing place between the school markings and Station Approach. I drive this route every day in the morning rush hour and the congestion is not bad. There are several passing places already, on the double yellow lines leading up to Station Approach, on the school markings (enough for 3 cars) and further back at the entrances to properties on Tadworth Street. The traffic flow is such that the wait is minimal because when the lights go green all the traffic can move forward with the existing passing places. Chinthurst school does not have any parking on site and if parking places along Tadworth Street are removed parents will have to park elsewhere and less safely (particularly given that the other side of Tadworth Street does not have a curb). Already it is not possible to park near the school in The Avenue between 8.45am and 9.30am. If parents have to park the other side of Tadworth Street then there will be a lot more children running across Tadworth Street at peak times which is an accident waiting to happen. Even if changes are pushed through a no waiting at any time seems to be overkill given that the perceived problem only occurs at peak times and I drive through many times in the day and there is no congestion at all apart from in the morning and evening rush hours.
31, 16	2	The introduction of 'no waiting at any time' will decrease available parking space and increase congestion as parents search for places to park. The 'passing place' will not work.
7	1 letter from Headmaster with 63 signatures.	Letter of objection with 63 signatures (although the signatures do not appear to support any particular statement). Main concerns are relating to safety of children who must be supervised to the school due to nature of traffic on Tadworth Street. There are only 14 spaces outside the school. The next nearest available parking is 160+ yards away. The traffic movements into the passing space would create additional problems as a visual distraction. (Requests additional safety measures such as traffic calming).
13	1	Residents association: support proposals, there is an argument for more parking controls to aid vehicles to pass each other.

Response

We accept the point raised that the 'passing place' may not be long enough to allow a queue of traffic to 'pull in'. However, there are very significant congestion issues here, and consequently we consider that the passing place should be 'moved' north to join the existing 'no waiting at any time'. This will allow more vehicles to queue at the traffic lights and thereby reduce congestion.

Parking at 'school times' is very often challenging for a short period of time. We do not consider that the removal of two 'spaces' will have a significant detrimental effect on parents ability to pick up and drop off children. Clearly parking in Tadworth is under pressure from various user groups with competing demands and different opinions, and we are trying to balance those needs.

Recommendations

Introduce a revised proposal as shown in the revised drawing in Annex 2.

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Tadworth Street (near Heathcote) - Tadworth	
Location number	61	
Drawings	18036	
Objection	0	
Support	1	
Other comment	1	
Total correspondence	2	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
30	1	There should be no parking between the entrance to Tadworth Park and the Children's Trust. This is dangerous due do to the high volumes of traffic; 'school pick-ups' should be banned.
12	1	Support for proposals from Tadworth Primary School.
Response		
We believe that proposals deal with the parking related safety concerns of the road. We do not believe that the restrictions need to be extended between the entrance to Tadworth Park and the Children's Trust at present, although such proposals could be considered in a future parking review.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advetised'.		

<u>Location:</u>	Gun Island' (junction of Ebbisham Lane / Walton Street), Chequers Lane, Walton Street - Walton on the Hill	
Location number	62	
Drawings	18043	
Objection	1	
Support	1	
Other comment	2	
Total correspondence	4	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
197.1	1	Whilst broadly in agreement with the proposals for Walton-on-the-Hill, I am concerned that an increase in restrictions will result in increased pressure on Duffield Road. Already we experience parking congestion during the day at school drop-off and collection times, and in evenings where the Riddell hall is in use. It is not unusual for residents to not be able to find parking spaces at these times. I would like to ask the Council to consider therefore resident's parking on Duffield Road, particularly from 8.00 to 10.00, and 15.00 to 20.30.
13	1	Support proposals.
2	1	You seem to have done away with the existing parking restrictions on the Walton Street side of Gun Island - not the most sensible idea. Also you have not provided designated parking bays as suggested.
81	1	Weekend restrictions are not required on the Ebbisham Lane side of 'Gun Island'.
Response		
<p>We have not removed parking restrictions from 'Gun Island'. We do not understand the requirement to introduce parking bays on 'Gun Island', but have left unrestricted spaces. We do not believe parking should be allowed at any time on the south side of 'Gun Island'; eastbound traffic would be on the 'wrong' side of the road approaching the bend if this were allowed, which would be inadvisable.</p> <p>We have not previously received requests for permit parking in this location. If such a scheme were introduced, there would be a charge for permits. We do not believe that further proposals should be considered as part of this review as this would required us to 're-advertise' the proposals which will extend considerably the completion date of the review as well as incurring additional costs. Customers wishing to pursue extra proposals at this location should request that it is added to our next parking review.</p>		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Howard Close (incl j/w Chequers Lane) - Walton on the Hill	
Location number	63	
Drawings	18162	
Objection	0	
Support	1	
Other comment	0	
Total correspondence	1	
Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
13	1	Support proposals.
Response		
None.		
Recommendations		
Introduce proposals 'as advertised'.		

ITEM 9

<u>Location:</u>	Walton Street (near Walton on the Hill Primary School). Sandlands Road - Walton on the Hill	
Location number	64	
Drawings	18042	

Objection	3
Support	1
Other comment	0
Total correspondence	4

Correspondence ID(s)	Count	Comment
13	1	Support proposals.
76	1	Concerned about the proposed single yellow line near no 20 Walton Street. This will cause inconvenience for residents. Parking for residents is already problematic due to the limited waiting parking bays, surrounding streets are already 'at capacity' with residents vehicles. Please consider removing or reducing the yellow line to only operate 8am to 4.30 pm Monday - Friday. Also please consider removing the disabled parking bay outside of Walton Pharmacy, it is rarely used by blue badge holders, who can already park relatively freely without fear of prosecution.
65	1	Proposals in Walton on the Hill and Tadworth are not needed or wanted. The plans for replacing parking bays with a loading bay is ridiculous, this should have been accommodated within the site itself. There are too few time limited bays in Walton on the Hill as it is.
81	1	The proposed single yellow line opposite the school is not needed on Saturday as the school is not operational.

Response
<p>The proposed loading bay will result in the loss of one parking space in the village - whilst the proposed retail development will provide for 5 additional off street parking spaces. Before the planning application was recommended for approval by the highway authority we required a detailed parking survey to be undertaken which demonstrated that the village could accommodate the loss of one parking space and that there was additional capacity at the peak hours for the proposed retail unit for short term parking, should the five space in front of the store be in use. This parking survey is available on the Reigate & Banstead Borough Council website under the planning application reference associated with the site.</p> <p>As the section of single yellow line near no 20 Walton Street is intended to relieve congestion at 'school times' we consider it appropriate to reduce the hours of operation of controls to 'Monday - Friday, 08.30 am - 5 pm'. Although this is not the time suggested it is similar and is more operationally efficient as the same time is used in other parts of the borough.</p> <p>We do not intend to remove the disabled parking bay near the pharmacy, and believe it is a valuable amenity for blue badge holders.</p>

Recommendations
Introduce a revised scheme as discussed above, see revised drawing in Annex 2.

This page is intentionally left blank