

Annex 2: Petition responses

The following provides a summary of the petitions (formally known as parking scheme request forms) received for consideration under the 2021-2022 parking review, analysis of them, and our recommended actions.

At some locations, we are recommending informal consultations to determine whether or not to go ahead with formal proposals, and to shape their form if so. Once these informal consultations have been completed, the feedback will be discussed with the chairman and vice-chairman of this committee, along with the relevant divisional member to decide whether to progress the scheme to formal advertisement (alongside the other schemes in Annex 1).



Cobham division

Portsmouth Road, Cobham

The petition is signed by every household of 24-38 Portsmouth Road inclusive.

The petition requests that we introduce a permit parking scheme to make it easier for residents of 24-38 Portsmouth Road to park in the currently uncontrolled section of road in front of their properties. The petition also mentions 'allocated' parking. It is not possible to allocate parking on a space by space basis on the public highway, which is why that request would have been rejected in the past.

The petition also requests the ability to park in the recently introduced permit scheme in Matthew Arnold Close.

Residents face competition for parking space in front of their house from local businesses, and struggle to find alternative parking in other roads when the spaces on Portsmouth Road are occupied.

Given that residents are fully supportive of the introduction of a permit parking scheme, we have proposed – as detailed in Annex 1 – to advertise such a scheme here. It will essentially be an extension of the scheme in Matthew Arnold Close, and permits will be interoperable. The scheme will consist of a parking bay 'Parking Mon-Sat 8am-6pm Permit Holders (M) Only'. Further details are explained in Annex 1.

Outcome: advertise the parking scheme shown in Annex 1.

St Andrews Walk, Cobham

The petition is signed by each of the 11 households in St Andrews Walk. The request is for a permit parking scheme for the road, as parking by non-residents makes it difficult for residents and their visitors to park here.

Our policy is to introduce permit parking schemes in locations where residents face competition for space from non-residents, and where they have no or very little access to off street parking.

Every property in St Andrews Walk has off street parking for at least one vehicle plus a garage, many enjoy considerably more than that. Therefore, the location doesn't meet our criteria and we cannot proceed with the idea.

If we were to introduce these schemes under these scenarios, significant general use on-street parking capacity would be lost, and in many cases such action would cause the displacement of parked vehicles to other locations where residents do not have such high levels of private off-street parking.

Outcome: no further action.

Lodge Close, Stoke D'Abernon

Residents have carried out a survey amongst themselves to assess the demand for parking controls in the road. Of the 61 houses in Lodge Close, 3 properties are empty or the owner uncontactable, 34 voted in favour of some form of parking restrictions, 8 voted against and 16 houses did not vote, meaning 59% of eligible residents voted in favour of some form of restrictions, which is some way short of the 70% we ask for before considering controls.

Lodge Close is a residential street about 0.5 miles from Cobham and Stoke D'Abernon rail station. There are other roads closer, notably Winston Drive which is essentially adjacent to the station, where residents have much lower levels of private off street parking, and no parking controls exist.

From observation of the site there doesn't appear to be a significant number of vehicles parkin in the road at the moment, and perhaps that is because of the impacts of the coronavirus. The road is of a standard with for a residential road with no through traffic, and accesses appear to be well respected by parkers. The regular driveways provide ample opportunities for vehicles to pass in nearly all cases. As with any road, temporary disruption due to building works or removal vans may occasionally cause more significant problems.

Every property in Lodge Close has ample off street parking and therefore the location doesn't meet our criteria and we support that particular suggestion.

If we were to introduce these schemes under these scenarios, significant general use on-street parking capacity would be lost, and in many cases such action would cause the displacement of parked vehicles to other locations where residents do not have such high levels of private off-street parking. In this particular case, vehicles could be displaced onto Blundel Lane, triggering the need for further controls.

Whilst we accept that some parking may at times cause inconvenience to residents, there doesn't seem to be a significant case for further controls at this time.

Outcome: no further action.

East Molesey and Esher division

School Road and Challoners Close

In 2019, residents submitted a request for a permit scheme in these roads, which led to a consultation on the idea. The consultation realised a very low response rate and a low level of support for the idea, but subsequently it has become apparent that residents were confused by the consultation/proposed scheme, so at their request we will carry out a further consultation as part of this review.

Outcome: carry out an informal consultation.

Hersham division

We didn't receive any petitions in this division.

Hinchley Wood, Claygate, and Oxshott division

Dalmore Avenue

Residents have contacted us with concerns that parking on both sides of Dalmore Avenue cause problems for vehicles accessing the road and for residents to get in and out of private driveways. We are therefore happy to carry out a consultation with residents to determine whether they would support a proposal for yellow lines on alternate sides of the road, similar to the proposal they suggested which gathered significant levels of support from those surveyed (20 of 24 households at the eastern end of Dalmore Avenue were in favour of restrictions).

Outcome: carry out an informal consultation.

The Dittons division

Ferry Road, Thames Ditton

We have received a petition, signed by 24 of the 28 households (85.7%) in Ferry Road, requesting a permit parking area for Ferry Road.

Residents have low or no private off-street parking, and the area is subject to relatively high stress parking conditions. It is therefore reasonable to carry out an informal consultation on a permit parking scheme for this road as it would fit our criteria for intervention.

Outcome: carry out an informal consultation.

Walton division

Winchester Road

Residents of part of Winchester Road have asked us to introduce a permit parking scheme covering the section of Winchester Road in-between Osbourne Close and Corby Road, the petition is signed by over 90% of residents in that section of the road.

Most residents will probably recall that we carried out a substantial consultation exercise back in 2017 about permit parking in Winchester Road and several other nearby roads. Following an initial consultation to which residents responded with a very low level of support for the idea, we formally proposed a scaled down the proposal covering Winchester Road between Highfield Drive and Colby Road, similarly to that requested by the petition. It received significant number of objections (39) and it seems that any further proposals here are like to generate similar numbers of objections, and we do not think it is appropriate to devote further resources to this location at the current time.

Decision: no further action.

Walton South and Oatlands division

Ashley Close, Walton

Residents of Ashley Close have requested a permit parking scheme for their road, with 25 out of 30 households showing support for the idea.

Similarly to some other requests we have received, residents of Ashley Close have very generous amounts of off street parking provision at their properties, and therefore would not be compliant with our policy to introduce a permit parking scheme here.

Site observations indicate that parking stress is not at a high level in the road, which at over 7 meters in diameter is wide enough to safely accommodate parking on both sides of it, and it carries no through traffic.

There doesn't seem to be a significant case for further parking controls at this time.

Decision: no further action.

Cricket Way, Weybridge

The request is for a permit parking scheme in the road in order to resolve problems residents experiencing in getting in and out of their driveways due to non-residents parking in the road to access the park.

Again, residents have high levels of off-street parking and therefore the request does not meet our criteria for implementation of a permit parking scheme. However, we could simply install a double yellow line on one side of the road to resolve the stated problem, and it seems reasonable to carry out an informal consultation with residents in the road based around this idea.

Outcome: carry out an informal consultation.

Weybridge division

South Road, Weybridge

Seven residents of South Road who do not have off street parking have signed a petition requesting that the hours of the existing permit parking scheme in their road are extended to operate 'at all times', or 'Mon-Sat 9am - 10pm', in order to resolve the problems of non-residents parking in their road outside of controlled hours making it very difficult to park near their homes.

It seems reasonable to make sure that the scheme is fit for purpose, and to extend the hours as per the request. In order to keep some consistency across parking schemes in the borough, we are proposing to consult with residents on the idea of extending the hours to 'Every-day 8am-10pm'.

Some other matters raised by the petition include the position regarding new developments in the road. Within the parking review (see Annex 1) it is proposed to remove the new flats that will exist on the "Wessex" site from being eligible for permits within South Road.

However, the officer report on the planning applications for 2 and 3 Beacon Mews states (unlike at Wessex) they do not think it pertinent to exclude these properties from permits. Therefore, we are not planning to do anything here and by default 2 and 3 Beacon Mews would be eligible for permits.

Outcome: carry out an informal consultation.

York Road

We have received a petition from 20-40 (evens only, inclusive), signed by the same plus 42, 46 and 48, requesting a permit holders only parking scheme on York Road.

Given that residents have no off street parking, and the area is under high parking stress, it seems reasonable to consider the idea by way of carrying out an informal consultation. See Annex 1 for further details.

Outcome: carry out an informal consultation.

West Molesey division

Cherry Orchard Road

We have received a petition from residents of Cherry Orchard Road, requesting a permit parking scheme. The petition received 63% support from residents of the road and although we ask 70% support before considering, we have visited the site and made an assessment in any case.

Although parking was found to be under reasonably high stress in the road, it's not unusually high for Molesey or many other areas in Elmbridge, and certainly no different to the adjacent Hurstfield Road. Therefore there is no differentiating factor which we would use to prioritise intervention here over other locations.

The river will inevitably attract some visitors and it is reasonable for them to have access to it.

Outcome: no further action.

Walton Road (junction with Langton Road)

We received a petition to local committee on 16 November 2020, and parking at this junction was one matter of concern. The committee decided to add the location to the parking review for consideration.

In the meantime, the yellow lines have been refreshed, the location highlighted to Elmbridge enforcement officers as one to monitor closely.

Site assessments for the parking review have been carried out, and sightlines were found to be adequate at this location.

Outcome: no further action.