

# Spelthorne parking review 2022: Decision report

A document explaining our final decisions on proposed parking schemes following public feedback

## Contents

Introduction .....	2
Stanwell and Stanwell Moor division proposals.....	3
Staines South and Ashford West division proposals .....	4
Ashford division proposals .....	7
Sunbury Common and Ashford Common division proposals .....	9
Lower Sunbury and Halliford division proposals.....	12
Laleham and Shepperton division proposals .....	15
Staines division proposals.....	16

## Introduction

The Spelthorne Parking Review 2022 proposals, which were agreed at Spelthorne Joint committee on 21 March 2022, and the proposed new electric vehicle recharging point locations, which were agreed by county councillors and the Parking Traffic and Enforcement Team manager in September 2022, were advertised from 14 October to 11 November 2022.

As part of this process, street notices were erected at each location, and notification cards were hand delivered to those properties immediately fronting proposed changes. In addition, a formal notice was published in the Surrey Herald.

All these documents referred members of the public to drawings and a statement of reasons document available online via the webpage: [www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorneparking](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk/spelthorneparking)

The Information was also made available to view at local libraries and council buildings.

Responses to the advertisement were received via an online form through the webpage above, or by letters being sent to the following address: Spelthorne Parking Review 2022, Parking Team, Hazel House, Merrow Lane, Guildford, Surrey, GU4 7BQ. Members of the public were asked to submit either a support, comment or objection response.

During the advertisement period, there were 16 support responses, 3 comment responses and 55 objections. All these responses have been read and considered in full, and the total number of responses for each location have been listed. However, for the purpose of this report, the responses have been summarised into key points only, followed by analysis and a decision on how to proceed following these considered responses.

The decisions made in this report are final and there is no appeal process. Any further requests for changes to these agreed restrictions will need to be submitted as part of a future [parking review of Spelthorne](#).

At locations where no objections or comments were received there is no analysis and the proposals will - unless otherwise stated - be implemented as advertised. Where changes have been made, there will usually be a revised drawing in addition to the written description.

# Stanwell and Stanwell Moor division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Robert Evans](#).

## Stanwell

### Long Lane

#### Overview:

Drawing number: 2022-1

Objections: 0

Comments: 0

Support: 0

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## Staines South and Ashford West division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Denise Turner-Stewart](#).

### Laleham

Berryscroft Road and Templedene Avenue

Overview :

Drawing number: 2022-5

Objections: 8

Comments: 0

Support: 1

Regarding the proposed double yellow line outside numbers 6,8 and 10, whilst these were deemed evident that these restrictions are not as crucial as the other proposed lengths for sight line and traffic flow reasons, and therefore it is decided not to proceed with this specific additional length extending from the end of the existing school keep clear marking.

### Bingham Drive (Electric Vehicles)

Overview :

- Drawing number: 0133
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### Gloucester Crescent (Electric Vehicles)

Overview :

- Drawing number: 01132
- Objections: 10
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Do not proceed.

### Summary

The objections related to the following: -

- Residents and visitors already struggle to find space as it is.
- This would negatively impact on residents living nearby and their guests.
- Chargers would be better in Edinburgh Drive by the parade of shops.
- Parking is already difficult for those without driveways or more than one car.
- This would negatively impact on disabled and elderly residents.
- Displacement parking would cause issues elsewhere.
- Residents cannot afford electric cars here.

### Analysis

Following the number of objections to this location and the lack of comments in support, it is decided not to proceed with charge points at this location.

## Ashford

### Station Crescent

Overview :

- Drawing number: 2022-6
- Objections: 0
- Comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## Queens Walk

### Overview :

Drawing number: 2022-6

Objections: 0

Comments: 0

Support: 1

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

## Ashford division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Joanne Sexton](#).

### Ashford

#### Feltham Road

Overview :

Drawing number: 2022-7

Objections: 8

Comments: 1

x Support: 2

̄ car.7TEw 0 1 93.024 693.82 Tm0 oer siTJE(e)-3(xq0.000008871 0 595.32 841.92 reW\*nBT/F1 1













Parking in this area is already difficult, especially at school peak times.

Parking will displace to Green Street.

Any parking issues on Heathlands Close are caused by large vans on the north side.

Residents with no off-street parking need to park on-street.

#### Analysis

Since 2010, several different residents have logged requests for double yellow lines to be introduced on the south side of Heathlands Close, to prevent parking on both sides to maintain access in and out of the street, for drivers and pedestrians. Residents have also submitted photos showing several different cars parked over the water service covers, which are also next to another service box cover that is parked over as well.

The carriageway of Heathlands Close is less than 4m wide and not suitable for on-street parking on either side. Drivers know this, and so they park as heavily on the footways as possible to keep the already narrow carriageway clear. Whilst parking on one side of this street is understandable, parking on both sides is not, as both footways are completely impassable as a result, and the narrow carriageway width is reduced even further by around half a metre on either side by overhanging vehicles, leaving less than 3m of carriageway remaining for vehicles to squeeze through. The issues residents have been reporting over the past 12 years do not coincide with all the points made in the objections, and often state the opposite.

There is no doubt that parking on both sides is excessive here on this incredibly narrow street, especially with the footways being impassable and with the reduced carriageway widths explained, and there is evidence of parking entirely obstructing the water service covers and service box, which would never be relocated to facilitate footway parking. Therefore, the restrictions are necessary here, and will resolve the longstanding history of complaints regarding parking on the south side.

### Blacksmith Close junction with Anvil Road and Forge Lane

#### Overview :

Drawing number: 2022-12

Objections: 0

Comments: 0

Support: 0

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### French Street junction with Lower Hampton Road, Elizabeth Gardens and The Pennards

#### Overview :

Drawing number: 2022-13

Objections: 2

## Analysis

Whilst the preference to park close to schools is understood, especially with young children, this parking should not jeopardise the safety of other road users, including others with young children. Parking by the junction with Elizabeth Gardens and by the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing obstructs sight lines for both drivers and pedestrians, as well as impacting on passing traffic, and it is already prohibited under the Highway Code not to parking within 10m of a junction. The majority of the proposed double yellow lines aim to keep the junction and the crossing point clear, and the proposed restrictions outside the school between the school keep clear marking and the junction with Lower Hampton Road aim to maintain footway access and traffic flow on this side, where parking sometimes causes people into the carriageway to pass.

Whilst it is understood that this wider area, including nearby Elizabeth Gardens, is difficult for parking, the priority for double yellow lines is to maintain access, sight lines and road safety where it is most important to do so, and these restrictions are necessary here to achieve this.

## The Avenue Parade

### Overview :

Drawing number: 2022-13

Objections: 0

Comments: 0

Support: 1

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.







Additional restrictions on the south side will create conflict between residents trying to park. The residents are being penalised in favour of passing traffic. The restrictions should only apply during the day.

#### Analysis

As explained in the statement of reasons document, the passing place prioritised the end closest to the Laleham Road junction, which is very slightly narrower than the rest of the street and the most problematic for passing traffic. However, it is understood that the proposed passing place would not resolve all the issues in this part of Commercial Road for passing traffic. However, i

### Analysis

Providing a cleaner and healthier environment is a top priority for Surrey County Council. One consideration for the transition in favour of a cleaner environment is providing electric vehicle charge point infrastructure for residents. The proposed electric vehicle bays would only be restricted to electric vehicles during specific daytime hours, allowing any vehicle to park outside of these hours.