

# Spelthorne parking review 2023: Decision report

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

## Contents

Introduction .....	2
Staines division proposals.....	3
Staines South and Ashford West division proposals .....	8
Laleham and Shepperton division proposals .....	12
Lower Sunbury and Halliford division proposals.....	15
Sunbury Common and Ashford Common division proposals .....	16
Ashford division proposals .....	17





Similar restrictions should be proposed for the surrounding streets as well.

Residents inside the proposed permit scheme area may still struggle to park near to their homes.

Many residents inside the proposed permit scheme area have off street parking whereas residents in surrounding streets do not.

The permit scheme might force non-permit holders to park in nearby private parking areas without permission.

This scheme was proposed before and dropped due to displacement parking, so why is it being proposed again as this same issue remains.

Richmond Road residents and visitors would still be allowed to park in nearby streets, but nearby residents would not be allowed to park in Richmond Road.

The number of spaces inside the permit scheme area will still not hold all resident and visitor cars so these will still need to be parked in surrounding roads.

The scheme will cause more problems than it will solve.

The problem is residents with too many cars not commuters, which have reduced in number over recent years.

There is no guarantee of a space, and the scheme does not operate in the evenings or overnight.

enough space on Gresham Road.

The comments related to the following points: -

Permits should be offered to Laleham Road properties south of Richmond Road as well.

General support of the scheme for residents and their visitors.

Permits should be offered to Gresham Road properties as well.

Parking will be displaced to Gresham Road.

Scheme should be expanded to other streets nearby as well.

## Analysis

12 out of the 49 objections (representing 10 households) were from residents inside the proposed permit scheme area.

32 out of the 36 support responses (representing 25 households) were from residents inside the proposed permit area.

There were around 120 notices hand delivered to the properties located inside the proposed permit area, in addition to multiple street notices erected both inside and outside the same area.

In terms of households located inside the proposed permit scheme, the number of supporting households is lower than

Road (part), Beehive Road, Edgell Road, Budebury Road, Wyatt Road and Langley Road. The remaining objections mostly came from residents elsewhere in Spelthorne.

The number of objections from residents of these surrounding streets was much lower than what was expected.

Whilst we ideally would have liked to have seen more support from residents located inside the proposed permit scheme area, considering all of the above broken down detail, the number of objections are not considered to be significant enough to justify not proceeding with this scheme, and it is therefore decided to proceed with this scheme and the associated slight double yellow line and electric vehicle bay revocations as shown on the plan.

Regarding the history of this proposal, in 2017/18, Surrey County Council carried out a large consultation on permit parking for all streets south of Staines Railway Station, but there was very little support for permit parking outside of the Richmond Road, Eton Court and Augur Close area. Whilst Edgell Road showed some higher levels of support for permit parking, with that street being located in the middle of several adjoining others, it was not deemed suitable for a permit parking scheme without incorporating all its adjoining streets, but as those adjoining streets generally did not support permit parking, this area was not taken any further for permit parking. As Richmond Road, Eton Court and Augur Close is a clearly defined area with only two junctions to enter from, and as these residents did show strong support for permit parking, as also reflected in their previous petitions for permit parking, it was decided to propose a scheme for these streets. However, this scheme was not approved for advertisement by the Spelthorne committee at the time, and they deferred the decision to the Spelthorne parking task group, where it was agreed the scheme should not be proceeded with due to concerns regarding displacement parking to the wider area.

Following plans for Thameside House to be redeveloped, there was a public exhibition for this development and Richmond Road residents raised concerns regarding the impact of that development on parking in Richmond Road and its adjoining streets. In response to these concerns, at the end of 2019, Surrey County Council and Spelthorne Borough Council agreed that permit parking should be reconsidered for Richmond Road, Eton Court and Augur Close when the Thameside House redevelopment was at a more advanced stage, which is the current situation. Therefore, as part of this 2023 Spelthorne parking review, the permit scheme was proposed again and subsequently agreed for advertisement, which this report is a summary of.

Deliveries will not be allowed to stop.

## **Leacroft junction with Georgian Close and Shortwood Common**

### **Overview:**

Drawing number: 2023-4

Objections: 5

Comments: 0

Support: 0

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### **Summary**

The objections referred to the following points: -

# Staines South and Ashford West division proposals

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

## Staines

### Stainash Parade, Kingston Road

#### Overview:

Drawing number: 2023-5

Objections: 22

Comments: 1

Support: 1

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections and comments referred to the following points: -

Paid parking should not be introduced here.

Parking spaces should not be reduced.

#### Analysis

All but one of the objections have confused these proposals with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre, which is not being proposed here. The proposals are just to amend our Traffic Regulation



## **Laleham**

### **Bingham Drive**

#### **Overview:**

Drawing number: 2023-6

Objections: 0

Comments: 0

Support:

## Ashford

### Avondale Road junction with A30 London Road (National Highways)

#### Overview:

Drawing number: 2023-8  
Objections: 5  
Comments: 2  
Support: 2  
Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections have all confused this double yellow line proposal with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

The comments referred to sight lines being difficult when exiting on the A30.

#### Analysis

As explained above, the objections have confused this double yellow line proposal with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

Regarding exiting onto the A30 from Avondale Road, this is indeed difficult due to parking taking place in the laybys located on the A30 and this has previously been reported to National Highways who are responsible for the A30 London Road as it is a trunk road and not under the jurisdiction of Surrey County Council. National Highways were looking into several issues along this part of the

junction. Residents can also report this issue to Highways England via their webpage.

<https://report.nationalhighways.co.uk/>

### Woodthorpe Road (Salvation Army)

#### Overview:

Drawing number: 2023-24  
Objections: 29  
Comments: 1  
Support: 3  
Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

Parking outside the Salvation Army building does not cause any problems.

The comment stated that lines are needed by the traffic islands.

A support response requested that the lines stop before the dropped kerb for number 78.

#### Analysis



# Laleham and Shepperton division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Maureen Attewell](#).

## Shepperton

### Watersplash Road

#### Overview:

Drawing number: 2023-9

Objections: 24

Comments: 6

Support: 2

Final decision: Do not proceed.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

Issues relating to parking by carers vehicles and those visiting more vulnerable residents.

Footway parking should be addressed.  
Displacement parking concerns.

### **Analysis**

The 24 objections represented 19 households, with 12 of those households being in Watersplash Road and the others being elsewhere in Spelthorne or further afield.

The 574 bus was re-routed to avoid Watersplash Road due to access issues in this part of the street where parking restrictions have been proposed. Buses are rigid vehicles and will not be as manoeuvrable as other vehicles of a similar size with articulated fronts, such as refuse collection vehicles.

However, it is clear from all the objections and comments received that residents believe there is no issue with access here for larger vehicles, or that such related incidents are rare, and that permanent parking restrictions would cause far more issues for residents than they would solve for passing traffic.

Taking all of this on board, it is decided not to proceed with these proposed double yellow lines, but the location will continue to be monitored for access issues.

## **Thurlstone Parade, High Street**

### **Overview:**

Drawing number: 2023-10  
Objections: 8  
Comments: 0  
Support: 1  
Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### **Summary**

The objections referred to the following points: -

shoppers who may not be able to afford electric vehicles.

### **Analysis**

7 out of the 8 objections have confused these proposals with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

The changes shown for Thurlstone Parade are just for our Traffic Regulation Orders to match the currently installed layout on the ground and nothing will change on the ground itself.

Regarding the electric vehicle spaces at this location, they occupy only a very small proportion of the total number of parking spaces available in Shepperton High Street for non-electric vehicle users, including on the opposite side of the parade and at each end of the electric vehicle spaces, where there is disabled parking and 3 hour parking nearby.

## **Manygate Lane**

### **Overview:**

Drawing number: 2023-11  
Objections: 0  
Comments: 3  
Support: 1  
Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### **Summary**

The comments referred to the following points: -

Double yellow lines should be extended all along this side of the road.

There are issues with vehicles overhanging driveways on the opposite side of the road.

**Analysis**



# Sunbury Common and Ashford Common division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Harry Boparai](#).

## Ashford



# Ashford division proposals

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

## Ashford

### Feltham Hill Road (Gatehouse Close)

#### Overview:

Drawing number: 2023-14

Objections: 6

Comments: 1

Support: 1

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

#### Summary

The objections referred to the following points: -

The parking issue is mainly caused by Royal Mail vans rather than residents.

This location is used as overflow parking for Royal Mail staff.

The parking is mostly residents without parking provision.

The parking restrictions will cause more issues on Poplar Road, especially with accesses.

Parking will be displaced further along Feltham Hill Road to outside the houses.

The comment requested additional restrictions on the other side of Poplar Road.

#### Analysis

As explained in the statement of reasons document, these restrictions are to prevent drivers parking on the footway along this section of Feltham Hill Road, which has continued to take place after the development construction had finished and the new access road built. This footway parking not only obstructs the footway which pedestrians and others are trying to use, but here it is also obstructing and damaging the multiple street boxes located in this footway, and obstructing sight lines to the newly constructed entrance to Gatehouse Close.

Footways are not designed to take the weight of vehicles, and drivers should not be parking entirely on footways in the first place, or driving over raised kerbs, and drivers should not be viewing this wide footway as any overflow parking area, either for Royal Mail staff or for residents and visitors.

**Analysis**

One objection confused these double yellow lines proposals with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

The Chessholme Road junction with Feltham Hill Road is currently on the 2024 Spelthorne parking review for assessment for possible double yellow lines as well.

**Feltham Hill Road junction with Garden Close****Overview:**

Drawing number: 2023-14

Objections: 0

Comments: 1

Support: 3

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

**Summary**

The comment requested restrictions for the Chessholme Road junction.

**Analysis**

The Chessholme Road junction with Feltham Hill Road is currently on the 2024 Spelthorne parking review for assessment for possible double yellow lines as well.

**School Road junction with Glenfield Road****Overview:**

Drawing number: 2023-15

Objections: 4

Comments: 0

Support: 3

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

**Summary**

The objections referred to the following points: -

Restrictions will push school parking onto other streets.

Stop trying to stop people parking.

**Analysis**

Some of the objections have confused these proposals for double yellow lines with paid parking for Ashford Town Centre.

The proposed extensions of double yellow lines on this junction are needed to improve sight lines for vehicles exiting this junction, especially during school peak times.

**Sandells Avenue junction with Wrens Avenue****Overview:**

Drawing number: 2023-16

Objections: 6

Comments: 1

Support: 2

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

**Summary**

The objections referred to the following points: -

Quiet road. No need for this.



## **Feltham Road**

### **Overview:**

Drawing number: 2023-18

maintain road safety, sight lines and access on the junction at all times. Whilst parking will likely move further into Ford Road, parking should never have been occurring on the junction in the first place as it is highly hazardous and obstructive to other road users.

## **Ashford Town Centre (Paid Parking)**

### **Overview:**

Drawing number: 2023-21, 2023-22 and 2023-23

Objections: 1,190 (Plus a 1,280 signature objection petition, plus 134 borough councillor leaflet objection responses)

Comments: 23

Support: 12 (Plus 1 borough councillor leaflet support response)

Final decision: Do not proceed.

### **Summary**

The objections referred to the following points: -

It will be the end of the town.

This will cause small businesses to close.

People will visit the big supermarkets nearby (Tesco and Lidl) instead where parking is free.

There are no problems with parking in Ashford town centre.

Shops and businesses are already struggling and closing down.

Parking will be moved to residential roads to avoid the charges.

There is already a lack of spaces since the multi-storey car park closed.

The multi-storey car park should be re-opened.

People will stop coming to Ashford and will go to other towns instead.

The existing 2 hour limit just needs to be better enforced.

Many people visiting Ashford only want to stop for a short period of time (5 or 10 minutes) and these people will not want to bother with the hassle of paying with cash or using an app just for these brief visits and will go elsewhere.



General support for double yellow lines.

Existing restrictions are not enforced.

Footway parking outside Superdrug is an issue that needs addressing.

### **Analysis**

The advertised proposal is to convert the existing single yellow lines (no waiting Monday to Saturday 7am to 7pm) to double yellow lines (no waiting at any time). The rules and exemptions for these waiting restrictions are the same, and the only difference being that single yellow lines prevent waiting during certain times of the day and week,

and wedding vehicles, and for loading and unloading and picking up and dropping off passengers. To the south of the Clarendon Road junction, outside the Fordbridge Community Centre, this section of road is remaining unrestricted, and parking will be allowed to continue there as it has been doing.

Some objectors reading the newspaper advertisement may have misunderstood that the double yellow lines are only proposed as shown on the plans and not necessarily for the entire length of street listed in that advertisement.

The majority of drivers visiting Ashford do not park on the single yellow lined areas, and as drivers would be more expected to park in nearby parking bays than in nearby residential streets, displacement parking to such residential streets is not expected to occur in any noticeable numbers as part of this double yellow line proposal.

On **Woodthorpe Road**, there will be a slight amendment to the proposed length of double yellow lines on the south side outside number 32, where the restrictions will terminate 5m east of the boundary line of numbers 32 and 34, to allow unrestricted parking to take place for small cars in between the two dropped kerbs.

## **Ashford Town Centre (Electric Vehicle Parking)**

### **Overview:**

Drawing number: 2023-23

Objections: 24

Comments: 3

Support: 1

Final decision: Proceed as advertised.

### **Summary**

The objections referred to the following points: -

Prevents non-electric vehicle drivers from parking.

Bays should be dual use.

Existing spaces should be maintained.

No more electric vehicle spaces are needed.

Charging spaces should be away from the town centre.

Not many electric vehicles in Ashford.

Electric vehicle bays are for recharging, not for visiting the town.

The comments referred to the following points: -

Signage should be clearer.

Paying to park and paying to charge vehicle here is unfair.

Electric vehicles damage the environment (short lifetime and batteries)

### **Analysis**

The proposed electric vehicle spaces are formalising those currently installed on Woodthorpe Road, vehicle recharging spaces on the public highway.

They are located amongst existing 2 hour bays but have a 4 hour time limit so that they can be used by those visiting the town or by residents living nearby. Having an electric vehicle only restriction ensures that these charge points are serving their intended road user, especially as they are expensive to install and maintain. Electric vehicle spaces can encourage new visitors to a town as electric vehicle owners look to find more spaces to charge their vehicles in Spelthorne. These spaces complim