

## Weybridge division proposals

The county councillor for this division is [Mr Tim Oliver](#). The [original drawings](#) are still available on our website for reference.

### Weybridge

#### Egerton Road

##### Overview

- Drawing number: 55
- Objections: 1
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 0
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

##### Analysis

One resident of Holme Chase objected to the scheme, stating that proposals will simply push problems further down the road and that instead a permit scheme should be introduced.

This area is inappropriate for a permit scheme as generally speaking residents have substantial amounts of off-street parking.

#### Fortescue Road

##### Overview:

- Drawing number: 56
- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 3
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

##### Analysis

The three responses in support of the proposals came from two addresses in Mayfield House. The 'other comment' came from a resident of Fortescue Road suggesting that they supported the restrictions and would be happy to see them extended further. We do not think this is necessary at the moment, however this could be reconsidered in future parking review if desired – please refer to the [Annex](#) on this matter.

## Radnor Road

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 57
- Objections: 6
- Other comments: 1
- Support: 4
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

### Analysis

Residents of Radnor Road raised six objections from five properties, and four comments in support from four properties. The 'other comment' was from a resident of a nearby road, which said that the proposals may improve safety but could lead to some displacement.

The comments in support said that the proposals are required to enable safe access along the road. The objections cite the fact that parking in Radnor Road is already very highly stressed. Many residents have more than one vehicle and the frontage of the properties are only about one car wide. They also state that parking is rarely a problem and when someone does park on the corner, they can be traced and asked to move.

The public highway exists to enable safe and efficient movement of goods and people, not to provide parking capacity. We have a duty to maintain the safety standards of the highway and to manage traffic on our network. We've had complaints from refuse services and local residents about the road being blocked at these points and if refuse vehicles cannot get through then the emergency services would have the same trouble. Telephoning people and asking them to move is obviously not a reliable or practicable way of managing this situation.

We recognise that parking is extremely valuable to residents, which is why the lengths of controls are absolutely minimised under these proposals.

## Springfield Lane

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 58
- Objections: 3
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: do not proceed.

### Analysis

We received four responses in total, two from Springfield Lane and two from Monument Green. The response in support of the proposals said that vehicles parking on the footway alongside 25 Monument Green have frequently caused damage to the wall at that location, as well as obstruction to service vehicles accessing the lane.

The objections state that residents do not have off street parking here, that there's very little available space within the permit parking scheme, and that they need to use this area to park their vehicles. Whilst we sympathise with residents, our priority is to maintain a safe and accessible highway network. Highways do not exist to provide parking capacity. Parking in this area is only achieved by parking on the footway which causes an obstruction to the footway and makes access to the sites on the opposite side of the road extremely difficult.

Given the feedback received, and the difficulties residents would have in finding alternative parking space we have decided not to proceed with the proposed yellow lines at the current time. However, we will monitor the location and may reconsider the idea if significant problems arise in future.

## St George's Avenue

### Overview:

- Drawing number: 59
- Objections: 0
- Other comments: 0
- Support: 1
- Final decision: go ahead as advertised.

### Analysis

We received one comment in support of the proposals on safety grounds from a resident of Cavendish Road.

## Wey Road, Round Oak Road

### Overview:

- Drawing numbers: 60 and 61
- Objections: 140
- Other comments: 6
- Support: 24
- Final decision: do not proceed.

### Analysis

We have provided a number of tables in [Annex 2](#) to show the breakdown of responses by road and stakeholder, the overall response rate, and the responses in relation to the original petition.

As shown in [Table 2.2](#), there were 11 objections (58%) and 8 comments in support (42%) from Round Oak Road residents, and 29 objections (66%), 12 comments in support (27%) and 3 other comments (7%) from Wey Road.

[Table 2.3](#) shows that even if substantial changes were made to the proposed scheme, there would still be a majority of residents opposed to the scheme.

### Main summary and count of comments from Round Oak Road and Wey Road (excluding multiple response from the same address):

- Restrictions are unnecessary, there are no parking/safety/congestion problems here.
- Parking permits place an unnecessary cost / inconvenience on residents / visitors with insufficient parking.
- Scheme should only operate Mon-Fri, 9am-5pm / scheme should only operate Mon-Fri, 9am-5pm if it must go ahead.
- These roads provide free parking for workers in / visitors to the town and that should be retained.
- Parking bays and lines would be visually intrusive.
- The charges should be increased to match those of Churchfield Road car park / parking period reduced on parking bays.
- All bays should be available to residents.
- Support.

- Proposals will increase traffic / reduce safety as the area is facilitated as a parking destination.
- Support, the road is full of parked cars.
- Scheme should operate Mon-Fri 10am-noon as this would minimise inconvenience to visitors and enable short term visitors to the town / high street.
- Every household should have at least one permit free.
- All bays should be for permit holders only.
- Current level of parking results in dangerous pinch points and obstructions.
- Car parking makes it difficult to get out of our driveway.
- Parking causes obstruction on the road / footway at certain places.
- Support, the proposals will enable people to visit the high street but prevent all day parking.

The results show 76 out of 79 responses (96%) from outside of the two proposals roads were objections (see [Table 2.2](#)). The main concerns related to displacement of parking to nearby roads, loss of access to the nearby church and school, and loss of free parking for workers and visitors to the town.

### **Decision**

Given that the analysis shows residents to be against the scheme and would be even if considerable amendments were made to it, and that non-residents were vehemently against the proposals, we have decided not to proceed with any changes to parking in Wey Road and Round Oak Road at the current time.